United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2015 No. 116

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 23, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Reverend Brian Bohlman, The Harvest Church, Lexington, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past and our hope for years to come, we assemble today with humility in our hearts as we ask for Your blessing upon the affairs of this House.

We also remember the words of President Lincoln, when he said: ''I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go.''

So, Lord, we thank You, that when we lack wisdom and strength, that You give generously to all who ask without finding fault.

May our elected officials and leaders work together towards the common interests of the American people. May they act justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with their God.

Lord, we also ask for Your protection over our servicemembers and families, both abroad and at home. Strengthen them when they are weary, increase their power when weak.

Continue to bless our Nation and the work of this House. For your honor and glory, O Lord, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TROTT 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 CHAPLAIN BRIAN BOHLMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize a constituent, Chaplain Lieutenant Colonel Brian Bohlman, as our guest chaplain today.

Chaplain Bohlman, a native of Bel Air, Maryland, now resides in West Columbia, South Carolina. Lieutenant Colonel Bohlman is a dedicated member of the South Carolina Air National Guard.

After enlisting in the Air Force in 1992, he faithfully served in the Air Force and Air Force Reserves before joining the South Carolina Air National Guard. On Active Duty, Chaplain Bohlman provided ministry at home and abroad during Operations Noble Eagle, Enduring Freedom, and Iraqi Freedom.

He is the author of ''So Help Me God,'' which is a historical review of the oath of the military office, and ''For God and Country,'' which discusses the call for military chaplaincy.

In recognition of his service and pastoral care, Chaplain Bohlman was awarded the Samuel Stone Award as the Air National Guard Chaplain of the Year in 2013, a well-deserved honor.

Chaplain Bohlman is also the founder and director of Operation Thank You, a nonprofit dedicated to inspiring our servicemembers and military families.

As a 28-year veteran of the National Guard and grateful parent of three members currently serving in the Guard, I know firsthand of Chaplain Bohlman's dedicated service.

I am grateful to welcome Chaplain Brian Bohlman, his wife, Shelley, and his daughter, Mary Ellen, to the Capitol today.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five further

Printed on recycled paper.

requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OPPOSE THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, this headline is dated July 21, 2025. It is what our children and grandchildren will read in the history books in 10 years. ''Due to Obama Agreement, Iran Develops Nuclear Arsenal. Rogue Nation Now Threatening To Strike United States, Destroy Israel, & Attack Other U.S. Allies.''

In addition to creating a nuclear Iran, this deal will also create an arms race. It will create a means through which to finance more terrorism. It will create more tension because we only have ''managed access inspections.''

What this deal will not change is Iran's behavior. They will continue to hate us. They will continue to call for ''death to America.''

This deal is a big gamble, a gamble the United Nations is apparently willing to take, but one that we in Congress must reject.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this deal. We can never allow this terrible headline to become a reality.

CONGRATULATING PRATT & WHITNEY ON THEIR 90TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pratt & Whitney on their 90th anniversary.

Since 1925, Pratt & Whitney has been a cornerstone of Connecticut's and the Nation's economy. In the last 90 years, men and women from across the country and in my State have designed and produced the most technologically advanced and dependable engines on the market.

Their F–135 engine powers Lockheed Martin's F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, and their new geared turbofan engine is setting the standard for performance in commercial aviation.

Pratt & Whitney's engineers, manufacturers, designers, and technicians have fostered Connecticut's innovation ecosystem for almost a century. We could not be more proud that they call Connecticut home.

Congratulations, Pratt & Whitney. We look forward to another 90 years of aviation leadership.

WE MUST ADDRESS SANCTUARY CITIES

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider legislation to address sanctuary cities, local policies that skirt Federal policies regarding the detention of undocumented individuals who have broken the law, a policy that led recently to a terrible tragedy. We should address this. It is right we do so.

But I rise out of concern for the enforcement mechanism in the current draft of the legislation. The current draft would penalize sanctuary cities by reducing assistance to law enforcement, the very men and women we rely on each day to keep us safe.

Consider the irony. To promote greater public safety in law enforcement, we are threatening to reduce assistance to law enforcement, when it is commissions and councils that actually adopt policies regarding sanctuary cities. This is simply wrong.

We can do better. I anticipate voting for passage because we need to address this issue nationally, but I ask my colleagues today to work together. Let's replace this shortsighted provision that wrongfully punishes those who serve us each day on the front lines of law enforcement, men and women that, months ago, we lauded on this House floor during Police Week for the fine work they do.

Let's not reduce resources for law enforcement. Let's ensure that we are able to increase and continue to invest in local law enforcement.

SAFE AND ACCURATE FOOD LABELING ACT OF 2015

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1599, which would nullify states' rights to label genetically modified organisms, commonly known as GMOs. The House will vote on this bill today.

I share the concerns of many of my constituents in California's 13th Congressional District about the proliferation of untested, genetically modified foods entering our food supply.

I also share the concerns about the risks to farmers, the environment, and public health created by the rushed commercialization of genetically engineered crops and genetically modified food products.

American consumers deserve the best information available when it comes to food choices that they make for themselves and their families. Already, some 64 nations around the world require GMO labeling.

We need to be on the side of transparency and the safety of the people we represent. That is why I support legislation like Representative PETER DEFAZIO's Genetically Engineered Food Right-to-Know Act, H.R. 913, which would require the labeling of genetically engineered foods at the Federal level.

So I hope my colleagues will defeat H.R. 1599 and move forward with Federal efforts requiring adequate and clear labeling for the foods American families are eating.

FINDING A CURE FOR DIABETES

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the 1.25 million American children and adults with type 1 diabetes.

As Members of Congress, we have the privilege of meeting with individuals from our home States advocating on various issues. All come from different backgrounds and different experiences; however, they all have one thing in common: they come to Washington looking to change our Nation.

Last week, I had the honor of meeting with 11-year-old Skye Archibald from Exeter, New Hampshire, who was in Washington as part of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation's Children's Congress. Skye was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at the young age of 9 and, since then, has been vital in changing the stigma attached with diabetes, raising money to help find a cure, and advocating at both the Federal and State level. In fact, her hard work and dedication has resulted in the signing of a bill by New Hampshire's own Governor.

It is because of bright and determined advocates like Skye that Washington can begin working better for New Hampshire. And it is because of Skye that I recently signed on to H.R. 1427, a bipartisan bill to help provide increased coverage of a vital tool that monitors sugar levels to help save the lives of those with diabetes.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MS. TOMMIE WILLIAMS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and legacy of a very inspirational Grand Prairie resident from the Dalworth community, Ms. Tommie Williams.

Ms. Williams worked as an educator in several capacities next-door in the Arlington Independent School District. She served as a first, third, and seventh grade teacher, a basketball coach, a cheerleading sponsor, and vice president of curriculum at Sam Houston High School. In addition, Ms. Williams was the first African American administrator and the first parent to serve as a community ombudsman in the Arlington Independent School District.

In honor of her outstanding service and education, the Tommie B. Williams Elementary School in Arlington was dedicated in her honor in 1991.

Although we lost a great educator in the Arlington Independent School District and many in the Dalworth community lost a great neighbor, her

friends, the students that she taught, the parents, the faculty will always remember her passion and her belief in a brighter future for our youngest members of society.

ENFORCE THE LAW AGAINST SANCTUARY CITIES

(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, today I rise in favor of H.R. 3009, Enforce the Law Against Sanctuary Cities Act.

Why does it take tragedy after tragedy before this Congress and America gets behind the idea that we don't have to have more tragedies like Kate Steinle in San Francisco or one that almost may be forgotten about, Jamiel Shaw, Jr., in southern California some years ago, all at the hands of illegal immigrants that should not be here, should be deported? Why do we keep doing this?

Indeed, sanctuary cities not only don't enforce the law, they intentionally cause people to be in harm's way because they are not enforcing the law. Denying funding to them is one strong message to sanctuary cities, over 300 of them now in the United States, that they are doing the wrong thing and needlessly endangering or losing the lives of Kate Steinle to illegal immigrants that are here causing this crime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 3009, and for the Senate to timely take it up and pass it as well.

□ 1015

SANCTUARY CITIES

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, watching the news lately, it is nothing but Donald Trump and his baseless rhetoric. He has attacked a war hero, but first attacked an entire country of people. Donald Trump is trying to get into the White House, but it looks like he has already infiltrated Congress.

This bill on the floor of this House today has Donald Trump written all over it. This Donald Trump bill treats people like criminals who haven't even been arrested yet.

Congress doesn't need to tell our local police and sheriffs how to keep us safe. Decades of research shows that this kind of bill will only make our neighborhoods less safe.

The safety of our families should not be a pawn to please Donald Trump. Republicans should work to fix our broken immigration system that will make our neighborhoods safer and supercharge our economy.

I stand with the Major County Sheriffs' Association and the Fraternal Order of Police and oppose this bill.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND REFORM ACT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed legislation that would fund the Nation's highway and transit programs through December 18.

Transportation and infrastructure are key components of economic development efforts in North Carolina, and this fiscally responsible bill keeps important road and bridge projects going in the short term while discussions continue on a longer term bill.

Earlier this year I introduced legislation to help the Federal Government responsibly manage taxpayer money and stretch the limited funds available to the highway trust fund by exempting it from the Davis-Bacon Act's outdated, wasteful labor requirements for Federal-aid highway and public transportation projects.

The Davis-Bacon Act was passed in 1931 and requires Federal contractors and subcontractors to pay the local prevailing wage for construction projects on which the Federal Government is a party.

For decades, it has been driving up the cost of Federal highway projects by mandating artificially high wages. It is time to get America back on track by spending wisely, not carelessly.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, just a few days from now, America will have the privilege of celebrating the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, with the sadness to know that that Voting Rights Act has been gutted by the United States Supreme Court with instructions for this Congress to respond to the rights of Americans to vote.

I am very proud of the words that Justice Ginsburg said: It is common sense that, if polio is on the demise, why get rid of the polio vaccination.

Voting prohibitions and prohibiting people from voting has decreased over the decades, but it has because of the Voting Rights Act. Frankly, we are doing a great disservice.

When there are rebel flags being flown to show racial divide or monuments that represent very dire comments about those who are slaves, it looks as if this Congress could bring a voting rights legislation to be voted on for all Americans to be able to vote.

What a sad state of affairs when we cannot have a real vote on the floor of the House to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, which many of us have worked on even from the last Congress.

I finally conclude by saying on this floor will be a bill dealing with what we call sanctuary cities, taking advantage of an enormous tragedy of which I offer my deepest sympathy.

The National League of Cities, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the national Major County Sheriffs' Association are saying that the bill dealing with sanctuary cities is misguided.

It penalizes law enforcement, and it doesn't allow the common sense that should have been issued in San Francisco, pick up the phone and communicate.

I think we should do the right kind of law in this body, not laws that will undermine the very principles of democracy, equality, and justice.

Pass a Voting Rights Act now.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 23, 2015 at 9:32 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1599.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3009, ENFORCE THE LAW FOR SANCTUARY CITIES ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 370 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 370

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3009) to amend section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny assistance under such section to a State or political subdivision of a State that prohibits its officials from taking certain actions with respect to immigration. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time

as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 370, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3009, the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act. The Rules Committee met yesterday evening and heard testimony from both the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, in addition to several Members interested in this important issue.

This rule brought forward by the committee is a closed rule and provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

We are bringing this rule forward today because both the safety of American people and the integrity of our system of laws depends on its passage. No institution, body, or agency has the right to selectively apply the law or selectively enforce the law.

The same individuals who claim exemption from our immigration laws demand equality under our criminal laws. Do we really want to live in a country where an agency claims the authority to pass political judgment on you and your circumstance to determine if the law applies to you?

This is precisely what the administration is proposing. Not only are their actions contrary to public safety, they fundamentally undermine the most basic concept of law.

I believe that sanctuary cities are unacceptable. That is why I was a part of the effort to prohibit them in Georgia and why I am so committed to continuing this fight here in Congress.

The tragic and preventible death of Kate Steinle in San Francisco at the hands of an illegal immigrant is the latest example of why we have to address sanctuary cities and enforce the law. Hear me, Mr. Speaker. Kate is not the only victim.

According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, of 74,911 Federal crimes in fiscal year 2014, 27,505, or 36 percent, were committed by those here illegally.

During an 8-month period in 2014, sanctuary cities released more than 8,000 criminal illegal immigrant offenders the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement was seeking to deport.

According to a new report released by the Center for Immigration Studies, of these 8,000 released, approximately 1,900 were arrested for successive crimes during the 8-month timeframe.

I believe San Francisco's hands are soaked in blood now. They choose to protect criminal illegal aliens over an innocent American woman.

Beyond the public safety threat posed by sanctuary cities, the Federal Government has the responsibility to be good stewards of tax dollars entrusted to them by hard-working Americans.

There is no reasonable explanation, in law or policy, as to why the Federal Government should send money to cities in the form of grants or reimbursements to help them enforce the law when they are blatantly ignoring the law.

It is a waste of taxpayer money to send this money to States for purposes of law enforcement when they clearly aren't using it for that purpose.

The situation before us today is one dangerous political hypocrisy. The administration has vocally stated immigration law lies with the Federal Government and the Federal Government alone.

In fact, their entire case against Arizona was premised on that point. That was when States were trying to enforce the law.

When States don't enforce the law, essentially playing into the administration's failure to enforce the administration's claims, there is nothing they can do. It is sort of an interesting proposition.

Last week I questioned the Secretary of Homeland Security about the issues of sanctuary cities. The Secretary stated there was nothing that DHS could do and that he didn't feel it was productive to try and force the cities to cooperate.

The administration jumped all over States that help enforce immigration laws, including suing Arizona for enacting laws to protect its borders and its citizens.

I ask: Where is the outrage by the administration over San Francisco's failure to follow the law? Where is the lawsuit?

It is not surprising that the administration is only outraged when States are acting in a manner that doesn't meet their political goals.

DHS refuses to make sanctuary cities comply with the law while, at the same time, DOJ is now requiring law enforcement in Maricopa County, Arizona, to provide services in Spanish to jail inmates and to have Federal oversight for all workforce enforcement raids. This kind of political hypocrisy is the kind that has already cost the life of Kate Steinle.

The administration wants a nonenforcement policy, but it is up to Congress to make the administration follow the law. That is exactly why the Rules Committee is bringing forward this rule and H.R. 3009.

Sanctuary cities ignore and shield illegal immigrants at the expense of law-abiding Americans, and the administration, through its failure to defend and enforce this law, is complicit.

Listen, Mr. Speaker, I believe that sanctuary cities should be descriptions of cities that provide safe and secure places for law-abiding citizens, not the definition for cities choosing to provide safety for those flaunting our immigration laws.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. The rule here today provides for consideration of H.R. 3009, a bill that I strongly oppose that wouldn't even solve the problem that it attempts to here today.

First, a little bit about the process. This is a closed process that reflects the practice of shutting down debate on the House floor.

We should be talking about how to protect Americans like Kathryn Steinle. Instead, we are limited to debating a bill that, even if it had been the law, would not have affected this case or others like it or secured our borders. We are not even allowed to introduce amendments that would secure our borders here before the House floor.

We have not had a single hearing on this bill, and it has not been marked up in committee. It simply appeared before the Judiciary Committee.

It simply appeared before the Rules Committee yesterday fully formed. We talked for several hours about many of its flaws there. But, unfortunately, nevertheless, it has been advanced under this rule to the House floor.

This bill is not a fix. It is not a solution to anything. It is a heavy-handed way to attack communities that are simply trying to find solutions to what is fundamentally a Federal problem.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, dress it up however you like. It is our fault, the institution of Congress' fault, the Federal Government's fault, that we have failed to secure our borders.

It is the Federal Government's fault that there are 10-, 12-, 14 million people in our country illegally, some of them felon immigrants. That is not the fault of any city or county or State.

Our law enforcement professionals—sheriffs, police chiefs—are doing the best they can with the facts on the ground which work against them because of this body's failure to act.

This bill before us is simply an attempt to provide a false solution to a tragic incident, this in spite of the fact this body has refused to bring forward a single bill to fix our broken immigration system or secure our border.

The murder of Kathryn Steinle was a terrible tragedy. It should not have occurred. There were so many breakages along the way and things that could have been done to prevent it. But this action is primarily a way to highlight our broken immigration system.

It is a disgrace, for instance, that our immigration enforcement agencies dedicate significant resources to pursuing tens of thousands of individuals with no criminal history while the enforcement of our laws against serious felons like Mr. Lopez-Sanchez, as a result, is limited to something like a phone call or an email from the sheriff in San Francisco.

□ 1030

ICE, the agency with sole authority to pursue, detain, and deport people within our borders—an agency with a budget of more than $5 billion annually—is to blame here for its perverse allocation of resources.

Mr. Speaker, ICE should have pursued this individual vigorously, and ICE is responsible for the fact that this man was walking the streets of San Francisco instead of in Mexico; but, rather than take responsibility for this tragedy and commit to making the necessary changes to prevent anything like this from happening in the future—like, for instance, encapsulating the President's DACA and DAPA programs in statute so that our limited enforcement resources can be focused on criminal felons rather than tens of thousands of individuals with no criminal history—instead of doing that, this body is threatening local law enforcement with reducing their funds to keep communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us would do even less to address this issue in a meaningful way. This legislation undermines local law enforcement, tramples the 10th Amendment to our Constitution, and directly undermines the authority and judgment exercised by local law enforcement agencies that are simply trying to do their job as best they can in light of a Federal failure—a Federal failure—to deport felon immigrants, a Federal failure to secure our borders, and a Federal failure to establish enforcement priorities in statute.

These decisions behind policing communities and ensuring public safety are made by those in those jurisdictions. We shouldn't have reactionary politicians in Washington threatening to cut off funding to sheriffs and police chiefs to make their communities less safe and lead to more victims of felons, both immigrant and American.

That is why this bill is opposed by the Conference of Mayors, Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, the Fraternal Order of Police, and many other law enforcement professionals.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which we began the session of Congress by reading, makes it clear that it is the Federal Government's responsibility to create and enforce immigration policy.

No matter how much this body tries to pass its failure on to cities, States, and counties, it will always come back here because only the Federal Government can secure our borders, only the Federal Government can establish enforcement priorities in statute, only the Federal Government can provide a pathway to citizenship, and only the Federal Government deports felon immigrants.

Despite this, however, Congress has displayed a complete and total unwillingness to even begin the debate on fixing our broken immigration system, instead choosing to threaten local law enforcement for our own failures in this town, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to reinitiate this debate just yesterday in the Rules Committee by introducing an amendment to this bill that would have allowed us to address the systemic problems by considering comprehensive immigration reform, including border security. Unfortunately, on a party-line vote, my measure was voted down and, therefore, in favor of maintaining this status quo.

Instead of having a meaningful debate on how to make our immigration system work in our favor and keep Americans safe by keeping immigrant felons off the street and securing our border, the Republicans are instead insisting to push this bill through the House, threatening local law enforcement without hearing, committee debate, or even the opportunity to amend it with good ideas from Democrats or Republicans.

Felons and egregious immigration violators like Mr. Lopez-Sanchez should not be free to walk the streets of this country, but until this body gets serious about securing our border and creating enforceable laws with the resources to enforce them, people like Mr. Lopez-Sanchez will walk free and will continue to harm Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will effectively require local enforcement of immigration laws, effectively trying to foist off our responsibilities on beleaguered local law enforcement agencies who, with their limited resources, are making the best judgments they can to keep their communities safe.

Federal courts have found that the DHS detainer policies violate the Constitution. Because ICE detainers request that a person be held in local custody for up to 2 days beyond the time they would otherwise be released, Federal courts have concluded that ICE detainers cause a new period of detention, and they are unconstitutional.

ICE has flouted this requirement for years, issuing detainers based on investigative interests alone; and these dragnet detainer issuances practices have caused the detention of countless people who were not criminal felons, felon aliens, who are not removable—even U.S. citizens in some cases.

The Federal courts finally caught up with this practice and found them to be unconstitutional and are holding local agencies under civil liability for honoring detainer requests from ICE.

In Colorado, for example, the Arapahoe County sheriff was forced to pay $30,000 to a victim of domestic violence who was, herself, arrested when she called the police for help. She was then held in the Arapahoe County jail at the request of Federal immigration authorities for 3 days after a judge had ordered her release. Another case in Jefferson County Sheriff's Office was forced to settle for $40,000.

Now, detainers are a form of communication and are therefore, in a reasonable reading of this proposed law, included. Effectively, you are presenting impossible choices to local law enforcement. You are telling them, on the one hand, subject yourself to civil liability or subject yourself to the cutting off of Federal grants to support your efforts.

Either way, Mr. Speaker, it is a loss for the safety of American citizens and a loss for law enforcement, all because this body fails to own up to the fact that only we can fix the problem; only we can secure the border; only we can replace our immigration system with a comprehensive approach that makes sense and has the resources to enforce it, the Federal resources to enforcement.

This isn't some theoretical matter that some intellectually curious law review cooked up. Jurisdictions in my district have been found civilly liable for enforcing detainers and been forced to pay. Lawsuits are being filed, and local law enforcement agencies that serve as proxies for ICE are losing.

If you want to tell cities in my State to enforce unconstitutional policies, why not take on the liability federally? Will this body pay the settlement from the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office? Will this body pay the settlement of $30,000 from the Arapahoe County sheriff?

The Republicans are making it clear that they don't have a plan to keep people like Kathryn Steinle safe. They don't have a plan to secure our borders. They don't have a plan to address our broken immigration system. This bill today is just another piece of evidence of this body's, this institution's failure to keep Americans safe.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to hit a couple of points here. It was stated by my friend from Colorado about the issue of San Francisco and pursuing individuals, such as this one who committed murder; and the fact is ICE did ask for him to be held. San Francisco made the choice to let him go, which is leading us to the issue today before us, and we want to continue.

Also, this one assertion that this is a false solution debate—when is it a false solution to actually have to be here and discuss actually enforcing the law? I think that is exactly what we are doing here. If you choose to enforce the law, that is what your proper role should be, and if not, these are the penalties that will be put in place.

I think we will continue this process, Mr. Speaker, and at this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule. This process is an absolutely outrage. I also rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3009.

Mr. Speaker, along with all of my colleagues and every American, my heart goes out to the family of Kathryn Steinle. The murder of any innocent person is a tragedy, and after each such heinous crime, we always ask ourselves: Could this have been avoided? Could we have done something differently?

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3009 paints itself as a remedy to Kathryn Steinle's death, but it does nothing—absolutely nothing—to address how to improve communication between our law enforcement, immigration, prosecutors, and penal institutions, nor does it improve the protocols and practices of how decisions are made on the release or transfer of a prisoner against whom ICE has lodged a detainer request.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3009 chose to penalize local law enforcement agencies and strip them of their Federal grants and funding when they prioritize working with immigrant communities in order to keep neighborhoods, cities, and towns safe.

Republicans would rather demonize these cities and local law enforcement agencies and force them to squander scarce local resources on immigration enforcement, instead of local policing. In effect, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3009 will make our cities and communities less safe, rather than more secure.

This is why law enforcement and city governments oppose this bill. It deliberately and cynically undermines their ability to protect their communities, nurture public trust in the police and our legal system, and strengthen our public safety.

H.R. 3009 is opposed by the Major County Sheriffs' Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Criminal Justice Association, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National League of Cities; all of them strongly oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reeks of prejudice. It isn't meant to solve any problem. It is meant to punish cities that don't embrace the views of anti-immigrant extremists. It is meant to demonize all immigrants as criminals.

It means to punish any city, any police officer, any sheriff, and any cop on the beat who challenges the Republican anti-immigrant orthodoxy of ''hate them all'' and ''deport them all.'' Deport the DREAMers; deport the parents of U.S. citizens; deport children fleeing violence—deport, deport, deport.

Mr. Speaker, this House continues to wait and wait for the Republican majority to show some leadership and bring up a comprehensive immigration reform bill. It has been more than 2 years since the Senate passed a strong, bipartisan immigration reform bill; and we are still waiting for the House Republicans to act.

What we need is a way to bring 11 million of our neighbors, friends, colleagues, small-business owners, and hard-working residents out of the shadows. Let them register, be documented, and not fear talking with the police. Let us recognize their achievements and contributions to the American way of life.

This bill had no hearings, no markup, and no input from local law enforcement—no regular order. In fact, in the topsy-turvy world of the Republican House, the Judiciary Committee's Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee is holding its first hearing on this topic today—this morning—when this bill is already here on the House floor for debate and voted today.

No, Mr. Speaker, this bill is just more of the same, old, divisive Republican anti-immigrant formula. America is better than this, and I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule and to oppose the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise and just, again, part of this is really—and even if you look at the Administration's view on this bill and others, it is almost an Alice in Wonderland effect. What is up is down and down is up. We are looking at this, that enforcing the law hurts enforcement of the law and that it is backwards.

Now, there are issues that need to be addressed. One of the issues is that we have a communication problem. I agree. We have got a communication problem. When they say, ''Hold him; he is going to be deported; he is deportable; he is not someone we want on our streets'' and San Francisco and other sanctuary cities choose to release him, that is a communication problem. I will agree with my friends across the aisle on that point.

To say that punishing views—how about enforcing the law? The last time I sat in my law classes, we didn't enforce views; we enforced laws. I think that is what we are bringing up here.

I can't let it pass. I talked about this before, and as a Member who believes that there are immigration issues that we need to address and as a member of the Judiciary Committee—which, by the way, has held hearings dealing with this subject—in fact, just last week, the Secretary of DHS was in. I questioned him directly about this, and it is amazing. He has no real opinion about sanctuary cities as he told me in his testimony.

I find that rather amazing in that he would say that there would be a problem not enforcing these laws, and when I asked about other laws that we want to enforce—is it okay for cities to turn their back on those laws—there is not an opinion there.

We have talked about this. We have had immigration hearings. We have begun the process of marking up legislation to secure our communities, to secure our borders, and to do those things; but before we start throwing in the nature of saying there is all wrong with the Republican majority on something that we have not done, I just want to go back and remind—I am still one who at the time was out there watching the proceedings from my home in the State of Georgia, where we were doing everything we could to balance the needs of our State and our economy during shutdown and during a depression, recession—whatever you want to call it—and we were trying to balance budgets, and we were watching this issue up here, but what I saw was that we are told today we are waiting for Republicans and the Republicans have all this bad agenda.

At the same point, when this body was controlled by my friends across the aisle, when the other body across the way—the Senate—was controlled by my friends across the aisle, and when the administration was new and in their early stages of developing their strategy for solving all the world's problems, what they chose to do was wreck health care and to work against community bankers. They chose that.

□ 1045

They chose not to do comprehensive immigration reform. They chose to use it as a political issue and a political pawn. They chose not to bring this up.

When you want to bring it up, let's shine the light brightly. Let's bring it up and shine the light brightly on both sides. The world was waiting. You managed to get a lot of other things through. You managed to do other things that you wanted to do, but you chose not to do this. You chose not to make this.

My question here is simply: the bill that is being brought forward, it says enforce the law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As the gentleman from Georgia might recall, when the Democrats controlled the Senate last session, they did pass comprehensive immigration reform with strong Republican and Democratic support. More than two-thirds of the body supported securing our borders, expelling felon immigrants, and keeping Americans safe. Had this body simply acted on that bill, as we repeatedly tried to get them to do, we quite likely would not be facing this tragedy that we face here today. Until this body acts, there are likely to be more victims, more American victims, of criminal immigrants.

It is not the fault of the Democrats. We, with the Republicans in the Senate, put together a bill that would have

addressed it. It is the fault of this body, the House of Representatives, that failed to act.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy with regard to this bill, which includes that the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto this bill. He then goes into some of the same arguments we have been talking about with regard to why we need to secure our border and grow our economy and make sure that we can fix our broken immigration system.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 3009—ENFORCE THE LAW FOR SANCTUARY CITIES ACT

(Rep. Hunter, R–CA, and 44 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3009. This bill fails to offer comprehensive reforms needed to fix the Nation's broken immigration laws, undermines current Administration efforts to remove the most dangerous convicted criminals and to work collaboratively with State and local law enforcement agencies, and threatens the civil rights of all Americans by authorizing State and local officials to collect information regarding any private citizen's immigration status, at any time, for any reason, and without justification.

The Administration continues to believe that it is critical to fix the Nation's broken immigration system through comprehensive commonsense legislation that builds on existing efforts to strengthen border security, cracks down on employers hiring undocumented workers, streamlines legal immigration, and offers an earned path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants to get right with the law if they pass background checks, contribute to the Nation's economy by paying taxes, and go to the back of the line. While the Senate passed comprehensive legislation with strong bipartisan support over two years ago that would do just that, the House of Representatives failed to take any action. According to the Congressional Budget Office, that legislation would also grow the Nation's economy by 5.4 percent and reduce Federal deficits by nearly $850 billion over 20 years. The Administration continues to urge the Congress to address all of the problems with the Nation's broken immigration system and take up commonsense legislation that will offer meaningful solutions to those problems.

The Administration also believes the most effective way to enhance public safety is through sensible and effective policies that focus enforcement resources on the most significant public safety threats. The Administration has put in place new enforcement priorities that do just that, focusing limited resources on the worst offenders—national security threats, convicted criminals, gang members, and recent border crossers. The effectiveness of these new priorities depends on collaboration between Federal, State, and local law enforcement. Every day, the Federal government fosters State and local collaboration through a variety of mechanisms, including policies, programs, and joint task forces. The Department of Homeland Security's Priority Enforcement Program (PEP) enables Federal immigration enforcement to work with State and local law enforcement to take custody of individuals who are enforcement priorities, including public safety and national security threats, before those individuals are released into communities. PEP is a balanced, commonsense approach to enforcing the Nation's immigration laws. It replaced the Secure Communities program, which, by establishing a ''one-size-fits-all'' approach to State and local cooperation with Federal immigration enforcement officials, discouraged some localities from turning over dangerous individuals to DHS custody. Secure Communities was embroiled in litigation and widely criticized for undermining State and local community policing efforts. PEP builds collaboration between Federal, State, and local law enforcement that allows for the most effective enforcement while enhancing community policing and trust. The Congress should give PEP a chance to work, instead of displacing that collaborative approach—which prioritizes the worst offenders—with the coercive approach of this bill, which makes no such differentiation.

Finally, the bill would condition Federal money on State and local governments allowing their law enforcement officials to gather citizenship and immigration status information from any person at any time for any reason. The Administration believes that such blanket authority would threaten the civil rights of all Americans, lead to mistrust between communities and State and local law enforcement agencies, and impede efforts to safely, fairly, and effectively enforce the Nation's immigration laws.

If the President were presented with H.R. 3009, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Donald Trump wing of the Republican Party is clearly ascendant here today. It is the dominant thinking among House Republicans.

This is the same crowd that, just back in February, threatened the funding for Homeland Security because they were so eager to deport our DREAMers—young people who came here as children, who have cleared a criminal background check, who paid a fee and are already contributing to America—because whenever they are in doubt on immigration, they fade to the extreme right. These are the same Members of Congress who have even gone to court to sue the President of the United States when he prioritized the deportation of criminals over immigrant families; and these are the same Republicans who were so fearful of a sane discussion here, and this Congress, this House, is never a sanctuary of sanity when it comes to immigration.

But they refuse to bring to the House floor a bipartisan bill unanimously approved in the Homeland Security Committee to deal with border security. If that weren't bad enough, they came back this year with a totally partisan border security bill, and they have been afraid to bring it to the floor because they do not want a reasoned discussion of immigration in this House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, this Congress is also never a sanctuary from partisan political stunts designed to capitalize on the latest tragedy, like the tragedy that occurred in San Francisco. This bill is not about grabbing criminals; it is about grabbing headlines. It is not about a thoughtful debate of the best immigration and law enforcement policies for our country; it is about scoring political points. It does so by rejecting the expert opinion of sheriffs and police chiefs and law enforcement experts and organizations and local mayors and leaders in the municipal level across America who say that, to fight crime effectively, they need to win the trust of all of the communities that they serve.

This bill is opposed by major law enforcement organizations, by municipal government organizations. I saw at the top of the list of those law enforcement organizations the police chief of my hometown, who works with community policing to make our communities safe. Some localities believe that they can better enforce the law, better keep our communities safe, if an undocumented person who is a witness or a victim of crime is involved with them and reporting those crimes and helping enforce the law.

If I have to choose between Donald Trump and his extreme attitudes embodied by colleagues here in this House today and my local law enforcement about how to protect my family, all of our families, I choose law enforcement. Let's reject this bad bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. If they are so committed to supporting local law enforcement, eliminating funding for the COPS program is hardly the way to do it. We ought to be putting our dollars and our support and our immigration laws in conformity with the law enforcement experts across America and protect our families.

Reject this bad bill, and then do something substantive to back our law enforcement officials.

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

I appreciate the argument, and this is why we have this time. But I do want to just remind again, from my previous statement, bringing up a bill last Congress reminds me of back when I used to coach kids in football. There was always that struggle you wanted to put as many kids in, you wanted everybody to play, and you still wanted to win the game. There was that balance that you always had.

It reminds me of one time it happened to be one of my own kids. Now, that is pretty hard when you are coaching one of your own kids and you get to the end of the game and you didn't put him in like you thought you were going to because the time had run out on the game. And you go to him—fortunately, he was my son. I was driving home, and I said, ''I am sorry.'' I called his name and I said, ''I am sorry I didn't get you into the game. The time had run out, but I had every intention of getting you into the game.'' That is about like saying last Congress when the Senate was Democrat but the House was Republican and we have different ideas and different views that we

are bringing forward. I simply go back to the time when that did not exist, when time was still on the clock and they chose not to do anything.

Also, it is a good distracter from what we are talking about today: cities enforcing laws, finding solutions, and doing so. That is simply what this bill does, that is what this rule provides for, and those are the things that need to be talked about. This is the discussion that needs to be had, and this is the discussion the American people are having all over, including, by the way, San Francisco, who is reevaluating their policy even now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my House colleagues to stop and think for a moment and to oppose not only the rule, but the underlying bill. It is extreme, it is anti-immigrant, and it is really not about sanctuary cities.

In fact, this flawed legislation actually second-guesses the decisions that are made by local police chiefs and sheriffs around the country on how best to police their communities and ensure public safety and ensure the kind of cooperation that they need in order for law enforcement to work properly.

As the founder and former executive director of the National Network to End Domestic Violence, representing domestic violence organizations and coalitions around the country, I am deeply concerned that this legislation will have a negative effect on the cooperation that is necessary between law enforcement and isolated, very isolated victims of domestic and sexual violence. Furthermore, it would strip the bipartisan provisions that passed in the Violence Against Women Act when we just reauthorized it.

Specifically, H.R. 3009 negatively amends section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by doing the following:

It undermines the spirit and protections of VAWA, effectively pushing immigrant survivors and their children, many of whom are likely U.S. citizens, deeper and deeper into the shadows of danger.

It undermines the policies that local communities have determined are appropriate for their localities to ensure that victims of crime come forward without fear of retribution.

It allows violent crimes to go uninvestigated, and it leaves victims without redress because of reductions in funding.

This bill would have damaging ramifications for families across the Nation and in my home State of Maryland.

I enter into the RECORD a letter from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, representing coalitions, organizations, shelters, services, and programs in every single State in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just quote from this letter. It says: ''Fear of deportation also strengthens the ability of abusers and traffickers to silence and trap their victims. Not only are the individual victims harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to abstain from reporting violent perpetrators or coming forward, and, as a result, dangerous criminals are not identified and go unpunished.''

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN,

JULY 21, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the Steering Committee of the National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (''NTF''), comprising national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual and domestic violence victims and women's rights, we represent hundreds of organizations across the country dedicated to ensuring all survivors of violence receive the protections they deserve. For this reason, we write to express our deep concerns about the impact of the ''Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act'' (H.R. 3009), which amends section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

As government officials, we ask you to approach this issue from the perspective of a leader and be sure of the implications this bill can have on entire communities. All parties have the common goal of making communities safer. This bill will encourage law enforcement to enforce immigration law, and will significantly hinder the ability of certain communities to build trust and cooperation between vulnerable and isolated victims of domestic and sexual violence and law enforcement. Last year marked the twentieth anniversary of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act (''VAWA''), which has, since it was first enacted, included critical protections for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence. This bill undermines the spirit and protections of VAWA and will have the effect of pushing immigrant survivors and their children (many of whom are likely U.S. Citizens) deeper into the shadows and into danger.

As recognized in VAWA, bipartisan legislation supporting our nation's response to domestic and sexual violence and stalking, immigrant victims of violent crimes are often fearful of contacting law enforcement due to fear that they will be deported. A recent and comprehensive survey shows that 41 percent of Latinos believe that the primary reason Latinos/as do not come forward is fear of deportation.

Policies that minimize the intertwining of local law enforcement with ICE help bring the most vulnerable victims out of the shadows by creating trust between law enforcement and the immigrant community, which in turn helps protect our entire communities. Fear of deportation also strengthens the ability of abusers and traffickers to silence and trap their victims. Not only are the individual victims harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to abstain from reporting violent perpetrators or coming forward, and, as a result, dangerous criminals are not identified and go unpunished. These criminals remain on the streets and continue to be a danger to their communities.

This bill undermines policies that local communities have determined are appropriate for their localities, and decrease the ability of law enforcement agencies to respond to violent crimes and assist all (immigrant, citizens, etc.) victims of crime. As recognized in VAWA, law enforcement plays a critical role in our coordinated community response to domestic and sexual violence. Federal law enforcement funding supports critical training, equipment, and agency staffing that assists domestic and sexual violence victims. H.R. 3009 will allow violent crimes to go uninvestigated and leave victims without redress due to reductions in funding.

For these reasons, we urge you to affirm the intent and spirit of VAWA and oppose the provisions above. Thank you very much for taking this important step to protect and support immigrant survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Ms. EDWARDS. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not what we need to do. We need to ensure the continued protections of domestic violence victims all across this country, no matter who they are and no matter where they are, and to know that law enforcement will be there to protect them and their children.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

The best way to address the problems in our immigration system, the best way to address the lack of security for American citizens, the best way to ensure that there are not others like Kathryn Steinle and others that have fallen victim to immigrant felons is to fix our broken immigration system, secure our borders. Only Congress can do that.

Now, the President has taken the first steps to help keep Americans safe by suggesting certain policies like DACA and DAPA programs. Now, DACA is being implemented; DAPA is, unfortunately, tied up in the courts. What these efforts allow our law enforcement agencies to do is to focus their efforts on criminals like Mr. Lopez-Sanchez rather than violators of our civil law. It would be better if this body could put those concepts into statute or, better yet, make sure that we can differentiate between noncriminals and criminals within the law.

An immigration reform bill would reduce the risk of tragedies like this and help keep Americans safe by helping law enforcement identify people who are here illegally, and it would bring people out of the shadows. Identifying the portion of our people that are here illegally that qualify for relief and for prosecutorial discretion would help our law enforcement agencies narrow their focus and targets to individuals like Mr. Lopez-Sanchez.

Immigration reform efforts like H.R. 15, which was the comprehensive bill from last Congress, would modernize our immigration agencies, increase enforcement and resources tools, technology, and border security to prevent tragedies like this from occurring. Doing the difficult work of having a meaningful debate around immigration reform is the only way we can ever be able to keep Americans safer and reduce the likelihood of this kind of incident.

A vote for this particular bill won't do anything to address these systemic problems. Had this been the law, it would not have prevented this tragedy, nor does it do anything to address the problems plaguing our immigration system. Instead, it threatens and bullies local law enforcement and says to them, either expose yourself to civil liability—which is very real. My agencies in Colorado have been forced to pay—they have been forced to pay—$30,000 or $40,000. So pay legal fines, or we are going to cut your grants.

Look, it is a natural tendency of people to pass the buck, and Congress is basically trying to pass the buck to local law enforcement for our failures here in this body.

Mr. Lopez-Sanchez should not have been wandering the streets of San Francisco or any other American city. He should not have been allowed to illegally enter. In fact, he had been caught at the border four or five times, and he had snuck across other times.

□ 1100

We need real border security, and we need to finally enforce our law and get serious about restoring the rule of law, which this bill would only make an even bigger joke.

Rather than restoring the rule of law and encouraging cooperation between Federal, State, and local authorities in cases that involve immigrant felons, this bill would punish local law enforcement for prioritizing public safety and community policing over trying to do the job that Congress and the Federal Government are supposed to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3¾ minutes remaining.

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

It is time for this body to fix our broken immigration system to keep Americans safe. How many other victims like Kathryn Steinle need to make the ultimate sacrifice—or the countless other Americans who are victims of other kinds of crime—at the hands of immigrant felons? It will be until this body chooses to fix our broken immigration system and restore the rule of law.

This particular bill would only further dissipate the rule of law. It tells local law enforcement you have to either pay fines that drain your ability to enforce our laws or you lose grants that reduce your ability to enforce our laws.

Either way, if this bill were somehow to become law—even though the President has indicated he would veto it—it would drain away the very local law enforcement resources, the purpose of which is to keep Americans safe.

Let us move forward to replace our broken immigration system with one that works, not try to pass the buck. Mr. Speaker, the buck can't be passed. It is the Federal Government's responsibility to secure our border and to establish immigration laws. It is the Federal Government's responsibility to deport criminals.

No matter how this body may try to say that it should be cities and counties and sheriffs and police chiefs—who are trying to do the dirty work—who are the result of our failure to take action, they need to make the decisions that are in the best interests of keeping their communities safe.

With 10 or 12 or 14 million people in our country illegally—some of them immigrant felons—we are passing along the buck to local law enforcement with an impossible task.

Rather than make that task more impossible by forcing them to pay civil fines or to lose important law enforcement resources, let's help them have the resources and policies they need to deport felon immigrants before they can commit crimes like the tragedy that occurred in San Francisco.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, to oppose this bill, and to reject this bizarre approach that we are seeking here today, which would have done nothing to have prevented this tragedy or any other like it, and would lead to countless more tragedies by taking resources out of the hands of those who are on the front lines—on our streets, in our neighborhoods—keeping Americans safe.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This is an interesting argument, as I stated before, because it really defies, in many ways, logic.

The best way to help prevent what has just happened is to enforce the law. It is not to give a substantive, wishy-washy: Well, I won't enforce this. I don't want to enforce this. I am making a political judgment.

In fact, that is really what the law should be there for, is to say: This is the law that has been passed through the political process, but this is the law for everyone.

When you have the debates in Congress, that is what the political argument is for. I don't disagree with my friend from Colorado, as this is the part that we are supposed to debate; but once it leaves here and it is printed and it is law and it is signed, it is to be enforced.

To really argue that, on this side, we don't want to enforce, and, on this side, we want to enforce, where does it end—when we don't want to enforce drug laws? trafficking laws? employment law? Where does it end?

I am sure there are political differences in many cities, possibly in my own district of the Ninth District of Georgia, where cities say: I am not sure I like this employment law. I am not sure I like having to deal with compliance, with Federal law. We will just ignore it. No. It is about enforcement.

Lopez-Sanchez was requested by ICE. Whether you are talking about limited resources or whether you are talking about a lot of resources, it doesn't matter. They requested him to be held.

San Francisco said no. It is San Francisco's choice—their political choice, their life choice. It was a life choice for this young lady. Her life is gone.

It is not an economic choice—it is a life choice—and their choice led to a life's being taken. It is not about whether you like the law or not, and it is not about whether you have a view on the law or not—it is about whether you will enforce the law or not.

I struggle with this as I understand about the interest of immigrant communities, and I understand about good policing. My father was a State trooper.

I understand the relationship between communities and of their all working together to provide a safe community; but sanctuary cities are sanctuaries for those who abide by the law—those who are here legally, those who want to live a prosperous life and just get up and go to work and not have to worry about being shot on the street by somebody who is being sanctuaried because he is here illegally—not once but multiple times over.

As has already been stated, this is not a judgment call. San Francisco could see this. They could see his record. They could see he had been detained for illegally entering. This is not something that was, frankly, even close. They chose.

The question remains: Do we enforce or do we not? The question remains: Do we want to be under a rule of law or do we want to have something else?

It has been brought up many times today of a bill in the last Congress that was passed by the Senate that would be the panacea for everything and probably would help this. That was the implication given.

I have just one question to those who make that assertion: If San Francisco and other sanctuary cities won't enforce the law now because of their political views, what gives them any idea they would for a new law?

We have got a fundamental problem here, Mr. Speaker. The fundamental problem is: Is political rule of law going to happen or is the rule of law going to happen?

Pass any bill you want, but if we allow them to ignore it without consequence, then you have no standard, you have no basis for debate, you have no place to move forward.

You can pass everything you want to and have the President sign it in beautiful ceremonies; but if we allow political subdivisions in this country to just continue to pick and choose, then we have got a problem.

Now, if there are issues, let's solve them here. Let's have the debates—I

agree—but this isn't up for debate when it leaves here.

So pass whatever you want to pass. Will San Francisco enforce it? I don't know—maybe, maybe not—but when they released and when other sanctuary cities release them and say: We are not going to hold. We are not going to do these things, then they have made a choice. Unfortunately, in this case, they made a life choice, and that beautiful life is gone.

This rule simply says enforce the law. This rule—this bill—says we have law. It is what we have got right now. It is not your aspirational goal. It is the law. Simply enforce it.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SAFE AND ACCURATE FOOD LABELING ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1599.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 369 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1599.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1111

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1599) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to food produced from, containing, or consisting of a bioengineered organism, the labeling of natural foods, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act, is the product of diligent and bipartisan work by the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Agriculture Committee.

Over the past year and a half that we have been working on this legislation, we have solicited input from Members and from relevant agencies like the FDA and the USDA. We have also met with the organic community, conventional farmers and ranchers, seed producers, scientists, and supply chain specialists.

Throughout this process, we have sought to address every legitimate concern and provide whatever clarification might be necessary.

The fact is that the scientific consensus on the safety of genetically engineered products is utterly overwhelming. Precisely zero pieces of credible evidence have been presented that foods produced with biotechnology pose any risk to our health and safety.

Given this fact, it is not the place of government—government at any level—to arbitrarily step in and mandate that one plant product should be labeled based solely on how it was bred while another identical product is free of a government warning label because that producer chose a different breeding technology. That is unscientific, and that is bad public policy.

The mandatory labeling of genetically engineered products has no basis in legitimate health or safety concerns, but is a naked attempt to impose the preferences of a small segment of the populace on the rest of us and make the constituents whom I serve in Kansas pay more for their food.

A recent study shows that the proposed State GE labeling laws could raise the cost of the average family's food bill by, roughly, $500 per year. Many, many families in Kansas simply cannot afford that.

Antibiotechnology interest groups are attempting to use State laws to force mandatory GE labeling on safe products and interfere with interstate commerce.

To ensure that families in Kansas and all across the country have access to nutritious and affordable food, H.R. 1599 accomplishes three primary objectives.

First, we ensure that every new GE plant destined to enter the food supply goes in for an FDA safety review.

Second, we prevent the creation of what would be the unworkable patchwork of State-by-State—or even county-by-county or city-by-city—mandatory GE labeling laws.

□ 1115

Finally, in order to provide clarity to those who prefer not to eat GE products, our bill authorizes a voluntary, user-fee-based non-GE labeling program at the USDA to provide even greater transparency and more options so that consumers, by ensuring a common definition for non-GMO for all foods, whether they are sold at the retail level or served in restaurants.

Members of Congress need to realize that allowing activists to create a patchwork State-by-State set of rules will have a real effect on our families and our districts. Those who support mandatory GE products must admit they are willing to increase the cost of food for families in Wichita and Dallas and Grand Rapids and in Vermont and in Boston and all across our Nation based on unscientific demands of a handful of antibiotechnology activists.

Congress' goal must be to ensure that people in those places have access to safe, nutritious, and affordable food to feed their families. A patchwork of laws will not accomplish that.

The reality is that biotechnologies, time and time again, have proven safe. It is simply not debatable. U.S. policies should reflect that. We should not raise prices on consumers based on the wishes of a handful of activists. I ask for everyone to support H.R. 1599.

Mr Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL K. CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY: I write in regard to H.R. 1599, Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Agriculture on July 14, 2015. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 1599 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 1599 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1599 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1599, ''Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Agriculture concurs in the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of the bill at this time, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a

conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work the Committee on Energy and Commerce as this bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to address this issue that Mr. POMPEO and this bill present to this House. This question of GMO labeling and biotechnology is a good thing. Biotechnology has done a lot of good things for this country and for consumers. This is not a question about whether the science says that GMO foods cause medical issues. That is not the issue.

The question is whether consumers, when they purchase food, have a right to know what is in it. What Mr. POMPEO and this legislation are suggesting is that, regardless of what consumers want, they won't be told.

This bill does two fundamental things. One, it says to those States that this is not about a small group of activists. This is States like Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut with massive bipartisan votes, Republicans and Democrats saying that they wanted the right to have these products labeled, and then the consumer can decide whether he or she wants to purchase that product. It is the market that ultimately decides.

This legislation would basically block all State laws that require mandatory GMO labeling; so if the State of Idaho, with its Republicans and Democrats in the legislature responding to the demands of its constituents, wanted to label it, they wouldn't be able to do it. It effectively blocks the FDA from creating a national labeling standard. That is the irony here.

If you are talking preemption, you at least have to talk about a national standard that has credibility and provides information that consumers want. In this case, we strip from the States the right to do what they believe is in the interest of their citizens and don't substitute any serious label that would apply across the board. This claim that this would create a patchwork of different State laws is not addressed when you don't even offer a national standard.

Next, it would allow ''natural'' claims on GMO foods and block State laws that prevent such claims. This legislation fundamentally takes away from your State and mine the ability to do what they believe is in the interest of their consumers: let them know what they are buying.

By the way, what is the problem with letting consumers know what they are buying? They are the ones that decide what products they want to consume. The issue here, again, to repeat, is not about the science of whether GMOs cause health problems, but there is a significant issue about GMO products requiring significantly more herbicides in order to produce, and the use of herbicides—glyphosate has gone from 16 million pounds to about 280 million pounds since the introduction. Those farming practices do have an effect, and a lot of consumers are really concerned about that.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise to lend my support to H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act. As a mother, farmer, and former nutrition education teacher, I understand the importance of providing valuable information to consumers about where their food comes from and how it is grown.

If we are going to face the growing challenges of obesity in this country and increasing demand for food worldwide, each and every American is going to have to engage in an honest dialogue about our food production and distribution systems.

It is important that these systems are based on sound science, with a strong set of food labeling guidelines that are consistent across State lines, affordable for all Americans, and provide accurate and easy to understand information on the package for those consumers wanting to know more.

H.R. 1599 is a mirror image of the successful USDA organic program that many of my constituents have come to appreciate and trust. This voluntary, commonsense option program is a compromise that balances the needs of both consumers and producers while providing a national path to getting consumers information that they may want.

I thank the chairman for bringing this timely bill to the floor. I ask all my colleagues to support H.R. 1599.

Mr. WELCH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I have stated at our two Energy and Commerce Committee hearings on this issue that I am sympathetic to the need for Federal legislation.

It does not make sense to have a patchwork of food labeling requirements in different States. I also do not believe that genetically engineered foods are unsafe. If they were unsafe, they would not be allowed on the market.

However, I acknowledge that the majority of consumers want foods made with genetically engineered ingredients to be labeled as such. They view this as a right-to-know issue. While I don't know of any scientific reason to require GE foods to be labeled differently than non-GE foods, I do not believe we will be engendering confidence in these foods if we pass H.R. 1599.

I feel that by preempting State right-to-know laws without creating any national labeling requirement, this legislation will be seen by most consumers as an attempt by Congress and Washington to prevent them from knowing which foods have GE ingredients, and therefore, I intend to vote against the bill.

However, I also understand why others think this bill is important and will vote for it. Obviously, it is up to any Member to decide for him or herself how this affects constituents in their own districts and vote accordingly.

Mr. POMPEO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act.

As today's global food chain expands, consumers deserve to know what is in their food. H.R. 1599 eliminates confusion and saves taxpayers from shouldering the costs associated with a patchwork of State labeling laws.

Additionally, H.R. 1599 ensures that our food supply is safe by clearly establishing the FDA as the preeminent authority to make science-based decisions concerning food safety. Currently, a patchwork of GMO labeling has emerged across our country, with some States having completely different food labeling requirements than others.

This hodgepodge of regulation increases the cost of food for families and negatively impacts food producers. By increasing transparency, reducing the cost of regulations, and improving food safety, H.R. 1599 will bring our Nation's food labeling into the 21st century.

Mr. WELCH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 1599.

This bill establishes a voluntary nationwide USDA-administered certification program for labeling genetically engineered food products, and we believe that this is a reasonable, workable solution that balances consumer demand to know more about their food with what we know about the safety of the foods that we produce.

I didn't sign on to this bill initially because I thought we needed to make some changes, which were eventually made and made the bill supportable, from my perspective.

This is a very important point. The bill ensures that every new genetically engineered plant destined to enter the market has to go through an FDA safety review. This change means that foods from genetically engineered plants will only be able to enter the marketplace after this happens, and that is a change from the current situation.

H.R. 1599 prevents the unworkable scenario of a State-by-State, county-

by-county, or even city-by-city labeling law. This patchwork of laws would only create confusion for consumers, farmers, and food companies and would also drive up consumer grocery bills.

I acknowledge that consumers want to know what they are eating, and in my opinion, H.R. 1599 provides them with that information. Before we can do anything in this area, we have to define what this means, and if you talk to five different people about what genetically engineered or genetically modified means, you are going to get five different answers.

One of the things that will happen with this bill if it becomes law is that the USDA will go through a process, talking to all the stakeholders, and come up with a definition of what this means, which I think is one of the most important things because, right now, I think there is a real disconnect between the science on this issue and the consumers.

What this bill does is allows companies like companies in my district to go and work with the Secretary to create a non-GMO label, nongenetically engineered label.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELCH. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Then consumers can find out. If they want to purchase nongenetically engineered products, there are companies out there that are going to provide them.

I think this doesn't get to where a lot of people want to get, but it gets us a long ways down the road. It will be able to define what this means and put in place a workable solution that I think people should support.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1599.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

When considering the substitute reported by the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to confirm that the committee was aware that many ingredients derived from genetically engineered crops have been so highly refined that they contain no genetically engineered material and that finished food products produced with such ingredients, likewise, would contain no genetically engineered material.

Mr. CONAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It certainly is our understanding that products—and sugar is a good example of those—may come from a GE crop, but the finished product has no genetic material in it.

Mr. POMPEO. This fact exemplifies why labeling as to whether or not food has been produced through genetic engineering is appropriately voluntary, not mandatory, as it seems unnecessary to require labeling about the use of genetic engineering if the labeled food contains no genetically engineered material.

I would just add—and hope that the gentleman from Texas would concur—that this approach is consistent with the exemption from the labeling requirements for major food allergens that Congress has established for highly refined oils as part of the Food Allergen Labeling and Consumer Protection Act of 2004.

While the eight major food allergens—milk, egg, fish, crustacean shellfish, tree nuts, wheat, peanuts, and soybeans—must be listed on food labels where they or ingredients containing protein derived from these allergens are added to food, the definition of ''major food allergen'' excludes any highly refined oil derived from a major food allergen and ''any ingredient derived from such highly refined oil.''

Mr. CONAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman is correct. This is a perfect example of why passage of this legislation is so important.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the gentleman.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1599. Mankind has used biological technologies for more than 10,000 years to improve crops and livestock and to make useful food products, such as bread, cheese, and to preserve dairy products.

When applied to plant breeding, these technologies have led to evolution of nearly every food product we consume. These and other advances have enabled us to proudly boast that we enjoy the safest, highest quality, most abundant, diverse, and affordable food supply and fiber mankind has ever known.

As our knowledge has increased, so has the speed and precision in which we are able to harness natural capabilities to improve the plants that we cultivate. These new applications of biotechnology have been available to American and international consumers for some three decades.

The safety of technology has been documented and confirmed by the world's leading scientific and public health organizations, including the World Health Organization, the National Academies of Science, the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, the American Medical Association, and the Royal Society of Great Britain.

□ 1130

The House Agriculture Committee has frequently reviewed these technologies. We have reviewed the regulatory mechanism that has been in place since the Reagan administration and have been regularly assured by the absence of any valid concerns regarding the safety or quality of products derived from these production technologies.

Biotechnology is an essential tool for farmers and our food supply to have in the toolbox. If we plan to feed the estimated 10 billion people in the year 2050 in an environmentally sound, sustainable, affordable way, they must be used.

Unfortunately, threats exist to our ability to fully utilize this technology in the form of proposed Federal and State laws as well as some new State laws that will be implemented soon if we don't act. Passage of any new antibiotech laws and amendments or implementation of those already passed will likely have far-reaching negative consequences, which we will debate today.

The legislation before the House today addresses this threat in a manner that pays tribute to the successful voluntary, market-driven programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. These programs have not only enabled farmers to receive premiums in the marketplace for their efforts to distinguish their products, they have appealed to the growing desire of many food-conscious consumers. One such example is the highly successful National Organic Program, many aspects of which we have replicated in this legislation.

The structure and coverage of this legislation, like that of the National Organic Program, will assure consumers are given reliable, accurate, and consistent information related to the genetic engineering, whether it is at the retail level or at a restaurant.

In developing this legislation, we worked in a bipartisan fashion between the Agriculture and the Energy and Commerce Committees, receiving and integrating the ideas and suggestions of Federal agencies, organic interests, conventional producers and handlers, and more.

Mr. Chairman, mandatory labels are used as a warning or a caution. Even our opponents to this legislation have said there is no safety issue here that we are talking about to ''scare'' potential consumers. We believe this voluntary program meets that need of letting consumers know, and I urge support of the bill.

Mr. WELCH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I am rising today in strong opposition to H.R. 1599, which actually stands in direct contradiction to the wishes of almost 90 percent of Americans across the country. It is no wonder that this legislation has more commonly become known to people who are very concerned about this issue as the DARK Act, or the Deny Americans the Right to Know Act. And that is really what is at issue here.

This legislation makes a mockery of transparency and leaves U.S. consumers in the dark. What are they so afraid of? Why deprive Americans of the ability to make educated choices about whether they want food with genetically modified ingredients? Why make the labeling of such food just voluntary? Why not require it as you require basic nutrition information on processed foods now? Why not join the 64 other countries, including the EU, Japan, Australia, Brazil, and China, in empowering our constituents with information, making mandatory labeling?

My State of Hawaii is the number one State for experimental genetically engineered plant field trials, according to the USDA. Many of my constituents are very concerned about GE crop field testing because of the lack of information about these trials and the pesticides that are being applied to the fields.

On the island of Kauai, in my district, residents organized and passed an ordinance requiring large agrochemical companies to disclose the pesticides they are spraying and observe buffer zones around schools, homes, and hospitals to prevent chemical spray drifts.

The DARK Act could overrule the rights of these local communities to make such decisions to protect their health and safety and guide the growth of their agricultural industries.

This legislation could overturn a ban on the cultivation of genetically engineered coffee passed by Hawaii Island constituents, potentially damaging the global reputation of Hawaii's famous and unique Kona coffee, the only domestic coffee industry in our country. It could negate a ban on the cultivation of genetically engineered taro, endangering a main staple and culturally significant plant for indigenous Native Hawaiians.

This is why I am calling on my colleagues to adopt the Genetically Engineered Food Right-to-Know-Act. I urge my colleagues today to vote against the DARK Act and support commonsense labeling as we move forward.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that there is some misinformation here. This legislation has literally nothing to do with rules about cultivation. State laws will be able to continue to govern that. That is simply about labeling. I think it is important every one know that.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act.

When any Federal agency mandates what used to be a voluntary process, it can only add to a bureaucratic headache. A mandatory process for FDA food labeling approvals would create increased costs for businesses and consumers, invite potential litigation, and burden our Nation's farmers and small businesses.

I am pleased to see that this bill streamlines the voluntary FDA labeling process, with the help of the USDA, to make a combined, joint effort to label food headed to the market. Having uniform rules for foods with a GMO-free label will benefit consumers and alleviate struggles with interstate commerce in response to a patchwork of State and local labeling standards. H.R. 1599 will help give consumers an opportunity to make an informed choice at the supermarket, while also advancing food safety and consistency in our food labels.

I thank my colleagues in the Agriculture Committee as well as the Energy and Commerce Committee for finding a way to make this change in a simple and most effective way.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1599. This legislation, which should be called the Deny Americans the Right to Know Act, or DARK Act, represents a major threat to consumer information. States have the right to determine their own local laws relating to GMO labeling, and the Federal Government shouldn't interfere.

I frequently hear Republicans talk about states' rights and talk about the big, bad Federal Government; but when it comes down to it, here they want to take away the rights of States and counties and the voice of people, instead to support huge corporations and companies.

Polls prove again and again Americans want to know what is in their food. Nine out of ten Americans support genetically engineered labeling, including majorities of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Whites, Latinos, Blacks. What else can bring everybody together? This isn't a ''handful of activists'' we are talking about here. We are talking about 90 percent of the American people.

It is the right of States to be able to determine how they label their food. States are doing it as we speak, just as they do with many other things: sell-by requirements; labels on bottled water around deposit requirements; States requiring origin of seafood and catfish, whether it is farm raised or wild caught.

It is a vibrant discussion across the States that we should not preempt here in Washington at the behest of a couple major world corporations. We are talking about the rights of hundreds of counties and States and tribes to talk about how close to schools and hospitals pesticides can be used that relate to genetically modified organisms. Do we really want pesticides used to kill superbugs sprayed across your 5-year-old child's playground?

These are the States that we are talking about, not a handful of activists. It includes States like Texas, where legislation has been introduced.

This bill will remove everything that has the right to know for people and for States. We need to stand up to fight for the right to allow States and consumers to make these kinds of choices for themselves. That is why I cosponsored my colleague from Maine's substitute amendment, which will remove the preemption language from the bill.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the DARK Act and to support consumer transparency.

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

We have heard on multiple occasions about this 90 percent number in some poll about folks who want to have this labeling. This doesn't even pass the smell test.

When consumers were asked to list the items they would like to see labeled, exactly 7 percent of respondents to a 2013 Rutgers University study volunteered GMOs. Frankly, the most reliable survey, the ballot box, has been 100 percent consistent. Every time a GMO labeling bill has been presented to voters in any State in the United States of America, they have rejected it.

There is most certainly not 90 percent of the folks wanting to know that. This bill will not deny those handful that do the right to do that. It is disingenuous to offer up anything to the contrary.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1599.

There are real sensitivities around GMOs and all issues regarding the food we eat and feed our children and grandchildren. It is our job as policymakers, particularly as it relates to the public health, to establish a factually and scientifically sound foundation prior to taking any action that would impact consumers in our economy.

The bill before us today, H.R. 1599, does just that by ensuring national uniformity regarding labeling of foods derived from genetically engineered plants by preventing a patchwork of conflicting State or local labeling laws which inherently interfere with interstate and foreign commerce.

Genetic engineering in agriculture has occurred for centuries. Ingredients from genetically engineered plants have been a part of the U.S. food supply for decades. In fact, as much as 90 percent of our corn, sugar beet, and soybean crops are now genetically engineered, and more than 70 percent of processed foods contain ingredients derived from such crops.

The FDA oversees the safety of all food products from plant sources, including those from genetically engineered crops. These products must meet the same safety requirements as foods from traditionally bred crops.

The FDA currently has a consultation process in place in which developers of the underlying technologies address any outstanding safety or other regulatory issues with the agency prior to marketing their products. The FDA has completed approximately

100 of such consultations. No products have gone to market until FDA safety-related questions have been resolved.

FDA officials have repeatedly stated that the agency has no basis for concluding that bioengineered foods are different from other foods in a meaningful way, and the World Health Organization has confirmed that ''no effects on human health have been shown as a result of consumption of such foods.'' In fact, they can grow faster, resist diseases and drought, cost less, and prove more nutritious.

Nonetheless, there recently have been a number of State initiatives calling for mandatory labeling of food products that contain GMOs. I am concerned that a patchwork of State labeling schemes would be impractical and unworkable. Such a system would create confusion among consumers and result in higher prices and fewer options.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Representatives POMPEO and BUTTERFIELD for their leadership on this legislation. I thank my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee for working through any issues and reaching consensus between the sponsors, committees of jurisdiction, implementing agencies, and impacted stakeholders. I commend the legislation to the House and urge its adoption.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. WELCH and Mr. MCGOVERN for their work on this issue.

Ladies and gentlemen, one of the most important lessons I have learned in the years I have been in this great body is that we have got to be aware of unintended consequences.

While some claim genetically modified organisms are safe beyond a reasonable doubt, the simple fact is that there is a great deal that we do not know about a technology that alters the basic building blocks of nature.

We have more to learn about how the widespread use of GMOs could hurt the resilience of our food system by reducing the diversity of plant species, and there is much research to undertake on how the chemicals that are used concurrently with GMOs threaten human health.

Just this year, the World Health Organization found the herbicide glyphosate to be a probable cause of cancer. GMOs are designed specially to be used with great quantities of this chemical, and the herbicide is being used in increasing quantities around the world.

This is why Pope Francis, himself, recently spoke of the need to exercise greater caution with regard to genetical manipulation by biotechnology. This is why more than 90 percent of Americans want GMO labeling, according to recent polling.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1599 would make it impossible for people to even be mindful of unintended consequences. It makes it impossible for people to know what they are purchasing and eating. It prevents States from taking prudent actions to protect consumers and farmworkers.

Our Nation's leading legal organizations, environmental groups, consumer groups, and food safety groups all oppose H.R. 1599 because it is an attack on transparency and a dangerous attack on our great tradition of federalism.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), an original cosponsor, who is responsible for getting this bill to the state it is in today.

□ 1145

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. POMPEO for yielding time and thank him for his leadership on this issue. I thank Mr. WELCH for his very thoughtful debate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1599 and urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on final passage. This bipartisan bill, cosponsored by 106 of our colleagues, creates a science-based nationwide labeling standard for plant-based foods.

It establishes a national GMO-free certification program administered by USDA that will provide a government-issued label to qualifying products which will provide a market advantage.

It requires the FDA to conduct premarket safety reviews of all new GM plant varieties before they can be used to produce food, and it requires the FDA to define the term ''natural'' through a rulemaking process allowing for public input and discussion.

Despite the downright false claims made by the opponents of what it will or won't do, H.R. 1599 is a measured approach. It gives consumers certainty, while taking into account the delicate balance and sheer size and complexity of the food supply chain that employs tens of millions of Americans and is responsible for feeding the country.

My opinion is shared by the bill's 106 sponsors and by 475 agriculture, science, hunger, and nutrition organizations from all 50 States.

The alternative to H.R. 1599, already beginning to play out in some States across the country, is a complex and unworkable patchwork of differing State laws that create an uneven playing field that only can cause confusion among consumers and do little to provide transparency.

Depending on what State regulations require, farmers and manufacturers would be forced to set up separate supply chains in order to comply with as many as 50 different State laws. Wholesale changes to growing, packaging, and shipping foods would have to be made, beginning at the farm and all the way to the supermarket shelf, in order to comply.

The new infrastructure requirements are as daunting as they are costly. You can bet that all of these costs will be passed on to our constituents, with a recent study showing the average cost topping $500 a year. For many of my constituents and others across the country, that will not work.

Despite going in with knowledge of the consequences that would result from upending a highly integrated and interconnected system, several States have already moved forward with proposals that would require foods containing these ingredients to be labeled. This is in response to an unsubstantiated claim that foods containing GM ingredients are in some way dangerous; they are not.

Foods containing GM ingredients are safe. Don't take my word for it. The science regarding the safety of bioengineered foods is not murky—the opposite, in fact. There have been over 2,000 studies worldwide that shows foods grown from these plants are safe.

The FDA, USDA, the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, the American Medical Association, National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the World Health Organization, and nearly every major scientific organization agrees that foods produced with bioengineered products are as safe as their non-GMO counterparts.

Even opponents of GM foods admit they ''have failed to produce any untoward health effects,'' but the demonization of GM foods continue, despite objective science proving the contrary. Those opposed to these foods simply reject science. That is tremendously disappointing. Along with the bill's bipartisan cosponsors—again, 106—I stand with the science.

That is why I have worked with my friend, Mr. POMPEO, and the bill's cosponsors, in advocating for a Federal framework, a Federal framework that puts the FDA and USDA—our Nation's foremost food safety authorities—in the driver's seat.

H.R. 1599 is a balanced approach that reduces confusion by providing consumers with labeling uniformity across State lines. It also addresses the concerns of those opposed to GM foods by establishing a program at USDA that will provide a Federal certification for GMO-free foods, while not neglecting the fact that our Nation's farmers and manufacturers grow and produce foods that are sold far and wide.

Without a Federal standard, those farmers and manufacturers will be forced to comply with uneven, costly, potentially misleading, onerous State-by-State mandates.

Compliance will require a new, costly supply chain infrastructure that will disrupt our food supply. It will cause confusion, Mr. Chairman, and uncertainty among consumers and, ultimately, will result in the consumer shouldering the increased costs associated with production.

In that regard, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for his commitment to work with livestock and meat producers, many of whom operate farms and processing facilities in North Carolina, to

address concerns about the definition of those products in the bill.

I share Mr. CONAWAY's commitment to getting the language right on those products and ensuring fair and accurate labeling, and I thank him for working so diligently with Mr. PETERSON on these amendments.

In conclusion, H.R. 1599 is reasonable and, Mr. Chairman, it is workable.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I have an idea. It is a radical idea. It is something that is unprecedented for this Congress, something that would genuinely surprise the American people. That idea is simple; let's give the American people what they want.

Poll after poll shows that an overwhelming majority of the American people favor mandatory GMO labeling. People want to know what is in their food that they eat, and they want to know how it is grown. We should give them what they want; yet the bill before us goes in the opposite direction. It keeps the American people in the dark about whether their food contains GMOs. It is no wonder why Congress is so unpopular.

To the supporters of this ''keep Americans in the dark'' bill, I would ask one simple question: What are you afraid of?

This debate is not about whether GMOs are good or bad. I consume GMOs; my kids consume GMOs. This is about consumers' rights to know what is in the food that they eat, plain and simple.

As many of my colleagues know, I am passionate about ending hunger, both here in this country and around the world. If I thought for one second that GMO labeling would cause food prices to rise, I wouldn't be calling for GMO labeling.

This is a scare tactic being used by opponents of GMOs labeling. The fact is companies change their labels all the time, for all kinds of reasons. Transportation and commodity prices are drivers of food prices, not labeling.

If you are worried about 50 States requiring 50 different labels, then support mandatory GMO labeling. Do not override States that have already embraced GMO labeling or consumers who want them. Sixty-four countries already have GMO labeling. Why can't we?

American food companies already have to label their foods as containing GMOs in those countries. Why can't American consumers have access to the same information? Keeping consumers in the dark about what is in their food is the wrong approach.

It is a ''Washington knows best'' approach from politicians inside the beltway who think they know better than the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 1599.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Vermont has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act.

I also have great appreciation for the effort by Mr. POMPEO for a thoughtful and bipartisan bill that will be successful.

Some of the opponents of this bill, based off clear speculation and fear-mongering, are again trying to deny America's first industry—farming—the necessary technology it needs to grow more food to meet consumer demand in this generation and the next.

In what other industry do we discourage innovation? Why is it that farming technology meets such scorn perpetuated by activist groups that stand to gain financially by tearing down modern agricultural practices?

Across numerous States, including my home State of California, voters resoundingly rejected State-mandated GMO labeling. The facts are clear. Biotechs have facilitated the growth of more nutritious crops, all the while reducing pesticide spraying by an estimated 975 million pounds.

Biotech crops have also increased crops produced, saved over 300 million acres of land, and helped alleviate poverty for 16.5 million small farmers and farm families, while reducing agriculture's—wait for it—greenhouse gases.

While some of the colleagues across the aisle have advocated consumers have a right to know—and I agree—but mandated labeling will only cause more consumer confusion, while drastically increasing the cost of foods for families at the store shelf across the entire Nation. This bill allows consumers to have a choice by establishing a voluntary non-GMO labeling program, much like the successful national organic program.

It is about common sense and delivering consumers what they want, choice and confidence while buying their foods without unnecessary confusion and high costs. A uniform, 50-State standard helps achieve that goal.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1599. This misguided legislation would limit consumers' access to information about the food they eat by preempting State laws and codifying the current failed system.

I want to be clear. This is not a debate about whether or not genetically-engineered foods are safe. It is a debate about whether or not consumers have a right to know what is in their food is the point I hope we can all agree upon.

Unfortunately, consumers currently do not have access to the information they are looking for when it comes to genetically engineered foods. Current labeling standards are so ineffective that consumers are often confused by the information that they do find.

Consumers should be able to trust that the labeling on food is both accurate and truthful. Consumers should not be confused about something as basic and fundamental as the food they eat, but rather than fix this problem, H.R. 1599 simply perpetuates the status quo of confusion.

The food industry claims the current voluntary system is adequate and consumers do have information they need; yet despite the fact that there are great numbers of genetically engineered foods on the market, very few of them have been labeled as such.

Our constituents want to know how their food is made, and they are calling on us to help make this information more accessible, but instead of responding to this call, this flawed legislation ignores the problem and makes it even harder to require labeling in the future. It removes FDA's authority to craft a national labeling solution yet also prevents States from acting on their own.

Simply put, this bill prioritizes profits over consumer choice and keeps consumers in the dark. That is why I strongly oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''no.''

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

As a third-generation farmer and a former director of my State's Department of Agriculture, I cannot stress enough the importance of this legislation for our Nation and our world's food supply.

Yesterday, I spoke on the merits of preventing a patchwork of conflicting State and local GMO labeling laws which would require producers to sell under potentially hundreds of different labels, and I still believe that is a very important element to this debate.

However, there is another aspect I would like to address on why I believe this mandatory labeling law, which some of my colleagues have called for, is a very poor idea.

Mr. Chairman, I question the motives behind some of these arguments. They say they ''want consumers to have information'' but that can't actually be their concern because this legislation gives consumers information. It is disingenuous to claim it doesn't.

If you want to go to a store and buy a ''non-GMO'' product, much like ''organic'' or ''cage-free,'' you can do that under this legislation. It will provide consumers all the information they need to purchase food they think is right for their families.

So what is their motive?

Is it they want to try to scare consumers, to demonize this technology?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WELCH. The point of order is the speaker is questioning motives of those on the other side of this argument.

The CHAIR. Is the gentleman asking that the gentleman's words be taken down?

Mr. WELCH. No, but I would suggest that the——

The CHAIR. The Chair would generally advise Members to avoid engaging in personalities.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, antiscience, fear-mongering strategies cannot be left unanswered. I believe there are a few things people should know about biotechnology.

First, I appreciate anyone's safety concerns. That is why it is important to note that the USDA and the FDA rigorously test every biotech crop for human safety for years before anything can be brought to the market.

To be clear, no peer-reviewed study—and there have been hundreds—has ever found GMO foods have caused health concerns, ever.

□ 1200

Individuals have concerns about environmental impacts. I appreciate that, too. But what many people don't know is that, by turning on just one gene in corn, we now have a corn that is significantly more pest-resistant, which means huge reductions in the use of pesticides. We can do this with other crops as well. To be probiotech is to be proenvironment.

There is a type of rice that is vitamin A-enriched and has the ability to prevent hundreds of thousands of cases of blindness and death from vitamin A deficiency around the world.

There is a really nasty type of wheat rot called UG–99 spreading from Africa and the Middle East that has the ability to kill 90 percent of the world's wheat supply.

To be clear, this would cause a global famine. Scientists are looking at a way to create rot-resistant wheat through biotechnology and gene sequencing, which would save millions and millions of lives.

Mr. Chair, this technology is good proenvironment, lifesaving technology. And while I agree we need to have a system to give consumers the freedom to use it or not, which this bill does, we cannot allow antiscience opponents of biotechnology to use scare tactics that would cost millions of lives in the end.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chair, as a veterinarian and an organic farmer, having spent 6 years in the House Ag Committee, including 2 as ranking member of the Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research Subcommittee, I have studied GMOs very closely, and it is something I take very seriously. In fact, back in the eighties, I helped write our State organic standards in Oregon.

For thousands of years, humans have grown or bred plants and animals to choose the most desirable traits for breeding the next generations in an effort to help them to be able to resist pests, disease, and increase yields.

Through biotechnology, we have been able to increase productivity and efficiency while reducing the number of inputs, like water and pesticides, resulting in higher crop yields. Higher crop yields per acre allow for better land management and the conservation of marginal lands.

GMOs, in combination with good agricultural practices, also improve soil quality and reduce pollution by allowing farmers to till, work the ground, less often or not at all, reducing soil erosion and reducing the carbon footprint of agriculture.

If you are worried about climate change and want good science, you should be for this bill. GM crops flourish in challenging environments without the aid of expensive pesticides or equipment that play an important role in alleviating hunger and food stress in the developing world.

This is precisely why I am very concerned about the demonization of biotechnology and the rejection by many of the supporting science behind it.

Food labeling should be about health and safety. The reason we have USDA and FDA is to provide uniform protection to consumers across this country, to avoid a patchwork of politically motivated, nonscientific, mythological regulations by activists, not scientists. And right to know is protected in this bill.

We have heard from many on polls. I would like to cite one. The Pew Research Center conducted a poll recently and found that nearly 90 percent—yes, 90 percent—of the scientific community found genetically engineered food is safe and poses no health threat to the environment or humans.

H.R. 1599 provides a uniform standard for non-GMO products through a USDA-administered program and ensures national uniformity for non-GE claims, providing consistency in the marketplace while ensuring consumer confidence in the integrity of the label.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO). I know this hasn't been an easy path to get to where we are today, to allow for consumers in all 50 States to be able to know what is in their food.

I congratulate my colleague from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) on the hard work he and his staff and those on the House Energy and Commerce Committee and House Ag Committee have put forth to make this bill a reality today.

I am proud, as a subcommittee chairman on the House Ag Committee for Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research, to put my name on an amendment to this bill.

I am proud to stand here today to support this bill as a member of that committee and, also, as a dad who is responsible for shopping for many of the products that we are going to see this label put on in the grocery stores when I go home every weekend.

Biotechnology is crucial to our ability to feed the world. It is a critical technology, so much so in my district in central Illinois that earlier this month I went on a biotech tour in my district.

I visited plants and research facilities from Litchfield, Illinois, to Clinton, Illinois. I met with workers and scientists who are committed to developing better seed products that will help us feed a growing world.

Mr. Chairman, it will help us feed a growing world. So many people that don't live in this great country, where we take for granted our ability to have access to the safest food supply on this globe, don't have access to food.

Biotechnology allows us to grow that food in countries where people need food. They need to eat. They don't know where their next meal is coming from. Without biotechnology, we are not going to be able to feed the billions that are going to be required in the coming years.

I want to tell you about Pioneer technology in Litchfield, Illinois, who is developing a soybean seed that won't have transfats. I thought that was good, Mr. Chairman. But this is the type of technology that we are talking about here.

Science is on our side. Science shows that GMOs and biotechnology are safe. As a matter of fact, just earlier today I was at a panel discussion with Alexis Taylor, the Deputy Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services right here at our USDA.

She even made a comment that GMOs are good for climate change. That should make many of my colleagues in this Chamber happy. But, unfortunately, I don't think that will get them to ''yes'' on this vote.

We are hearing a lot about motives, Mr. Chairman. Our motives are to make sure that every single American in all 50 States has access, has the transparency, knows what is in their food.

This is exactly what H.R. 1599 is going to do for every single one of them. Every mom and dad in this country is going to know what is in their food.

That is exactly why we are doing this. That is exactly why I am here to support this bill. That is exactly why I am proud of my colleague from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) for doing exactly what we are going to do today.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I will now enter into the RECORD two articles, ''Mandatory GMO Labeling'' and ''NFU Union Reiterates Support for Mandatory GMO Labeling.''

[From the Huffington Post, July 23, 2015]

MANDATORY GMO LABELING—IT'S YOUR RIGHT TO KNOW

(By Gary Hirshberg)

The crossfire on whether or not to require mandatory labeling of GMOs has become so heated and partisan that it's hard to discern the facts from rhetoric. The latest volley was last week's Slate essay that challenged labeling proponents' lack of substantive proof that GMOs are unsafe or unhealthy. Author William Saletan raises many valid points, but equally fails to address the hyperbole and enormous gaps between the promise and actual performance of agricultural biotechnology. But beyond this imbalance, he entirely misses the fact that there is a long history of government-enacted labeling disclosures that have nothing to do with safety concerns. There are no unique risks associated with orange juice ''from concentrate'' compared to fresh juice, or from ''wild caught'' vs. farmed fish, but both require labeling so that consumers can choose. Most content on food labels is government mandated, marketing oriented, or intended to inform consumers about information that people just want to know.

And that is the fact that trumps all the others. Despite years of heated and often exaggerated rhetoric on both sides of the GMO labeling debate, poll after poll reveals that the public's skepticism has remained unchanged and that people just want to know. The latest Mellman polls show the same results as polls taken three years ago—nine in every 10 of Americans want labels on foods containing GMOs so they can make up their own minds. Here are the three reasons why this choice makes sense:

INADEQUATE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

There have been essentially no studies by the government or independent researchers designed to assess the long-term public health impacts of growing and consuming GMO crops. FDA approvals are essentially based on studies conducted by industry. GMO technology developers design and conduct all of the studies carried out on their own inventions, interpret the results (almost always finding ''no new or novel risk''), and report their conclusion to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as part of a ''voluntary consultation.'' The FDA then performs a cursory appraisal of the submitted data, and rarely asks for additional information. It does not verify the data's reliability, nor attempt to independently confirm the conclusions drawn from it by the companies. This is why the FDA is always careful to say, in closing out a ''voluntary consultation'' that ''you [the company] have concluded . . .''

The lack of credible, independent research on GMO safety, performance, and economics is the root cause of lingering controversies over GMO crops like papaya and golden rice, as well as confusion over whether Integrated Pest Management, organic systems, or GMOs are the best way to deal with pests.

In order for us to be able to trust the science, both the public and private sectors need to invest more heavily in the work and careers of independent scientists willing to develop and apply improved tools to monitor the impacts of GMO technology and alternatives. Until then, skepticism will not diminish, in spite of the propaganda.

DRASTICALLY INCREASED HERBICIDE USE DESPITE CLAIMS TO THE CONTRARY

While proponents promised that GMO crops would reduce pesticide use, they have, in fact, locked farmers into unilateral, chemical and toxin-based pest management systems that are bad for farmers, the environment, and consumers. However, the use of herbicides, a category of pesticides that kill weeds, has explosively increased, according to USDA survey data. Where GMO soybeans and cotton are grown in 2015, overall per acre herbicide plus insecticide use will be close to double the level in 1996 at the dawn of the GMO era.

Since the mid-1990s, when biotech companies introduced genetically engineered crops that are not adversely impacted by the herbicide glyphosate, its use has increased 16-fold to the point where the USGS has found glyphosate in 60–100 percent of Iowa rainwater. Over-use of this formerly effective weed control has led to the rapid spread of over a dozen serious glyphosate-resistant weeds, so now farmers must now spray three, four, or five herbicides. This includes older products with greater potential to cause damage. Farmers also now apply herbicides throughout the growing season instead of a single application at the beginning with greater potential to damage the soil, harm wildlife, and increase collateral damage, particularly among those living in farming areas and drinking water with multiple herbicide residues in it.

Thanks in large part to to GMO crop technology, glyphosate is now by far the most heavily used pesticide in history, both in the U.S. and worldwide. Glyphosate is now showing-up in the drinking water, air and breast milk of mothers in areas where these herbicides are in concentrated use. Most people on the planet are exposed to glyphosate on a near-daily basis. And this past spring, the world's most respected cancer research group—the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified glyphosate as ''probably carcinogenic.''

So to summarize, regardless of whether GMOs are ultimately found to be safe to eat, the WHO IARC findings raise serious questions about whether they are safe to grow. As resistance continues to escalate due to over-use, farmers will have no choice but to continue increasing their use of these toxic herbicides. This is surely material to us all.

IT'S SIMPLY OUR RIGHT TO KNOW

Responsible advocates are not demanding mandatory GMO labeling because they are unsafe; we are demanding labeling because people want, and have a right to know how our foods are grown. Just Label It and other responsible labeling proponents have never argued that science has proven GMOs to be unsafe, although we have and will continue to make the case for more in-depth, independent science using state-of-the-art methods to be as sure as possible that they are safe. But while scientific questions persist over the safety of today's GMO crops, the now sharply upward trajectory in the amount of herbicide needed to bring most GMO crops to harvest on every continent on which GMO, herbicide-tolerant crops have been planted, is deeply worrisome.

People have dozens of valid reasons for wanting to know whether their food is from genetically engineered crops. Some are grounded in religious or ethical views. Others reflect concern over the long-term consequences of corporate control over both seeds and the food supply. Yet others legitimately believe that there has been inadequate independent testing of GMOs for health and safety.

Whatever the reason, it is clear that facts and rhetoric will continue to be debated for years to come. In the interim, mandatory labeling of GMO foods will give consumers another option to steer clear of uncertainty and support farming systems and technology more closely aligned with personal values and concerns. This Thursday, Congress will vote on H.R. 1599 the so-called Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (colloquially called the ''DARK Act'' for Denying Americans the Right to Know), which deceptively purports to support federal labeling disclosures. But in fact, this bill would effectively block any hopes of American joining the other 64 nations around the world who have instituted mandatory GMO labeling. This bill needs to be stopped so that all interested parties—food companies, farmers, regulators and consumers can sit down at a table and forge a mutually acceptable and responsible mandatory labeling protocol free of hyperbole and judgment that simply allows consumers to vote in the marketplace for the kind of food system we want.

Please contact your congressperson and tell them to stop the DARK Act and vote against H.R. 1599.

[From the National Farmers Union, July 21, 2015]

NFU REITERATES SUPPORT FOR MANDATORY GMO LABELING, OPPOSES POMPEO BILL BUT NOTES PROGRESS

WASHINGTON.—In light of the U.S. House of Representatives' consideration of the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (H.R. 1599), National Farmers Union (NFU) President Roger Johnson again highlighted NFU policy on Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) labeling. The policy supports conspicuous, mandatory, uniform and federal labeling for food products throughout the processing chain to include all ingredients, additives and processes, including genetically altered or engineered food products.

''NFU appreciates efforts by Representatives Pompeo, R–Kansas, and Davis, R–Illinois, to reduce consumer confusion and standardize a GMO label,'' said Johnson. ''The bill passed out of committee makes significant improvements over previous versions of this bill. Absent a mandatory labeling framework, however, NFU cannot support this bill.''

Johnson noted that the bill has changed several times from the one introduced during the last Congress. Improvements include additional authority for the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), a labeling framework that if utilized could reduce consumer confusion, greater emphasis on the Food and Drug Administration's role in safety reviews, and a GMO label that works in conjunction with USDA's organic seal instead of counter to it.

''Consumers increasingly want to know more information about their food, and producers want to share that information with them,'' said Johnson. ''It is time to find common ground that includes some form of mandatory disclosure for the benefit of all aspects of the value chain, but this bill is not that common ground.''

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the gentleman who preceded me in the well acknowledge climate change and say that GMOs are the solution.

I do think climate change is a problem. I don't think GMOs are the solution.

Let's go to some of the arguments we have just heard: This is what we have been doing for millennia, hybridization, you know, where you graft the plant onto another plant.

I am not quite sure when the last time was when a flounder mated with a tomato plant, but we now have tomatoes that have injected into them

flounder genes in order to enhance production, or the last time an eel mated with a salmon. They are putting eel genes into genetically modified salmon—Frankenfish—so they will grow twice as fast as other fish, twice as fast.

Now, they say: Don't worry. They won't get out. And, besides that, most of them are sterile. Yes. Right. Okay. So what happens when they do get out and they begin to cross-breed with real salmon as opposed to eel salmon or whatever these things are?

This bill would prohibit any labeling. You catch a real salmon, it is a salmon. You present someone with a GMO eel salmon, it is a salmon. You can't distinguish. You don't have to disclose. So that is not exactly hybridization, folks.

You know this thing about being politically motivated, nonscientific, and scare tactics because we want to have it disclosed that GMOs are contained in the product. Well, I didn't hear those arguments when they required red dye number two or cellulose or xanthan gum. Why not GMOs?

Sixty-four countries require the labeling of products that contain GMOs, not the United States of America. Bastions of democracy like China, Russia, Saudi Arabia, require it for their consumers. But, no, we are not going to allow that in the United States of America.

Proliferation of labels. Yes. That is happening at the State level. And that is states' rights, which Republicans normally are for, except when a State does something they don't like, and then they are against it.

But there is a solution to that, my bill, which would require a uniform national label which just simply discloses ''contains GMOs.'' It won't cost any additional money, since they are having to change the nutritional labels anyway.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELCH. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Now, we heard a lot about pesticides. This is great. Let's talk about Monsanto and glyphosate-resistant corn.

They are using more pesticides today on cornfields than they did historically, more, and they had glyphosate-resistant corn.

They dumped the glyphosate on the corn: Don't worry. There will never be a glyphosate-resistant weed. Oops. They were wrong. Weeds everywhere now taking over the cornfield.

Let's change that up. We are now going to have 2,4–D—remember Agent Orange? Pretty darn close—resistant corn. They are going to dump thousands, millions, of tons of 2,4–D over this corn.

That is the net result of this sort of forward movement that they are touting as helping us deal with pesticide and herbicide issues: Oh. Don't worry. There will never be a 2,4–D resistant weed. If there is, don't worry. They will get an even more toxic chemical.

They are addicting farmers to their products and addicting farmers to buying more and more of their pesticides.

We have now seen milkweed wiped out in the Midwest, causing a crisis with monarch butterflies, who are actually a pretty critical pollinator. Most people don't know that, apparently. And that is the result of all this glyphosate and the coming of 2,4–D.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act, also known as ''the DARK Act.'' One of my concerns is that this bill blocks the FDA from creating a national mandatory GMO labeling system.

The current voluntary labeling system is not providing consumers with the information they need because only 2 percent of the products on the shelves have voluntarily submitted to the non-GMO labeling process.

It is apparent that mandatory labeling is sorely needed, such as the kind required by Mr. DEFAZIO, the gentleman from Oregon's bill, the Genetically Engineered Food Right to Know Act.

In addition, what has happened to the outcry for states' rights from the other side of the aisle? This bill preempts States from passing their own GMO labeling laws.

This would essentially invalidate the will of the people and, in so doing, limit a State's ability to respond to the individual needs of its constituents.

There have been many discussions and conversations surrounding this bill. One such discussion has been extremely troubling, debasing, and scornful. Specifically, there are some who say that poor people don't care what is in their food, nor do they care what they eat.

Let me be clear: I don't care whether you are wealthy or poor. All Americans deserve to know what is in their food. Poor people are, first and foremost, human beings. They are not marginal subordinates in a democratic civil society.

Poor people deserve the same respect and consideration as the wealthy. Despite what some may think, poor people do care about what food they eat, and they should be able to choose what they put in their bodies.

I will say it again. All Americans deserve to know what is in their food. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 1599, the DARK Act.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling measure before us.

This legislation, I understand, creates a great deal of angst among various supporters and opponents. We have heard that. But it also creates a uniform, science-based labeling standard. I think that is a move forward.

It also creates Federal regulations for the Food and Drug Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture to remain preeminent authorities in food safety and labeling, just as it has been for decades.

Additionally, it creates a national GMO-free certification program so consumers who choose to buy non-GMO foods have the ability to do so without the higher prices or the misleading labeling.

This legislation does not reject consumers' rights to choose. While the opponents of this measure wish it would do other things, it does not. I think it is a balanced attempt.

Furthermore, the voters of California, as many of you may know, recently, in proposition 37, had an opportunity to put in GMO labeling. Mr. Chairman, 42 percent said ''yes,'' and 58 percent of the voters of California said ''no.''

I urge we support this legislation.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), my colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee. He is a good man. Sometimes he is misguided, but he likes Ben & Jerry's ice cream. I appreciate that. And it is GMO-free.

But I do want to address seriously the arguments the gentleman has made because, number one, this is a serious issue. It is a serious issue, first of all, because this legislation puts handcuffs on all of our State legislatures from doing whatever it is they deem in the best interest of their people.

□ 1215

Secondly, it puts handcuffs on voters. Mr. POMPEO said that voters have rejected this. In some ballot initiatives, that is the case. He is right. Why pass a law that takes that power from the voters and invest it here?

This is a very serious policy question where the United States House of Representatives is intruding into the efforts of States to represent the people that they serve.

By the way, three States have passed laws by overwhelming margins. In Vermont, the Vermont Senate bipartisan body, it was a 26–2 vote; the Vermont House bipartisan body, it was 114–30 vote. In Connecticut, it was 143–3 in the House and 35–1 in the Senate. In Maine, it was 114–4, and it was unanimously passed in the Senate 35–0.

What we are doing in the House of Representatives right now is saying to the Vermont legislature, saying to the Maine legislature, and saying to the Connecticut legislature: Drop dead. What you passed, we are taking away.

I don't think that is right.

I will make an acknowledgement. Sometimes, it is the right thing for the Federal Government or the Congress to preempt State action so that it can have a uniform, across-the-board standard. That is what the DeFazio bill does. It acknowledges that so you don't have this patchwork.

This bill, with voluntary labeling, in effect, creates a patchwork. Does it mean that company A decides they do want to label and they write the label they want and company B writes another label or doesn't? What does that mean for consumers?

First of all, in all likelihood, there will be no labels. Secondly, there will be the patchwork produced by this legislation that is what the critics of the State-by-State approach say they want to avoid.

Next, there was an assertion by my friend from Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, that a label is a warning. I think that really goes to the heart of what the dispute here is. Is a label a warning?

In fact, the proponents of the DeFazio bill and the opponents of this bill are not asserting that the purpose of the label is to suggest there is scientific evidence indicating GMOs cause health problems. What a label is, is information; and the consumer then decides. Your consumers and my consumers, they decide. Whatever their reason is, they have a right to decide to buy product A or B, depending on what is in it or what is not in it.

What is the big fear about letting consumers know? A lot of the big advocates that are pushing this are, in fact, some of these manufacturers that create products that they sell to farmers, and Mr. DEFAZIO outlined that in his argument. They fear that the label will reduce the saleability of that product.

Here is the irony: If what they are producing and selling is so good and so nutritious and so tasty and so yummy, why not let the consumer know what is in it? That would be something you would want to advertise.

This really is a very profound decision by this Congress. Number one, it is telling States that have been taking initiative on the basis of their citizens' desires that they can't do it anymore. Number two, in the name of avoiding a patchwork set of regulations, it is creating the inevitability of a patchwork. Then, three, in a very basic way, it is telling American consumers that it is really none of their business what is in their product, no matter how much they really want to know what is in their product.

I urge that we vote ''no'' and defeat this measure and stand for State rights and consumer rights to know.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

As I close, I would like to offer my thanks first to Mr. WELCH for the respectful debate today and for the ice cream. I would like to thank my lead cosponsor, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for his hard work all along the way; as well as being the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, he has leaned into this and really made us able to get where we are today

I would like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman CONAWAY, and Ranking Member PETERSON for their support and effort in getting this legislation to the floor as well. I would like to thank all the staff on the Energy and Commerce and Agriculture Committees for their hard work, too.

I would be remiss if I didn't thank Blake Hollander on my staff, who put in long hours making sure this commonsense bipartisan bill was ready for the floor.

Mr. Chairman, it is really very simple. H.R. 1599 has two very simple goals. First, it is to ensure families in Kansas and across the country have access to nutritious and affordable food; and, second, it is to make sure that those who wish to avoid food products that contain GMOs will be able to do so, that they will not be denied the right to know.

In place of a convoluted patchwork of loophole-filled State or local labeling laws, we will ensure that our food policy is science based and transparent to consumers.

Let's be very clear. Consumers who wish to avoid foods containing GMOs are able to do so today, and they will be able to do so after this bill becomes law—except it is better now. There will now be a clear standard about what that term really means.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense, proconsumer, profarmer bill that brings clarity to food labeling and keeps affordable food for our constituents.

I encourage all my colleagues to support H.R. 1599, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, on June 23, 2015, the House considered H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act. It is my intention to vote against this legislation. For the past four decades I have fought tirelessly for one of the finest products in the world, wild Alaskan salmon. The multi-billion dollar seafood industry in Alaska is the largest private sector employer in my state. Yet the approval of a genetically engineered (GE) salmon, or ''Frankenfish'' as I call it, could put our thriving and iconic fishing sector in jeopardy.

Frankenfish could pose a grave threat to our wild salmon stocks in Alaska, and the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) support for approving GE salmon is disturbing. Equally disturbing is the fact that, if approved, the FDA has said that it would not require GE salmon to be labeled.

In today's global marketplace, a consumer's access to accurate ingredient information is paramount. Clear and accurate GE labeling requirements attempt to mitigate the risk of market confusion or rejection by countries that have no interest in purchasing the hybrid organism. Consumer confusion about what types of salmon or seafood are genetically engineered may deter shoppers from purchasing these products altogether. If GE salmon is approved despite opposition from Congress and nearly two million people who wrote in to the FDA, it should be clearly labeled to avoid the potential market rejection of all salmon.

In an effort to ensure that Alaskan consumers have this essential information, Alaska enacted legislation in 2005 that requires the labeling of all products containing GE fish and shellfish. However, the so-called Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (H.R. 1599), recently referred out of the House Agriculture Committee, would block states like Alaska from requiring mandatory labeling of GE fish while also curtailing FDA's ability to craft a true, national GE labeling system. Rather, its proponents would suggest that Alaskan fishermen should go through a costly non-GMO certification if they want consumers to know that their salmon is not genetically engineered. Why should all U.S. salmon fishermen have to prove their salmon are non-GMO when farmed GE salmon coming into the U.S. from other countries would not. It is insufficient for consumers and it is insufficient for Alaska's thriving fishing industry.

For these reasons, I oppose H.R. 1599 in defense of states' rights to decide these important matters for themselves. All consumers should be able to see whether their salmon is Frankenfish or not.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which would preempt the ability of states to require GMO labeling laws.

Numerous studies have shown that Americans want to know what's in their food. As states respond to this trend, we should not restrict their ability to keep consumers informed about the food they eat. GMO labeling laws are widely supported by consumers in over 60 countries including China, Russia and the European Union. We should not deny states the ability to make this decision for their residents.

While I understand the concerns about the potential for a patchwork of state labeling laws, companies, can, of course, voluntarily choose to provide GMO information on their labeling. In fact, many of those opposing this legislation provide information on GMO products in Europe and other countries.

Mr. Chair, this bill was rushed through the Agriculture Committee and came too quickly to the House floor before we could have a serious discussion about GMO labeling and consumer rights. We must closely study the merits of the bill and find common ground between labeling and a consumer's right to know before we vote on this far-reaching legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to highlight an editorial that my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman CHELLIE PINGREE of Maine and I recently wrote expressing our opposition to H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act. It appeared in the July 21, 2015 online edition of The Boston Globe.

[From the Boston Globe, July 21, 2015]

LET AMERICANS DECIDE FOR THEMSELVES ON GMOS

(By Jim McGovern and Chellie Pingree)

America has a proud tradition of empowering consumers. You can walk into any grocery store in the country, pick up a product from the shelf, and immediately learn the calorie count, the amount of protein per serving, and the full list of ingredients.

So it's alarming that Congress could soon pass a bill that aims to keep consumers in the dark when it comes to foods with genetically modified organisms, or GMOs.

This week, the House of Representative will consider the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act. Unfortunately, the bill does nothing to support safe and accurate food labeling. Instead, it protects the status quo by preventing states from requiring labels on foods containing GMO ingredients and locks in the current and inadequate voluntary GMO labeling system.

As more of the foods we eat contain GMOs, consumers naturally want to know which foods contain them. All they are asking for are the facts. This bill ignores that.

Congress needs to pass a law that puts consumers first by requiring mandatory GMO labeling across the country, eliminating confusion and establishing one national standard.

Polls consistently show that there is overwhelming support for clearly labeling foods that have been genetically modified or contain GMO ingredients. In a 2012 survey by the Mellman Group, 89 percent were in favor of labeling with 77 percent saying they ''strongly'' prefer GMO labeling. That same survey also showed strong bipartisan support for GMO labeling with huge majorities of Democrats (85 percent), independents (93 percent), and Republicans (88 percent) all in favor.

While Congress has been stuck in neutral, states have stepped up and passed laws that give the power back to consumers. In 2014, Vermont became the first state to require mandatory GMO labeling. Connecticut and Maine have both passed laws to require labeling and more than a dozen other states are considering similar oversight, including Massachusetts. What's more, 64 other countries have GMO labeling, including Brazil whose consumption patterns are similar to those in the United States.

Supporters of the bill claim that GMO labeling will increase food prices. While plenty of things impact the prices we pay at the grocery store—including transportation costs and ingredient costs—GMO labeling is not one of them. In study after study, we have seen that a simple GMO disclaimer on food packaging will not increase prices.

Food companies change their labels all the time to make new claims, and all food companies will soon have to change their labels to make important changes to the Nutrition Fact Panel. Adding a few words to the back of the food package about genetic engineering will not have any impact of the cost of making food.

Opponents of updating food labeling made the same bogus arguments when they fought nutrition labeling in the 1980s. Back then, they claimed that disclosing the presence of calories, salt, fat, and sugar would require costly reformulations. But those much more significant changes to foods labels—adding the Nutrition Facts Panel and including more information about ingredients—didn't change the price of food at all.

Americans want more information, not less. What we need is one law that makes GMO labeling mandatory across the country and establishes a single national standard that eliminates confusion and puts consumers in charge.

This debate isn't about the safety of GMOs. It's about consumers' right to know what's in the food they put on their tables. We ought to give them that right.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my strong support of the bipartisan Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015. I want to recognize the hard work my colleague of Mr. POMPEO, as well as the efforts of both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Agriculture into this legislation.

As a representative from the great State of Iowa, I am extremely sensitive and aware of the issues facing agriculture—from farm to fork—and I am aware of the challenges my constituents face while producing the delicious and nutritious food the rest of us consume. On an annual basis, Iowa grows $12B worth of corn and $5.7B worth of soybeans, of which 95% and 97%, respectively, are Genetically Modified Organisms—or GMOs. Recently, states began to enact laws that required labeling of these GMO products, often with exemptions for local products, would increase compliance costs for producers and create confusion for consumers.

This bill addresses the current patchwork of state biotechnology labeling requirements—compliance with which would be a daunting task for the producers in my district that distribute food throughout the United States—by providing a mechanism for uniform labeling requirements. No one benefits—not farmers, nor food manufacturers and processors, nor retailers, and most of all, not consumers—from a confusing collection of state laws—each different, with different requirements—creating great confusion among consumers in the marketplace.

It does so by establishing a voluntary non-GMO labeling program at USDA modeled after the highly successful National Organic Program. Today, when consumers go into a grocery store, they may see a wide variety of products that may have a non-GMO label on it. However, there isn't a standard that defines what a non-GMO product is or is not. The language of the bill directs the USDA to establish standards and certification process for producers in order to put a non-GMO label on their products.

Mr. Chair, a number of constituents along with some of my colleagues, are advocating for mandatory labeling for GMO products because consumers have a right to know what is in their food. I agree—consumers have a right to know—and the standards set by the USDA under this legislation will provide consumers with all the information necessary to make informed decisions and choices on their grocery stores purchases. This bill protects and enhances consumer choice by establishing a voluntary non-GMO labeling program—without costing them an extra $500 a year per family that economists at Cornell University estimate mandatory labeling would.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1599—over 470 agricultural and food organizations that represent the entire food chain have already done so. The legislation enhances consumer choice, clears up confusion in the marketplace, and enhances consumer confidence in the food we eat.

Vote ''Yes'' on H.R. 1599.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 114–24, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–216. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Savings clause.

TITLE I—FOOD SAFETY AFFIRMATION FOR CERTAIN PLANT PRODUCTS

Subtitle A—Food and Drug Administration

Sec. 101. Consultation process.

Subtitle B—Department of Agriculture

Sec. 111. Regulation.
Sec. 112. Regulations.
Sec. 113. Preemption.
Sec. 114. Rule of construction.
Sec. 115. Implementation report.

TITLE II—GENETIC ENGINEERING CERTIFICATION

Sec. 201. Genetic engineering certification.
Sec. 202. Regulations.
Sec. 203. Preemption.
Sec. 204. Applicability.

TITLE III—NATURAL FOODS

Sec. 301. Labeling of natural foods.
Sec. 302. Regulations.
Sec. 303. Preemption.
Sec. 304. Effective date.

SEC. 2. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act (or the amendments made by this Act) is intended to alter or affect the authorities or regulatory programs, policies, and procedures otherwise available to, or the definitions used by, the Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) or the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service under the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), to ensure the safety of the food supply and the protection of plant health.

TITLE I—FOOD SAFETY AFFIRMATION FOR CERTAIN PLANT PRODUCTS

Subtitle A—Food and Drug Administration

SEC. 101. CONSULTATION PROCESS.

Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by inserting after section 423 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 350l) the following:

''SEC. 424. FOOD DERIVED FROM NEW PLANT VARIETIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall continue to administer the consultation process established under the Food and Drug Administration's policy statement entitled 'Statement of Policy: Food Derived from New Plant Varieties' published in the Federal Register on May 29, 1992 (57 Fed. Reg. 22,984).

''(b) DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FOOD FROM GENETICALLY ENGINEERED PLANTS AND COMPARABLE FOODS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the use of genetic engineering does not, by itself, constitute information that is material for purposes of determining whether there is a difference between a food produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant and a comparable food.

''(2) LABELING REQUIRED.—The Secretary may require that the labeling of a food produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant contain a statement to adequately inform consumers of a difference between the food so produced and its comparable food if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) there is a material difference in the functional, nutritional, or compositional characteristics, allergenicity, or other attributes between

the food so produced and its comparable food; and

''(B) the disclosure of such material difference is necessary to protect public health and safety or to prevent the label or labeling of the food so produced from being false or misleading in any particular.''.

Subtitle B—Department of Agriculture

SEC. 111. REGULATION.

The Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle F—Coordination of Food Safety and Agriculture Programs

''SEC. 461. NOTIFICATION RELATING TO CERTAIN GENETICALLY ENGINEERED PLANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), it shall be unlawful to sell or offer for sale in interstate commerce a nonregulated genetically engineered plant for use or application in food or a food produced from, containing, or consisting of a nonregulated genetically engineered plant unless—

''(1)(A) the Secretary of Health and Human Services notified the entity seeking evaluation of a food produced from, containing, or consisting of the genetically engineered plant in writing that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in evaluating the food from the genetically engineered plant through the consultation process referred to in section 424(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, has no objections to the entity's determination that food produced from, containing, or consisting of the genetically engineered plant that is the subject of the notification is safe for use by humans or animals, as applicable, and lawful under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and

''(B) the entity seeking evaluation of a food produced from, containing, or consisting of the genetically engineered plant submits to the Secretary of Agriculture the notification of the finding of the Secretary of Health and Human Services under subparagraph (A); or

''(2) before the date of the enactment of the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015, the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

''(A) considered the consultation process referred to in section 424(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to such genetically engineered plant to be complete;

''(B) notified the consulting party in writing that all questions with respect to the safety of food produced from, containing, or consisting of the genetically engineered plant have been resolved; and

''(C) published such notification on the public Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration.

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), this section does not apply with respect to the sale or offering for sale in interstate commerce of a genetically engineered plant—

''(1) for the purpose of research or development testing, including—

''(A) testing conducted to generate data and information that could be used in a submission to the Secretary under this title or other regulatory submission; or

''(B) multiplication of seed or hybrid and variety development conducted before submitting a notification under subsection (a)(1)(B);

''(2) solely because a processing aid or enzyme produced from the genetically engineered plant is intended to be used to produce food; or

''(3) solely because the genetically engineered plant is used as a nutrient source for microorganisms.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b)(1) may be construed as authorizing the sale or offering for sale in interstate commerce of a nonregulated genetically engineered plant for use or application in food or a food produced from, containing, or consisting of a nonregulated genetically engineered plant.

''(d) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish on the public Internet website of the Department of Agriculture, and update as necessary, a registry that includes—

''(A) a list of each nonregulated genetically engineered plant intended for a use or application in food that may be sold or offered for sale in interstate commerce, in accordance with subsection (a);

''(B) the petitions submitted to, and determinations made by, the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to such a plant; and

''(C) the notifications of findings issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to such a plant or the use or application of such a plant in food.

''(2) TRADE SECRETS AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the protections offered by laws, regulations, and policies governing disclosure of confidential commercial or trade secret information, and any other information exempt from disclosure pursuant to section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, as such provisions would be applied to the documents and information referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1).

''(e) IMPORTED FOOD.—In the case of food imported into the United States that is food produced from, containing, or consisting of a plant that meets the definition of a nonregulated genetically engineered plant or a plant that, if sold in interstate commerce, would be subject to regulation under part 340 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), the provisions of this section shall apply to such food in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply to a food that is not so imported.

''SEC. 462. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) FOOD.—The term 'food' has the meaning given such term in section 201(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(f)).

''(2) NONREGULATED GENETICALLY ENGINEERED PLANT.—The term 'nonregulated genetically engineered plant' means a genetically engineered plant—

''(A) for which the Secretary of Agriculture has approved a petition under section 340.6 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), for a determination that the genetically engineered plant should not be regulated under this Act; or

''(B) that—

''(i) is not subject to regulation as a plant pest under this Act;

''(ii) contains genetic material from a different species; and

''(iii) has been modified through in vitro recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) techniques.''.

SEC. 112. REGULATIONS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate interim final regulations to carry out the amendments made by section 111.

SEC. 113. PREEMPTION.

Regardless of whether regulations have been promulgated under section 112, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, no State or political subdivision of a State may directly or indirectly establish under any authority or continue in effect as to any food in interstate commerce any requirement with respect to the sale or offering for sale in interstate commerce of a genetically engineered plant for use or application in food that is not identical to the requirement of section 461 of the Plant Protection Act (as added by section 111 of this Act).

SEC. 114. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in the amendments made by this subtitle is intended to alter or affect the ability of—

(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services to take enforcement actions with respect to a violation of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), including section 301 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 331); or

(2) the Secretary of Agriculture to take enforcement actions with respect to a violation of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), including section 411 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7711).

SEC. 115. IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly submit to Congress a report evaluating the progress made in the implementation of subtitle F of the Plant Protection Act, as added by section 111. Such report shall include—

(1) an analysis of plants over which regulatory oversight under such subtitle is required;

(2) an analysis of the extent to which the provisions of such subtitle establish an appropriate scope of regulatory oversight for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and the Food and Drug Administration, including their oversight of public research programs; and

(3) any potential changes to the Plant Protection Act that would better facilitate implementation of a coordinated, predictable, and efficient science-based regulatory process.

(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER EFFORTS TO MODERNIZE REGULATION.—The report under subsection (a) shall be prepared, to the greatest extent practicable, in accordance with the process described in the memorandum issued by the Executive Office of the President on July 2, 2015, entitled ''Modernizing the Regulatory System for Biotechnology Products'', including the directive specified in such memorandum to update the ''Coordinated Framework for Regulation of Biotechnology'' published by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology Policy, in the Federal Register on June 26, 1986 (51 Fed.Reg. 23302).

TITLE II—GENETIC ENGINEERING CERTIFICATION

SEC. 201. GENETIC ENGINEERING CERTIFICATION.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle E—Genetic Engineering Certification

''SEC. 291. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) The term 'certifying agent' means the chief executive officer of a State or, in the case of a State that provides for the statewide election of an official to be responsible solely for the administration of the agricultural operations of the State, such official, and any person (including a private entity) who is accredited by the Secretary as a certifying agent for the purpose of certifying a covered product as a product, the labeling of which may indicate whether the product is produced with or without the use of genetic engineering.

''(2) The term 'covered product' means—

''(A) an agricultural product, whether raw or processed (including any product derived from livestock that is marketed in the United States for consumption by humans or other animals);

''(B) any other food (as defined in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) not derived from an agricultural product; and

''(C) seed or other propagative material.

''(3) The term 'genetically engineered plant' refers to a plant or plant product (as those terms are defined in section 403 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7702)), if—

''(A) it contains genetic material that has been modified through in vitro recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) techniques; and

''(B) the modification could not otherwise be obtained using conventional breeding techniques.

''(4) The term 'comparable food' means, with respect to a covered product produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant—

''(A) the parental variety of the plant;

''(B) another commonly consumed variety of the plant; or

''(C) a commonly consumed covered product with properties comparable to the covered product produced from, containing, or consisting of the genetically engineered plant.

''(5) The term 'handle' means to sell, process or package covered products.

''(6) The term 'producer' means a person who engages in the business of growing or producing covered products.

''(7) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Agricultural Marketing Service.

''SEC. 291A. NATIONAL GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a voluntary genetically engineered food certification program for covered products with respect to the use of genetic engineering in the production of such products, as provided for in this subtitle. The Secretary shall establish the requirements and procedures as the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out such program.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—In developing the program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with such other parties as are necessary to develop such program to ensure that producers or handlers seeking to make claims under section 291B or 291C are certified to make such claims.

''(c) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall implement the program established under subsection (a) through certifying agents. Such certifying agents may certify that covered products were or were not produced with the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant, in accordance with this subtitle.

''(d) SEAL.—The Secretary shall establish a seal to identify covered products in interstate commerce using terminology the Secretary considers appropriate for covered products certified under this title, including terminology commonly used in interstate commerce or established by the Secretary in regulations.

''SEC. 291B. NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR LABELING NONGENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To be sold or labeled as a covered product produced without the use of genetic engineering—

''(1) the covered product shall—

''(A) be subject to supply chain process controls that address—

''(i) the producer planting seed that is not genetically engineered;

''(ii) the producer keeping the crop separated during growth, harvesting, storage, and transportation; and

''(iii) persons in direct contact with such crop or products derived from such crop during transportation, storage, or processing keeping the product separated from other products that are or are derived from genetically engineered plants; and

''(B) be produced and handled in compliance with a nongenetically engineered food plan developed and approved in accordance with subsection (c);

''(2) in the case of a covered product derived from livestock that is marketed in the United States for human consumption, the covered product and the livestock, products consumed by such livestock, and products used in processing the products consumed by such livestock shall be produced without the use of products derived from genetic engineering; and

''(3) labeling or advertising material on, or in conjunction with, such covered product shall not suggest either expressly or by implication that covered products developed without the use of genetic engineering are safer or of higher quality than covered products produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant.

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—A covered product shall not be considered as not meeting the criteria specified in subsection (a) solely because the covered product—

''(1) is manufactured or processed using a genetically engineered microorganism or a processing aid or enzyme;

''(2) is derived from microorganisms that consumed a nutrient source produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant; or

''(3) is an approved substance on the National List established under section 2118 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6517).

''(c) NONGENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A producer or handler seeking certification under this section shall submit a nongenetically engineered food plan to the certifying agent and such plan shall be reviewed by the certifying agent who shall determine if such plan meets the requirements of this section.

''(2) CONTENTS.—A nongenetically engineered food plan shall contain a description of—

''(A) the procedures that will be followed to assure compliance with this section;

''(B) a description of the monitoring records that will be maintained; and

''(C) any corrective actions that will be implemented in the event there is a deviation from the plan.

''(3) AVAILABILITY.—The nongenetically engineered food plan and the records maintained under the plan shall be available for review and copying by the Secretary or a certifying agent.

''(d) TREATMENT OF LIVESTOCK.—In the case of a covered product derived from livestock that is marketed in the United States for human consumption, the covered product shall not be considered to be genetically engineered solely because the livestock consumed feed produced from containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant.''.

''SEC. 291C. NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR LABELING GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To be sold or labeled as a covered product produced with the use of genetic engineering—

''(1) the covered product shall be produced and handled in compliance with a genetically engineered food plan developed and approved in accordance with subsection (b); and

''(2) the labeling of or advertising material on, or in conjunction with, such covered product shall—

''(A) not expressly or impliedly claim that a covered product developed with the use of genetic engineering is safer or of higher quality solely because the covered product is a product developed with the use of genetic engineering;

''(B) not make any claims that are false or misleading; and

''(C) contain such information as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(b) GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A producer or handler seeking certification under this section shall submit a genetically engineered food plan to the certifying agent and such plan shall be reviewed by the certifying agent who shall determine if such plan meets the requirements of this section.

''(2) CONTENTS.—A genetically engineered food plan shall contain a description of—

''(A) the procedures that will be followed to assure compliance with this section;

''(B) a description of the monitoring records that will be maintained; and

''(C) any corrective actions that will be implemented in the event there is a deviation from the plan.

''(3) AVAILABILITY.—The genetically engineered food plan and the records maintained under the plan shall be available for review and copying by the Secretary or a certifying agent.

''(c) PROHIBITION AGAINST RESTRICTING CERTAIN DISCLOSURES.—With respect to a covered product that otherwise meets the criteria specified in subsection (a), the Secretary may not prevent a person—

''(1) from disclosing voluntarily on the labeling of such a covered product developed with the use of genetic engineering the manner in which the product has been modified to express traits or characteristics that differ from its comparable food; or

''(2) from disclosing in advertisements, on the Internet, in response to consumer inquiries, or on other communications, other than in the labeling, that a covered product was developed with the use of genetic engineering.

''SEC. 291D. IMPORTED PRODUCTS.

''Imported covered products may be sold or labeled as produced with or without the use of genetic engineering if the Secretary determines that such products have been produced and handled under a genetic engineering certification program that provides safeguards and guidelines governing the production and handling of such products that are at least equivalent to the requirements of this subtitle.

''SEC. 291E. ACCREDITATION PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and implement a program to accredit a governing State official, and any private person, that meets the requirements of this section as a certifying agent for the purpose of certifying a covered product as having been produced with or without the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant, in accordance with this subtitle.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—To be accredited as a certifying agent under this section, a governing State official or private person shall—

''(1) prepare and submit to the Secretary an application for such accreditation;

''(2) have sufficient expertise in agricultural production and handling techniques as determined by the Secretary; and

''(3) comply with the requirements of this section.

''(c) DURATION OF ACCREDITATION.—An accreditation made under this section shall be for a period of not to exceed 5 years, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, and may be renewed.

''(d) COORDINATION WITH EXISTING ORGANIC PROGRAM ACCREDITATION.—A governing State official or private person who is accredited to certify a farm or handling operation as a certified organic farm or handling operation pursuant to section 2115 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6415) (and such accreditation is in effect) shall be deemed to be accredited to certify covered products under this subtitle.

''SEC. 291F. RECORDKEEPING, INVESTIGATIONS, AND ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) RECORDKEEPING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, each person who sells, labels, or represents any covered product as having been produced with or without the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant shall—

''(A) maintain records in a manner prescribed by the Secretary; and

''(B) make available to the Secretary, on request by the Secretary, all records associated with the covered product.

''(2) CERTIFYING AGENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A certifying agent shall—

''(i) maintain all records concerning the activities of the certifying agent with respect to the certification of covered products under this subtitle in a manner prescribed by the Secretary; and

''(ii) make available to the Secretary, on request by the Secretary, all records associated with such activities.

''(B) TRANSFERENCE OF RECORDS.—If a private person that was certified under this subtitle is dissolved or loses accreditation, all records and copies of records concerning the activities of the person under this subtitle shall be transferred to the Secretary.

''(b) INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may take such investigative actions as the Secretary considers to be necessary—

''(A) to verify the accuracy of any information reported or made available under this subtitle; and

''(B) to determine whether a person covered by this subtitle has committed a violation of any provision of this subtitle, including an order or regulation promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to this subtitle.

''(2) SPECIFIC INVESTIGATIVE POWERS.—In carrying out this subtitle, the Secretary may—

''(A) administer oaths and affirmations;

''(B) subpoena witnesses;

''(C) compel attendance of witnesses;

''(D) take evidence; and

''(E) require the production of any records required to be maintained under this subtitle that are relevant to an investigation.

''(c) VIOLATIONS OF SUBTITLE.—

''(1) FAILURE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—Any person covered by this subtitle who, after notice and an opportunity to be heard, has been found by the Secretary to have failed or refused to provide accurate information (including a delay in the timely delivery of such information) required by the Secretary under this subtitle, shall be assessed a civil penalty of not more than $10,000.

''(2) MISUSE OF LABEL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any person who, after notice and an opportunity to be heard, is found by the Secretary to have knowingly sold or labeled any covered product as having been produced with or without the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant, except in accordance with this subtitle, shall be assessed to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000.

''(B) CONTINUING VIOLATION.—Each day during which a violation described in subparagraph (A) occurs shall be considered to be a separate violation.

''(3) INELIGIBILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), any person that carries out an activity described in subparagraph (B), after notice and an opportunity to be heard, shall not be eligible, for the 5-year period beginning on the date of the occurrence, to receive a certification under this subtitle with respect to any covered product.

''(B) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES.—An activity referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

''(i) making a false statement;

''(ii) a violation described in paragraph (2)(A);

''(iii) attempting to have a label indicating that a covered product has been produced with or without the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant affixed to a covered product that a person knows, or should have reason to know, to have been produced in a manner that is not in accordance with this subtitle; or

''(iv) otherwise violating the purposes of the genetically engineered food certification program established under section 291A, as determined by the Secretary.

''(C) WAIVER.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary may modify or waive a period of ineligibility under this paragraph if the Secretary determines that the modification or waiver is in the best interests of the genetically engineered food certification program established under section 291A.

''(4) REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A certifying agent shall immediately report any violation of this subtitle to the Secretary.

''(5) CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, after providing notice and an opportunity to be heard, issue an order, require any person who the Secretary reasonably believes is selling or labeling a covered product in violation of this subtitle to cease and desist from selling or labeling such covered product as having been produced with or without the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant.

''(B) FINAL AND CONCLUSIVE.—The order of the Secretary imposing a cease-and-desist order under this paragraph shall be final and conclusive unless the affected person files an appeal from the Secretary's order with the appropriate district court of the United States not later than 30 days after the date of the issuance of the order.

''(6) VIOLATIONS BY CERTIFYING AGENT.—A certifying agent that is a private person that violates the provisions of this subtitle or falsely or negligently certifies any covered product that does not meet the terms and conditions of the genetically engineered food certification program established under section 291A, as determined by the Secretary, shall, after notice and an opportunity to be heard—

''(A) lose accreditation as a certifying agent under this subtitle; and

''(B) be ineligible to be accredited as a certifying agent under this subtitle for a period of not less than 3 years, beginning on the date of the determination.

''(7) SUSPENSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, after first providing the certifying agent notice and an opportunity to be heard, suspend the accreditation of the certifying agent for a period specified in subparagraph (B) for a violation of this subtitle.

''(B) PERIOD OF SUSPENSION.—The period of a suspension under subparagraph (A) shall terminate on the date the Secretary makes a final determination with respect to the violation that is the subject of the suspension.

''(8) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—On request of the Secretary, the Attorney General may bring a civil action against a person in a district court of the United States to enforce this subtitle or a requirement or regulation prescribed, or an order issued, under this subtitle. The action may be brought in the judicial district in which the person does business or in which the violation occurred.

"SEC. 291G. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; FEES.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to establish the genetically engineered food certification program under section 291A, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

''(b) FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon establishment of the genetically engineered food certification program under section 291A, the Secretary shall establish by notice, charge, and collect fees to cover the estimated costs to the Secretary of carrying out this subtitle.

''(2) AVAILABILITY.—Fees collected under paragraph (1) shall be deposited into a fund in the Treasury of the United States and shall remain available until expended, subject to appropriation, to carry out this subtitle.''.

SEC. 202. REGULATIONS.

In promulgating regulations to carry out the amendments made by section 201, the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) provide a process to account for certified nongenetically engineered covered products containing material from genetically engineered plants due to the inadvertent presence of such material;

(2) to the greatest extent practicable, establish consistency between the certification programs established under subtitle E of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (as added by section 201 of this Act), the organic certification program established under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.), and other voluntary labeling programs administered by the Secretary;

(3) with respect to regulations for covered products intended for consumption by non-food animals, take into account the inherent differences between food intended for animal and human consumption, including the essential vitamins, minerals, and micronutrients required to be added to animal food to formulate a complete and balanced diet; and

(4) provide a process for requesting and granting exemptions from the requirements of subtitle E of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (as added by section 201 of this Act) under conditions established by the Secretary.

SEC. 203. EFFECTIVE DATE; PREEMPTION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Regardless of whether regulations have been promulgated under section 202 of this Act, the amendments made by section 201 shall take effect beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITIONS AGAINST MANDATORY LABELING OF FOOD DEVELOPED USING GENETIC ENGINEERING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no State or political subdivision of a State may directly or indirectly establish under any authority or continue in effect as to any covered product (as defined in section 291 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as added by section 201 of this Act) in interstate commerce, any requirement for the labeling of a covered product indicating the product as having been produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant, including any requirements for claims that a covered product is or contains an ingredient that was produced from, contains, or consists of a genetically engineered plant.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a State (or a political subdivision thereof) may establish either of the following voluntary programs for the regulation of claims described in such paragraph:

(A) A program that relates to voluntary claims to which paragraph (1) of section 204(a) of this Act applies.

(B) A program that—

(i) is voluntary;

(ii) is accredited by the Secretary pursuant to section 291E of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (as added by section 201 of this Act); and

(iii) establishes standards that are identical to the standards established under section 291B or 291C of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as applicable (as added by section 201 of this Act).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For the sole purpose of subsection (b)(1), a covered product derived from livestock that consumed genetically engineered plants shall be deemed as having been produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant.

SEC. 204. APPLICABILITY.

(a) EXISTING CLAIMS.—A voluntary claim made with respect to whether a covered product (as defined in section 291 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as added by section 201 of this Act) was produced with or without the use of genetic engineering or genetically engineered plants before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) may be made for such a product during the 36-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) after the expiration of such 36-month period, may be made so long as the labels associated with such a claim meet the standards specified in section 291B or 291C of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as applicable (as added by section 201 of this Act).

(b) ORGANIC CERTIFICATION.—In the case of a covered product (as defined in section 291 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as added by section 201 of this Act) produced by a farm or handling operation that is certified as an organic farm or handling operation under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.), such product is deemed to be certified as a product produced without the use of genetic engineering under the genetically engineered food certification program established under section 291A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (as added by section 201 of this Act).

TITLE III—NATURAL FOODS

SEC. 301. LABELING OF NATURAL FOODS.

Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z)(1) If its labeling contains an express or implied claim that the food is 'natural' unless the claim is made in accordance with subparagraph (2).

''(2) A claim described in subparagraph (1) may be made only if the claim uses terms that have been defined by, and the food meets the requirements that have been established in, regulations promulgated to carry out this paragraph.

''(3) Notwithstanding subparagraph (2), prior to the finalization of regulations to carry out this paragraph, the use of any claim that a food is 'natural' shall be allowed if consistent with the Secretary's existing policy for such claims.

''(4) In promulgating regulations to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary shall differentiate between food for human consumption and food intended for consumption by animals other than humans.

''(5) For purposes of subparagraph (1), a natural claim includes the use of—

''(A) the terms 'natural', '100% natural', 'naturally grown', 'all natural', and 'made with natural ingredients'; and

''(B) any other terms specified by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 302. REGULATIONS.

(a) PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue proposed regulations to implement section 403(z) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 301 of this Act.

(b) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue final regulations to implement such section 403(z).

SEC. 303. PREEMPTION.

Section 403A(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343–1(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting a comma; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) any requirement for the labeling of food of the type required by section 403(z) that is not identical to the requirement of such section.''.

SEC. 304. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The labeling requirements of section 403(z) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 301 of this Act, shall take effect on the effective date of final regulations promulgated under section 302(b) of this Act. The provisions of section 403A(a)(6) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 303 of this Act, take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–216. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–216.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 5, insert the following:

''(3) LABELING OF PRODUCTS THAT ARE REQUIRED TO BE LABELED ABROAD.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall require that food produced from, containing, or consisting of a genetically engineered plant and intended for sale in interstate commerce be labeled as such if—

''(i) the person producing or manufacturing the food, or any affiliate thereof, produces or manufactures an equivalent food intended for consumption in a foreign country; and

''(ii) the person or affiliate is required by such foreign country to indicate in the labeling of such food that it is produced from, contains, or consists of a genetically engineered plant.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'affiliate' means any entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with another entity.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 369, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, there was a time when Monsanto supported labeling. Of course, 64 countries have adopted labeling, including the United Kingdom.

Here is what Monsanto said back then: Monsanto fully supports U.K. food manufacturers and retailers in their introduction to these labels. We believe you should be aware of all the facts before making a purchase. We encourage you to look out for these labels.

That was then; this is now. Now, Monsanto and Monsanto's allies say such labeling is impossible, impractical, and unnecessary. There was a time when Monsanto was proud of their genetically modified organisms. Why not now?

We have heard all of these arguments, some of which aren't exactly accurate, about the great benefits of GMOs. Why not put on there, ''GMOs solve global warming.'' Put it right there on the label. For all the people who are concerned about climate change, that would be something.

Now, 64 countries around the world require labeling; and many, many large U.S. firms actually do label in those countries. The countries are all the European Union—that is a pretty big slice of the world economy—China, Japan, Australia, South Korea, Brazil, India, New Zealand, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Saudi Arabia. Now, all of those countries require it; U.S. manufacturers ship products to those countries, and they put it on the label.

Now, Hershey's is not the only company that does this. This is a Hershey's label, and it is ''made in the USA.'' We like that. We like exporting things around the world, so we are very proud of the exports of Hershey's and other food manufacturers, but because of laws in Sweden, they have to say ''contains genetically modified organisms.''

Now, somehow, they can do that there. I mean, the EU has consistent rules, and my bill would have rules consistent with the EU. They could make one label, which would go to about half the world's economy. If it really costs money to print different labels, that would actually save them money, and it would do away with this argument about a proliferation of various different labels across the U.S.

There are some other countries that have different requirements, and they do still export to those countries, too. They can't have a uniform overseas label, but they could get darn close with all of the European Union, United States; and New Zealand and Australia are virtually identical.

Now, it isn't just Hershey's. These large companies go into—at least—50 of the 64 countries that require labeling: Pepsi, Tyson, Nestle, Coke, Mars, Hershey, Kellogg, and Heinz.

Now, I was contacted by Hershey, and they said: We can't deal with the proliferation in the States.

Then they should support my bill. Get a uniform national label. Let consumers know it contains GMOs. Monsanto can go out and tout the benefits or others can tout the benefits of GMOs, and then they could have one label for the EU and the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the United States should not let other countries dictate U.S. food policy. This would be absurd. It is exactly what this amendment does.

The proponents of this amendment seemingly wish to scare the public with unjustified warning labels on all products produced with any technology or, short of that, punish companies that have the audacity to engage in foreign commerce.

Just because European policy has been driven by fear-mongering, we should not allow it to be so here in the United States. We should not succumb to this angry rhetoric. We should lead the world in getting this policy right.

Now, let's just say, for sake of argument, we were to pass this amendment. I would like to ask: Who would be responsible for enforcement of such a quagmire? What agency licenses exports of food? What agency would be responsible for monitoring where in the world those products went and what specific requirements were placed on them by the countries receiving those products?

Assuming such information is actually obtained, that information is likely proprietary business information, exempted from disclosure between agencies by the Freedom of Information Act.

Here in the United States, we rely on the FDA for responsibility for food inspection, but as many proponents of

mandatory warning labels are quick to point out, the FDA inspects less than 1 percent of the products.

Are the proponents just doing this for show? Or do they actually expect an agency to fulfill its enforcement obligation? If so, has this amendment been scored?

I can only imagine what the cost will be to the agency to ensure that labels mandated by this amendment's sponsors are accurate.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take us backwards. It would require an even more patchwork set of rules. I urge that we get to uniformity. The logistics of enforcing every product label and their counterpart in 1 of 195 other countries in the world would be costly and a waste of taxpayer dollars.

I urge the defeat of this ill-conceived effort to punish American businessmen and -women who are doing their best to grow our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, 64 countries require labeling, including the European Union. This would give companies an opportunity to have a consistent label across the United States and into the European Union.

Consumers want this. The polls are consistently 88 percent. Monsanto spends $20 million, $30 million like they did in Oregon convincing people it would drive up food costs; and then they won by one one-hundredths of 1 percent in that election, after spending a record amount of money.

Americans want to know what is in their food; don't put them in the dark.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, we should not create a system whereby U.S. food producers are at the complete mercy of global actors all around the world. Goodness knows what the requirements would be for their labels here.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–216.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, line 12, at the end of section 113 of the bill insert the following: ''Nothing in this title or the amendments made thereby shall be construed to limit the authority of a State or tribe (or a political subdivision thereof) to prohibit or restrict the cultivation of genetically engineered plants on or near tribal lands.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 369, 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 rise to offer an amendment to ensure tribal sovereignty is not inadvertently harmed by this legislation, the DARK Act.

I am joined by several colleagues in support of this amendment, including cosponsors Representatives POLIS, MCCOLLUM, GRIJALVA, and RUIZ.

Now, much of the debate this morning has focused on how and if this bill will preempt State and local laws, which would include ordinances in my district that have been adopted by Marin, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Trinity Counties.

□ 1230

I agree with my colleagues: we deserve to know what is in our food, and this bill prevents local and State governments from providing consumers with that information, the information they want.

But in today's debate, little has been said about the need to protect the principle of tribal self-governance. I recognize that some of my colleagues believe the manager's amendment addresses any concerns regarding preemption and tribal sovereignty. I disagree. That is why I am offering this amendment to address any potential ambiguity in the bill, and to ensure that tribes can continue to take action on GMOs, as many of them have sought to do. If the underlying bill is supposed to protect tribal sovereignty, I would hope that the bill supporters wouldn't mind making that protection explicit by passing this amendment.

In 2013, the National Congress of American Indians, which supports my amendment today, passed a resolution calling on Congress and the Federal Government to ''preserve, protect, and maintain the integrity of traditional native foods, seeds, and agricultural systems . . . support the labeling of seeds or products containing GE technology and ingredients . . . create GE and transgenic crop-free zones; and oppose the use and cultivation of GE seeds in the United States.'' But this bill would preempt the creation of a national standard for GMOs that NCAI has asked for.

Now, this is not just about crops, Mr. Chairman. The Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, which includes several tribes in my district, are strongly opposed to the FDA approval of genetically engineered salmon due to the potential for harmful impacts on wild salmon that are so important to the tribes and to, frankly, the commercial economy in my district. Under this legislation, it is hard to see how FDA could ever require the labeling of genetically engineered salmon.

With the significant concerns over GE foods and the proactive steps that tribes are taking on their lands and resources, we ought to make clear that this bill will not affect tribes' authorities to prohibit or restrict the cultivation of GE plants on or near tribal lands.

The Congressional Research Service has taken a look at this bill's new preemption section, and they have said that the effects of the preemption language are ambiguous. In the case of impacts to tribes, we ought to leave no ambiguity.

I urge support of this amendment. No matter how we feel about the legislation as a whole, I would hope, at the very least, we could clarify that tribes should retain the authority to restrict GE plants on their own lands, if they so choose.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, simply put, H.R. 1599 does not prohibit local governments from passing and enforcing bans on cultivation of genetically engineered crops. Similarly, it does not do that with respect to tribal sovereignty either.

The bill before us applies only to the food use and labels. There is nothing in this legislation that any opponent can point to that suggests or implies interference with State or local ordinances related to plant cultivation, period.

Likewise, the preemption provision that the amendment seeks to modify only applies to States and political subdivisions thereof. Tribal lands are sovereign. They are not affected.

If the amendment sponsor wishes only to clarify sovereign rights of tribal governments on their land, then we would be happy to work with him, but the structure of this amendment appears to provide tribal governments with some level of authority over land outside of their boundaries. This may or may not have been the intended purpose of the amendment, but it has serious unintended consequences.

I urge the sponsor to withdraw this amendment and allow us the opportunity to work together to address their concerns.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the intent is not to prohibit or restrict or preempt tribal sovereignty, why not make it clear, why not pass this amendment?

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, there are three preemption sections in this bill: one prohibits States from labeling GMOs; another establishes something for a label called ''natural,'' which will contain GMOs and can contain GMOs and still be labeled ''natural''; and then

finally, a very poorly written big section that seems to preempt all State regulations and tribal regulations.

The Navajo Nation has a ban on the cultivation of genetically modified crops. They are trying to preserve their indigenous crops.

States have provided for buffer zones in 30 States. This bill, I believe, will preempt those 30 States from establishing buffer zones to protect conventional crops.

We had conventional wheat in Oregon that was banned from export because of GMO pollution—conventional wheat, let alone organic wheat, which would be worthless if it had GMO pollution.

So in this bill I had an amendment to clarify this section and say, no, no, no, not preempting State Departments of Agriculture establishing reasonable rules to protect conventional and organic farmers from preemption. They say they fixed it. I don't believe they have. That part of the bill is very vague. This, I believe, could both preempt tribal sovereign entity, State sovereign entity, and reasonable regulations to protect other farmers.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the language is very clear. It says that ''no State or political subdivision of a State may directly or indirectly establish under any authority or continue in effect as to any food in interstate commerce any requirement with respect to genetically engineered plants for a use or application of food that is not identical to the requirement of section 461 of the Plant Protection Act.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree that that language is clear, but I would note that that language says nothing about tribal sovereignty.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, this is a bill that is deeply flawed. It should be opposed for all sorts of reasons. But here is an amendment that would at least make it a little better for those of us that represent Indian Country, for those of us that care about tribal sovereignty.

For those of us that want to protect the tribes who have taken action on their land, who have in some cases partnered with States for buffer zones near tribal land, we ought to at least take this additional step to make it clear that they can do that, that we are not running roughshod over their tribal sovereignty.

With that, I request an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, nothing in this amendment will impact tribal sovereignty one iota. It talks about States and political subdivisions. That doesn't apply in any way to tribal land.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–216.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, lines 13 through 17, amend paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) A claim described in subparagraph (1) may be made only if—

''(A) the claim uses terms that have been defined by, and the food meets the requirements that have been established in, regulations promulgated to carry out this paragraph; and

''(B) the food is not produced using, does not contain, and does not consist of a genetically engineered plant.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 369, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would make clear that foods labeled ''natural'' cannot contain genetically modified material.

I want to emphasize right from the outset it is about our basic right to know what we are eating and what we are feeding to our children.

FDA already requires clear labeling of over 3,000 ingredients, additives, and food processes. One example: fruit juice must indicate whether or not it is from concentrate. Clearly, that is not a judgment on food safety; it is a simple matter of transparency.

Calling GMO foods ''natural'' is not transparent. It is confusing, and we have the data to back that up.

As Members can see from the chart behind me, almost two-thirds of American adults believe that ''natural'' already means GMO-free, and 84 percent agree that that is what it should mean.

We need to make sure that food labels reflect that commonsense understanding. As drafted, this bill would do the opposite. It would codify the status quo, being that food companies can put ''natural'' on a product, even if it was genetically engineered, which allows misleading labels. It would perpetuate misunderstandings and confusion. It would keep American families in the dark.

This is not what the American public wants. More than 90 percent of us want clear GMO labeling. In response to this overwhelming demand, three States—Vermont, Maine, and my home State of Connecticut—have passed laws restricting the ''natural'' label to foods that do not contain GMOs. Several other States are considering similar laws.

Without my amendment, this bill would nullify those State laws. This would represent a serious setback for the right to know in these States around the country.

Mr. Chairman, American families want clear information about GMOs. They deserve that information. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my colleague.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this bill would deceive consumers. It would say that there will now be an FDA definition of ''natural.'' The FDA has never, ever wanted to try and define ''natural'' and that it would include GMOs. Something labeled as ''natural''—Cheerios, naturally flavored—if it contained GMOs, they wouldn't have to say that.

So consumers often, in fact, confuse the ''organic'' and the ''natural'' label. In fact, some polls show that consumers more often think ''natural'' is natural and they are not quite sure what ''organic'' is. This bill is going to muddy those waters further, deceive consumers, and have them buy things labeled ''natural'' that contain genetically modified organisms.

Why is that in this bill? We can fight over the labeling standards for disclosure. Why are you going to muddy the waters and confuse things and create a new mandatory Federal definition and label for ''natural'' that contains GMOs?

Again, here we have all natural vodka creamy marinara. Wow, that is something. And again, this has a number of things in it that very likely contain GMOs that wouldn't be disclosed. But they do have to disclose, and she does, cellulose, sorbic acid, whey, xanthan gum, vodka—of course, it is vodka sauce. But in the future, natural, contains GMOs, no disclosure.

This is really, really I think probably the most egregious part of a very egregious bill—preempting states' rights. Remember, this is the party of states' rights. Until a State does something they don't like, then we have got to preempt it.

Then they say, well, we can't have proliferation of labels. Well, there is a very simple solution, my bill, one mandatory standard Federal label that would say, ''contains GMOs.'' Then that label could be sold into the European Union. You would be able to sell to about half of the world's economy with one label; whereas, today, you have got to have one label for the EU, one label for the U.S., and then a multiple of other countries where 50 major corporations sell their products.

This is so disingenuous. It is very discouraging.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, as I said at the beginning, this is not a question of safety or otherwise of GMO foods. We need to ask ourselves a simple question: Does the word ''natural'' really mean to a salmon engineered to grow at double the normal rate? a cereal created in a laboratory to be resistant to herbicide? a tomato with fish genes? Are these things natural? Our common sense says no. A clear majority of Americans agree. By overwhelming margins, we want to know when our food contains GMOs.

We are what we eat, and whether it is the number of calories in our kids' Happy Meals, the country where our beef was raised, or the GMO content of the food we buy at the supermarket, as consumers, as parents, as Americans, we have a right to know.

As drafted, this bill would fly in the face of that broad consensus and keep us in the dark. For the sake of transparency and for commonsense, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting; this whole entire debate we have talked about science. The science clearly shows that genetically modified seeds, genetically modified foods, are safe for every single American family.

It is also interesting that my colleague brought a box of Honey Nut Cheerios to the floor. My colleague talked about claims made on that box. Well, it is interesting that my colleague didn't bring a box of regular Cheerios that sometimes contain a label of non-GMO.

Well, it is a marketing ploy, and that is what we are trying to correct here, because there is no GMO oat. It is all to convince consumers that it is somehow safer, even though there is no distinction between that Cheerios that has that label and the other Cheerios box that doesn't.

□ 1245

It is interesting to see those specific points brought to the floor to try and make this case. It is just clearly not resonating with the American people.

There are no clear and consistent standards for the term ''natural,'' which is why we are trying to correct this in this bill.

We need to make sure that consistent litigation that has come about because of the very definitions of what the term ''natural'' means can stop. Let's put a clear standard in place.

H.R. 1599 also requires the FDA to file a notice and comment rulemaking process to define and set standards for the term ''natural.'' I thought this was exactly what the rulemaking process was supposed to be used for.

This will allow for an open, transparent, public process so that the FDA can establish such standards based on the facts, the science, and the input received.

This amendment would predetermine that outcome and not allow for a science-based, fact-driven process—that is open to the public—to continue to move forward.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. Let's get on the path of passing H.R. 1599 in this House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. PINGREE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114–216.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows through the end of the bill, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Non-GMO Disclosure Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. NON-GMO FOOD CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle E—Non-GMO Food Certification Program

''SEC. 291. CERTIFICATION OF NON-GMO FOODS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a voluntary certification program for food produced without the use of genetic engineering to be known as the Non-GMO Food Certification Program.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with other relevant parties to develop the Non-GMO Food Certification Program.

''(c) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall implement the Non-GMO Food Certification Program through certifying agents. Certifying agents may certify that products were not produced with the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant, in accordance with this subtitle.

''(d) SEAL.—The Secretary shall establish a seal to identify products that were not produced with the use of genetic engineering or a genetically engineered plant in interstate commerce using terminology the Secretary considers appropriate, including terminology commonly used in interstate commerce or established by the Secretary in regulations.

''SEC. 292. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) GENETICALLY ENGINEERED.—The term 'genetically engineered', used with respect to a food, means a material intended for human consumption that is—

''(A) an organism that is produced through the intentional use of genetic engineering; or

''(B) the progeny of intended sexual or asexual reproduction (or both) of 1 or more organisms that is the product of genetic engineering.

''(2) GENETIC ENGINEERING.—The term 'genetic engineering' means a process—

''(A) involving the application of in vitro nucleic acid techniques, including recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) and direct injection of nucleic acid into cells or organelles;

''(B) involving the application of fusion of cells beyond the taxonomic family; or

''(C) that overcomes natural physiological, reproductive, or recombinant barriers and that is not a process used in traditional breeding and selection.''.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to implement the Non-GMO Food Certification Program in accordance with section 291 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.), as added by section 2.

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act (or the amendments made by this Act) is intended to alter or affect the authorities or regulatory programs, policies, and procedures otherwise available to, or the definitions used by, the Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) or the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service under the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.).

Ms. PINGREE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 369, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maine.

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

I appreciate the lively debate that has gone on today, and I want to speak in favor of this particular amendment.

This is the Pingree-DeFazio-Polis amendment in the nature of a substitute, which strikes all of the anticonsumer and antifarmer provisions of the underlying bill.

This comes down to a very simple proposition: Do consumers have a right to know what is in the food they buy and that they feed to their families?

As we have heard many times today, 9 out of 10 consumers say, yes, they support GMO labeling. The public wants to know, as more and more people care about what is in their food and where it comes from. People want to know more, not less, about what they eat.

We already know a lot about our food. We know how many calories are in it, thanks to the labels. We know how much vitamin C we get per serving. We know if a fish is farm raised or wild caught.

We want to know those things. We actually know if our orange juice is made from concentrate or not. Maybe not everybody wants to know that, but it is right there on the label. Shouldn't we also be able to know if the food we are buying has GMO ingredients?

I know some of the opponents of labeling have suggested that consumers might be frightened by GMO ingredients if they were to see them on the labels.

Do we really think that consumers are not smart enough to handle this information? Do we really think that 90 percent of Americans are wrong to want GMO products labeled?

Not only does this bill make it very unlikely that we would ever see the labeling of GMO products on a national basis, but it goes after the laws that have already been passed at the State level, just like in my State of Maine.

Our law was passed by a Democratic legislature, was signed by a conservative Republican Governor, and it has a huge amount of public support.

Now Congress wants to tell the consumers of my State and my State legislators that they cannot have this basic piece of information.

I guarantee you, if Congress passes this law, my State legislature and my constituents will not be happy. They do not want to see their ability to make those decisions taken away.

Not only does this bill go after State labeling laws, but it may also preempt laws and regulations at a local level that protect farmers from contamination by drift from GMO crops.

In my State and in many others, local organic farms are contributing to the economy by growing high-value, high-demand crops.

Some local and county governments have created buffer zones to protect those farms from contamination from GMO crops, and we have heard from experts who say this bill would preempt these laws.

Why would we want to do that? Why would we want to undercut one of the fastest growing sectors in our farm economy that has been very beneficial to rural States like mine—that has revitalized many communities and that has provided economic opportunities for our farmers? What reason would we have to go in the opposite direction?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It would strike the dangerous parts of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would completely gut the primary purpose of the legislation before us today.

In order to prevent a patchwork of 50 different labeling laws for genetically engineered ingredients, preemption is necessary to protect interstate commerce.

Of course, we have heard a lot today about states' rights, but the Founders understood what was important about interstate commerce.

They knew that local governments were at risk of trying to put in place rules that favored local activities; so they accounted for this. They created what is called the Interstate Commerce Clause.

It is right there in the Constitution, and it is pretty darned clear. It was about trade between the States. It said that the Federal Government shall have the authority to regulate this trade. It is important that we do this today, but this amendment would deny us the capacity to do that.

Current State labeling initiatives include a number of varying exemptions, loopholes, and caveats, making it very confusing for not only food producers, but for consumers to understand what it is they are truly consuming.

H.R. 1599 builds on this idea of a uniform standard to provide clarity and consistency to consumers that they can depend upon, regardless of where they shop for food.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), my good friend and the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The author is an organic grower. She knows how people care about what is in their food.

I represent one of the most successful agricultural counties in the United States—Monterey County. I challenge anybody to find a county in this country that makes $4.5 billion a year by growing over 100 different crops in one county.

Food is just like politics—it is all local. What the underlying bill does is strike local control—local control where people care about the methodology of growing.

My area is the area that blossomed into creating the California Organic Standards Act, which I authored in the California State Legislature, which became the model for the Federal Organic Standards Act. This preempts some of the regulations in there. That is not a good thing to do.

Although the Federal Government may have the authority on interstate commerce, I don't think that people want the Federal Government to preempt the ability for them to know their farmers, to know their food, and to have it be labeled as they so choose in a local area.

Labeling is really important, but what you do is change the definition of labels here to one size fits all. That is not the way this country works. That is not the way farming works. And it is certainly not the way that consumers want it to be.

It is too early for the Federal Government, for Congress, to jump in and try to mix up this field. Allow local politics to exist. Allow people to choose to know what is in their food by allowing it to be labeled locally.

Let's support American agriculture so that we can sell it abroad. This bill does everything but gain confidence. The amendment is to be supported.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to follow my colleague from California. Less than a year ago I was in his fine district, and I saw the benefits of the agricultural industry in Monterey, California.

I actually toured an organic food processing facility in and around my colleague's district, and I saw firsthand the impact of California agriculture.

I want my colleagues to be assured that the organic labeling program is exactly what this bill is modeled after.

The words that may have been developed in the California State Senate and in the California State Assembly are part of our national organic standards because they work. Organic is a voluntary program just like we are trying to put forth.

This is exactly what we are trying to do, Mr. Chairman—address the concerns of many Americans who want a label and who have contacted our offices.

Americans also want standards; so, when we hear words like ''contamination,'' unfortunately, it connotates negativity to consumers that somehow GMOs are bad for them. The science, though, clearly shows they are not.

As a matter of fact, I just walked over to the Senate side and sat down with some of my colleagues who probably will not vote for this bill. We didn't know, because there was no label, whether or not that sandwich we ate contained genetically modified organisms—seeds—if it were produced with GMOs.

We are trying to fix that. We would allow that sandwich shop to actually meet a set of standards, just like how our organic growers do today, to determine what a GMO product means.

When we hear about trade, earlier today, I was with a member of the European Parliament, Julie Girling. We were talking about some of the impacts of the GMO rules and regulations in the EU on their ability to get cheap food into their supermarkets.

I would urge my colleagues to talk to those who are experiencing the exact same thing right now in our European countries that are our allies. Talk with Ms. Girling. Talk to her about the problems that Europe is experiencing.

We are trying to stop those problems from happening here in America. I want to make sure that we use science—that we use the facts—and that we use a model of a very successful organic labeling program to write this bill.

Therefore, my colleagues should be in favor of this if they are so in favor of the existing program today.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, who cares deeply about issues surrounding our environment and public health.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered to H.R. 1599 by Congresswoman PINGREE and Congressman DEFAZIO would replace the underlying bill with a voluntary certification program for non-genetically engineered foods, enabling companies that elect to go through this process to certify that their food is non-GE and share this information with consumers through a seal established by the USDA, similar to the organic program.

This amendment is a step forward in providing consumers with the information they want. While this amendment would preserve the ability of States and localities to act in regards to the labeling of non-GE and GE foods, it unfortunately does not address the problem many of us have heard about today, and that is a patchwork of food labeling requirements across the country.

As I have said previously, I can't support preempting State labeling laws without establishing a national mandatory labeling standard in its place. Moving forward, I hope that we can work with the Senate to strike a balance that will address concerns we have heard on both sides of this issue.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a hard-working Congressman who cares deeply, as well, about agriculture issues and about the consumers in his State.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentlewoman who represents the other Portland. I deeply appreciated her leadership and insight in this area.

Mr. Chairman, these are areas that touch Americans on a whole host of levels, but one of the things that is important to note is that the extreme provisions of the preemption bill, of the underlying bill that we are discussing, actually have significant negative consequences on hard-working farmers in our State.

There are vast world markets that we export to, and most of the world markets care about whether or not the product is genetically engineered or not. You can argue the merits, but the world market has made a judgment.

We had some cross contamination in wheat for the genetically engineered strain, which set off alarm bells. Oregon farmers lost business as a result of that.

The underlying bill would undercut the efforts of 40 States in working with their local communities to try and provide protections.

Whether or not you are going to label it, there is no reason that you can't provide reasonable buffers around crops that are genetically modified so that you can help provide some protection.

□ 1300

Why would we want to strip away the ability of State and local governments to provide those sort of protections?

Now, in the long run, Mr. Chairman, what we need to do is just have a uniform national policy that labels these, that gets rid of all the problems of multiplicity of labels and the costs and the confusion. My good friend from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has legislation that would do precisely that. But in the meantime, I deeply appreciate my friend from Maine stepping up to get rid of the most egregious part of the underlying bill, create a program that they can label their products GE free, and get rid of these egregious preemption provisions.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Would the Chair please inform how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kansas has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

We have heard a lot of arguments about this bill today and the various components of it, why the bill is not a good idea, and why my amendment, which would strike most of the egregious parts of the bill, would be a beneficial way to change this.

Just to go back to my favorite example about labeling, the next time you go into a grocery store, take a look at the carton of orange juice. Right there on the front of the label you will see the words ''from concentrate'' on most of the juice boxes. By law, those words have to appear right there on the front of the label in letters at least half as tall as the name of the brand. We are that specific.

Now, the fact that we need to know the difference in that carton between fresh squeezed and made from concentrate or any other process that might have been used shows me that we have decided to have labels for almost everything you can think of except GMO ingredients.

If it is so important for Americans to know whether or not their orange juice is made from a concentrate, don't you think it is reasonable to put a label somewhere on the back of a package of food telling consumers whether or not it contains GMO ingredients?

This bill, if it is passed by the House, will effectively guarantee that consumers won't have access to that information when they go to the grocery store. This bill will take away the rights of States like mine in Maine to pass laws that protect our consumers. States like Maine and Vermont, who have already passed laws like this, will not have the right to proceed. The Pingree-DeFazio-Polis amendment will strike the worst parts of this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would put us right back where we are today, with a patchwork of laws confusing consumers and making it difficult on American food companies to compete around the world to feed the next billion people.

This amendment would drive up the cost of food for every consumer in the United States of America by relegating them to the set of patchwork rules, which would drive costs throughout the food safety and supply chain.

We have heard today that this puts farmers at risk, it makes life for farmers difficult. We have heard from Representatives from Maine who said that, and yet the Maine Beverage Association and the Maine Potato Board both endorsed this legislation.

We have heard that this will hurt Oregon farmers and Oregon consumers, and yet the Oregon Farm Bureau, the Oregon Feed and Grain Association, the Oregon Potato Commission, the Oregon Retail Council, the Oregon Seed Association, the Oregon Wheat Growers League, and Oregonians for Food & Shelter endorsed this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will gut this entire legislation. It takes away the important balance that has been struck in order to make sure that, in fact, consumers do have the right to know.

We have heard these vague epithets trying to rename this bill the DARK Act, Denying Americans the Right to Know, but as a good conservative, I can promise you, this bill doesn't deny any consumer any right to know what is in their food product.

If a consumer, like my cousin, who likes her non-GMO food, wants to continue to feed that to herself and her family, when this bill becomes law, she will still be able to do so. I would never deny any American the right to know what is in their food.

This is about freedom and consumer choice and affordability. Our bill will achieve that, and this amendment would destroy that. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

The amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114–216 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 303, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—123

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Higgins
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—303

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

NOT VOTING—7

Brady (PA)
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Israel
Kaptur
Keating
Lujan Grisham (NM)

□ 1332

Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Messrs. DONOVAN, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CLAY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. BUTTERFIELD and LAWRENCE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 227, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—196

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zinke

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—10

Bishop (MI)
Brady (PA)
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Israel
Kaptur
Keating
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Pearce
Royce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1338

Mr. FLEISCHMANN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. VEASEY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 262, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—163

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—262

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

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (PA)
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Israel
Kaptur
Keating
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Pearce

□ 1342

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chair of the Committee

of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1599) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to food produced from, containing, or consisting of a bioengineered organism, the labeling of natural foods, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 369, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 275, noes 150, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

AYES—275

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

NOES—150

Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop (UT)
Brady (PA)
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Israel
Kaptur
Keating
Lujan Grisham (NM)

□ 1350

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk to change the title of the bill to the ''Deny Americans the Right to Know Act.''

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Polis moves to amend the title of H.R. 1599 to read as follows: ''A bill to enact the 'Deny Americans the Right to Know Act' or the 'DARK Act'.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6 of rule XVI, the amendment is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the amendment to the title will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 370.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 87, nays 337, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—87

Aguilar
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Connolly
Conyers
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Edwards
Ellison
Fattah
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Honda
Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kuster
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Nolan
O'Rourke
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Polis
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

NAYS—337

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei

Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carney
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Israel
Kaptur
Keating
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1407

Mr. RUIZ and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3009, ENFORCE THE LAW FOR SANCTUARY CITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3009) to amend section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny assistance under such section to a State or political subdivision of a State that prohibits its officials from taking certain actions with respect to immigration, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 174, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross

O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Brady (PA)
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Doggett
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Israel
Kaptur
Keating
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
McNerney
Quigley
Sires
Vela
Wilson (FL)

□ 1416

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 464, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ENFORCE THE LAW FOR SANCTUARY CITIES ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I call up the bill (H.R. 3009) to amend section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny assistance under such section to a State or political subdivision of a State that prohibits its officials from taking certain actions with respect to immigration, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3009

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act''.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (SCAAP) FUNDING.

Section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) A State (or a political subdivision of a State) shall not be eligible to enter into a contractual arrangement under paragraph (1) if the State (or political subdivision)—

''(A) has in effect any law, policy, or procedure in contravention of subsection (a) or (b) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373); or

''(B) prohibits State or local law enforcement officials from gathering information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.''.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON DOJ GRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) COPS.—In the case of a State or unit of local government that received a grant award under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.), if, during a fiscal year, that State or local government is a State or local government described in subsection (c), the Attorney General shall withhold all of the amount that would otherwise be awarded to that State or unit of local government for the following fiscal year.

(b) BYRNE-JAG.—In the case of a State or unit of local government that received a grant award under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.), if, during a fiscal year, that State or unit of local government is described in subsection (c), the Attorney General shall withhold all of the amount that would otherwise be awarded to that State or unit of local government for the following fiscal year.

(c) STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS DESCRIBED.—A State or unit of local government described in this subsection is any State or local government that—

(1) has in effect any law, policy, or procedure in contravention of subsection (a) or (b) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373); or

(2) prohibits State or local law enforcement officials from gathering information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 3009, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I support H.R. 3009, the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act, and commend Representative HUNTER for introducing this legislation. It helps to address one of the main factors contributing to the collapse of immigration enforcement in the United States, ''sanctuary cities'' that prohibit their law enforcement officers from sharing information with Federal immigration authorities to enable the removal of unlawful and criminal aliens.

Nearly 20 years ago, Congress realized that sanctuary cities were impeding the Federal Government from enforcing our immigration laws and jeopardizing the safety of our residents, immigrant and native-born alike.

Legislation cowritten by former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, LAMAR SMITH, prohibited States and localities from becoming sanctuaries for unlawful aliens.

The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 ensures that jurisdictions cannot prohibit or restrict government officials from sending to or receiving from Federal immigration authorities information regarding the immigration status of any person.

Unfortunately, despite the proliferation of sanctuary jurisdictions, the Justice Department has never initiated a prosecution for violation of the 1996 act. If the administration won't act, Congress must, and that is what Mr. HUNTER's bill does.

It withholds key Federal law enforcement grants from sanctuary jurisdictions that violate the 1996 act. Enactment of Representative HUNTER's legislation will help persuade sanctuary jurisdictions to simply abide by current Federal law and, in doing so, advance public safety.

Representative HUNTER's bill is an important first step, but there is much more we will need to do to rebuild immigration enforcement in the United States. Once jurisdictions notify DHS of arrested unlawful and criminal aliens, it is crucial that they hold these aliens for transfer so that DHS can launch removal proceedings.

The Center for Immigration Studies has revealed that, in the first 8 months of 2014, sanctuary cities refused to comply with DHS detainers for 8,145 aliens. After releasing these aliens, in only an 8-month period, 1,867 were arrested again for a criminal offense. Most recently, San Francisco's refusal to honor a DHS detainer resulted in the tragic death of Kathryn Steinle.

This is why it is so important that jurisdictions honor DHS detainers. In fact, just this morning, we held a hearing in the Judiciary Committee where a representative from the Steinle family testified.

The conclusion of the witnesses was that we need to make crystal clear that compliance with ICE detainers is mandatory; yet this administration openly proclaims that detainers can be ignored and has chosen to dramatically scale back their issuance.

This administration has chosen to create enforcement-free zones for millions of unlawful and criminal aliens. It has turned the U.S. into a sanctuary Nation. That is the current reality.

Despite DHS' pledge to prioritize the removal of serious criminal aliens, in the last year, the number of administrative arrests by criminal aliens has fallen by a third. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement continues to release thousands of criminal aliens onto our streets, 30,558 in 2014, of which another 1,423 have already been convicted of new crimes.

There are almost 180,000 convicted criminal aliens currently in removal proceedings living in our neighborhoods and almost 170,000 convicted aliens who have been ordered removed from the country also still living free and causing crimes on our streets.

Under the Obama administration, the total number of convicted criminal aliens who are not being detained has jumped 28 percent since 2012 to a total of nearly 350,000.

We must prevent this or any other administration from being able to turn off the switch on immigration enforcement. Representative GOWDY, chairman of the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee, has offered us a way forward to ensure enforcement of our immigration laws, despite the purposeful inaction of any administration.

His legislation, the Michael Davis, Jr. and Danny Oliver in Honor of State and Local Law Enforcement Act, allows States and localities to enact and enforce immigration laws of their own, as long as they are consistent with Federal law. Jurisdictions could proactively take responsibility for protecting their communities and ensuring the integrity of our immigration system.

Today, we are making an important down payment on protecting our constituents, and I appreciate the majority leader's commitment to me that we will take additional action to ensure compliance with our immigration laws in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3009, the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3009, the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act.

This thoroughly flawed measure is a blatant attempt by most of the majority to insert its anti-immigrant status agenda into local policing initiatives. It does this by prohibiting State and local governments from receiving critical criminal justice funds if they have policies that prioritize public safety and community policing over Federal immigration enforcement.

The bill absolutely makes no sense because, rather than improving public safety, it will achieve the complete opposite; and that is not just my conclusion. Law enforcement agencies from across the United States and numerous organizations—such as the Major County Sheriffs Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, the United States Conference of Mayors, and the National League of Cities—all oppose this bill.

In effect, this bill would punish law enforcement officers by withholding the funds they need to do their jobs, and it would require States and localities to prioritize Federal immigration enforcement ahead of enhancing public safety.

Reactionary proposals such as this legislation will only make our communities less safe because immigrants will not report crimes or otherwise cooperate with the police if they fear they or their family members may be asked for their immigration status. As a result, crimes will go unsolved and unpunished while criminals are free to victimize more people.

In addition, withholding crucial United States Department of Justice funds from local communities will not lower crime. Studies have demonstrated that these programs, particularly the COPS and Byrne JAG funds, provide crucial support services to fight criminal activity, but a vote for H.R. 3009 is a vote to take these funds away and to risk making communities less safe.

All of us, on both sides of the aisle, are opposed to violent crime. There is simply no debate about that. Not one of us would condone what happened to Kate Steinle in San Francisco, but H.R. 3009 is simply the wrong approach.

I agree with the Major Cities Chiefs Association that the best way to reduce crime in their cities is to gain the community's trust and cooperation. I also believe that the majority of immigrants in this country are hard-working, law-abiding residents; and comprehensive immigration reform would allow these law-abiding individuals to come out of the shadows and get right with the law.

Such legislative reform would enable Immigration and Customs Enforcement to focus its limited resources on deporting the worst elements, while ensuring that our entire community, citizens and immigrants alike, are protected from harm.

Instead of considering this commonsense solution, the majority—most of them—have repeatedly voted to deport DREAMers; to deport the parents of United States citizens; and to deport vulnerable children from fleeing persecution, violence, and trafficking.

Now, the majority, in the form of H.R. 3009, asks us to override the public safety mission of State and local enforcement agencies to increase deportations.

I strenuously urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, let me say to Chairman GOODLATTE, thank you very much for your leadership on this and thanks for moving this so quickly. This is a timely bill, and I just want to thank you and your committee for moving it so quick.

This legislation is about one thing. That is accountability. The American people have the right to not give their Federal tax dollars to municipalities and States that do not follow Federal law.

There are lots of changes to enforcement that must be imposed on sanctuary cities, and we are going to work toward those things. This Republican Congress is going to work toward those things, just as we are putting in motion a mechanism today that holds sanctuary cities accountable.

I think we can all agree that any locality must comply with the law, and they are required to coordinate and cooperate with the Federal Government. If an arrest is made, the Federal Government should be notified.

The fact that San Francisco and L.A. and other cities disagree with the politics of Federal enforcement does not give them a free pass to subvert the law. If they do, there has to be consequences.

The way that we impose consequences on these sanctuary cities is by hitting them where it hurts, and that is in their pocketbook. It is simple.

If you don't comply with the law as it stands now, then you don't receive coveted Federal money intended for law enforcement. And that money allocated for fiscal year 2015 alone almost adds up to a billion dollars.

$800 million are going to municipalities, cities, counties, and States that care more about illegal alien criminals, felons, than they do their own citizens. It is time we stand up to sanctuary cities and begin holding them accountable for their failure to uphold the law.

I come as a representative that has sanctuary cities in my district. They are going to lose money for this. They are going to lose money because they are not complying with Federal law.

This Federal money that they get is taxpayer money from States like Wisconsin, from New York, from South Carolina, from Florida, and throughout the entire country. People around this country don't want their money going to States and cities that don't care to follow the Federal law.

Again, if you are a State, city, or locality and you choose to defy Federal immigration law, you will be cut off from three Federal programs: the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, the Community-Oriented Policing Services program, and the Byrne JAG program.

These are the three funds that will get cut if you are a sanctuary city. All you have to do to receive these funds is comply with the Federal law.

This bill is just the first step in restoring accountability in our immigration system. Our border infrastructure continues to fall short in too many places, and I am as frustrated as anyone in this Congress that the administration refuses to enforce Federal immigration law.

These are all serious issues that need to be addressed, and I look forward to working with this Congress and Chairman GOODLATTE in the future to advance these goals.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3009.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, we have an immigration system that is badly broken. There are 11 million undocumented people in this country. Contrary to what Donald Trump may think, the majority of these people are not rapists.

They are hard-working people, spouses and parents of U.S. citizens, DREAMers, entrepreneurs who want an opportunity to come forward, submit to background checks, and become fully American.

Faced with a broken system, State and local law enforcement have adopted policies to enhance public safety and maintain community trust.

Because when people are afraid of the police, when they are afraid that the police might ask them or their family about their immigration status, they are afraid to report crimes, unlikely to cooperate with investigations, and then criminals thrive and the general public suffers.

This bill puts an impossible choice between State and local law enforcement agencies. They can either abandon policies that work or they can lose the Federal funds they rely on to police their communities and protect them.

The dangers posed by this bill are real. 144 national, State, and local advocacy organizations have written opposing this bill because of the detrimental impact it would have on public safety, big cities, but also little ones like Dayton, Ohio, a place that most people don't think of as a sanctuary city.

In Dayton, police officers are told not to check immigration status of witnesses and victims, nor to ask about immigration during minor traffic stops.

The police chief there has explained that this policy has helped them have a safer community. According to the chief, after the policy was adopted, serious violent crime dropped nearly 22 percent and serious property crime decreased almost 15 percent.

Madam Speaker, why should Dayton, Ohio, be barred from receiving funds for policing when their policies work?

Now, punishing the law enforcement officers by withholding the funds they need is not only incorrect, it is why the bill is opposed to by the Major County Sheriffs' Associations, the Fraternal Order of Police, dozens of sheriffs and police chiefs.

The President has said we should deport felons, not families, and that is what his priority enforcement program does.

The Secretary of Homeland Security told the Judiciary Committee just last week that withholding funds from communities would be a huge setback in efforts to improve the relationship between DHS, State, and local law enforcement in communities across the country.

It has been said that this bill is a response to the tragic murder of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco, just up the road from my district.

However, nothing in this bill would have prevented that outrageous murder of Ms. Steinle. Nothing in the bill would have required the Bureau of Prisons and ICE to consult with San Francisco, to ascertain whether or not the 20-year-old warrant would lead to a prosecution.

Nothing in this bill would have required ICE to obtain a warrant, as is necessary to hold people beyond the term of their criminal sentence.

Nothing in the bill would even have affected the sheriff of San Francisco's decision to release the individual charged with murdering Ms. Steinle.

So that tragedy should not be used to advance a different agenda, this bill.

Over the last year we have come to the floor to vote on bills to deport the DREAM Act kids, to deport the parents of U.S. citizens, to deport vulnerable children fleeing persecution and sex trafficking.

Today we are asked to vote on a bill that overrides the public safety mission of State and local law enforcement agencies and to increase deportations all around.

We had the votes to pass comprehensive immigration reform in the last Congress, and I hope we can get back to that point.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I would note that we have an opportunity here to learn from the tragedy in San Francisco to come up with real solutions that would make our community safer instead of using that tragedy as an excuse to promote a different agenda.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to make very clear nothing in this bill requires any officer of the law to ask any question of any victims of crime about their immigration status.

All it does is prohibit cities and counties from ordering their officers to not communicate with ICE or gather information from ICE about the status of individuals. This is a good bill.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the current chairman of the Science Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from Virginia and a good friend and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I support H.R. 3009, the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary City Act. The bill is appropriately named, since sanctuary cities violate current laws that require these jurisdictions to share information with Federal authorities about illegal immigrants who have been arrested.

H.R. 3009 helps enforce an immigration bill I introduced several years ago that became law. This legislation withholds certain Federal funds from sanctuary jurisdictions that hide the immigration status of illegal immigrants charged with crimes. These reforms serve as a first step in keeping dangerous criminals off our streets and out of our neighborhoods.

Sanctuary cities have increased under this administration, which has done nothing to discourage them.

During only an 8-month period last year, sanctuary cities released almost 9,000 illegal immigrants charged with or convicted of serious crimes. One-quarter have already been arrested again for committing more crimes, like murder and sexual assault. When does it end?

I don't understand how anyone could oppose enforcing immigration laws. The victims are not Democrats or Republicans. The victims are innocent Americans.

Many of the crimes committed by illegal immigrants could have been prevented if the Obama administration had enforced immigration laws. Instead, it has chosen to ignore them and innocent Americans continue to pay a steep price.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for authorizing this legislation, and I urge its approval.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3009, which would make communities across the country less safe from crime.

This legislation would withhold needed Federal funding from cities that prohibit their law enforcement authorities from collecting information on a person's immigration status or that have policies restricting the disclosure of this information to other governmental entities.

Many cities, including New York, have made the reasonable determination that they will not question victims of crime or witnesses to a crime about their immigration status. They believe it is counterproductive to make them afraid to cooperate with law enforcement.

But this bill says that we in Congress know better, and, in the name of protecting public safety, we will deny such cities the funds that they need to protect the public safety.

Many cities think that their communities are safer when a victim of domestic violence feels comfortable asking the police for protection from their abuser without fear of deportation.

They believe that witnesses to a murder ought to step forward and assist law enforcement in tracking down the perpetrator without fear that they will face consequences of their own if they step forward.

They think that good policing depends on building trust with their residents and that striking fear among immigrants that they may be deported if they report a crime makes everyone less safe.

Punishing residents of cities whose officials have made such decisions is both unfair and unwise. New York City alone could lose $57 million under this legislation.

This would not only punish the public officials who set these policies and the undocumented residents in their

communities, but it would punish all innocent people who depend on these Federal resources to protect public safety.

My heart is with the Steinle family, and we all share their outrage at Kate's senseless murder. But this bill and other attempts to punish so-called sanctuary cities would do nothing to address the issues that might have prevented her death.

Instead of taking positive steps to improve communication between Federal, State, and local authorities, this bill simply demonizes immigrants and perpetuates the myth that they are more prone to commit a crime than is the native-born population.

This legislation might fit comfortably in Donald Trump's campaign platform, but it has no business on the House floor.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I just want to make clear that the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee, is wrong about this bill. He says it only prohibits States and localities from adopting policies about not communicating with ICE. This is not true.

The bill also prohibits State and local law enforcement agencies from adopting policies directing their officers not to collect information about immigration status for the general public.

Any individual, the bill says. So it doesn't state that State and local police must gather immigration status information for the Federal Government.

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

□ 1445

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say again, nothing in the bill requires any officer to ask any question of any victim of crimes about their immigration status. All it does is prohibit cities and counties from ordering their officers to not communicate with ICE or to gather the information status of individuals.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this bill coming to the floor.

I hear this discussion, and it seems to me there is a consistent theme that the people on the other side of the aisle are opposed to bringing leverage to political subdivisions to bring about law enforcement. They assert that nothing in this bill could have prevented the tragic murder of Kate Steinle.

I would suggest that if we had no sanctuary jurisdictions in America, there is a lot greater chance that his deportation would have stuck; and if we had a President of the United States who worked to get our law enforcement officers to coordinate at each level of our political subdivisions rather than litigate when they do mirror Federal law, likely we would have had a chance to prevent not only her tragic death but that of thousands and thousands of others.

I support this bill. It is encompassed within an amendment that I brought to the floor here on June 3 that passed with 227 votes. I congratulate DUNCAN HUNTER for his persistence on this legislation that is 6 years long. I am grateful to be working on an immigration issue with the second generation of Hunters.

I see there is much more enforcement that is ahead of us, but this is a step, and it is a step that helps us find out are people for a thread of enforcement and bringing some leverage to try to bring the political subdivisions in line rather than having them flout the law, which they have consistently done, and it has grown dramatically under the Obama administration.

I would add that there is much more that I would like to do, much more to do. I would like to move Kate's Law. MATT SALMON has brought some of that. I would like to make it incremental so it goes from a 5-year mandatory to a 10-year mandatory on second offense and move it up the line. I would like to make E-Verify mandatory. I would like to pass the New IDEA Act so the IRS can help enforce this. I would like to build a fence, a wall, and a fence, Madam Speaker, and I would like to repass the border bill that we did last summer. There are a number of good things.

By the way, we need to make detainers mandatory, and we need to tighten up the loophole language. All of that we have a chance to do after Labor Day. Today we need to do what we can do, and that is pass this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this misguided legislation offered under the false pretense that it has something to do with the tragic murder of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco. Make no mistake, Miss Steinle's killer should not have been on the streets. We must get to the bottom of the official misjudgment and negligence and the bureaucratic breakdown that led to this tragedy.

As the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations, I take a backseat to no one when it comes to deporting dangerous criminal aliens who pose a threat to public safety. But we also need to be very clear about this: this tragedy has nothing to do with so-called sanctuary cities.

The bill before us would punish some of the most vulnerable cities high on the UASI list—places like San Francisco, New York, Miami, Chicago—punish them for exercising their lawful discretion in dealing with noncriminals or those with minor violations. They do this in order to protect the public and enforce the law, which requires trust and cooperation with immigrant communities. To scapegoat entire cities and make law enforcement less effective through this bill is simply inexcusable.

I urge its defeat.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to the gentleman from North Carolina, this bill has everything to do with what happened in San Francisco. The tragic murder of Kate Steinle was because the city of San Francisco was not following the law and contacting the immigration service and doing things to make sure that he was deported. Instead, they released him back onto their streets.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, in support of American families.

This week, we have heard powerful and heartbreaking stories from families who have lost a loved one at the hands of an illegal immigrant. Oftentimes, these individuals were able to operate freely because of the sanctuary policies of certain U.S. cities, policies that ignore Federal immigration law.

It is time this Congress put the lives and welfare of American citizens and legal residents first. It is time to protect the innocent. This means not another Kate, Josh, Dennis, Danny, Grant, and countless others. It is time to penalize cities that willfully ignore Federal law to the detriment of citizens and legal residents.

I encourage my fellow Members to read the testimony from this week's Senate hearing. Read about the lives lost, the brutality of the crimes, the lack of remorse by the perpetrators, and the heartbreak of the families. Today we have a choice: protect fellow Americans or give sanctuary to criminal aliens.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ), an excellent member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, just a few weeks into his campaign and Donald Trump has a bill on the floor of the House. That is better than some of the Senators he is running against. Donald Trump announces his campaign, saying Mexican immigrants are mostly murderers, drug dealers, and rapists. What is the response from the Republican Party? Do they denounce him? No, they only denounce people when they go after war heroes who ran for President. I denounce him for that, too.

Some tried to distance themselves from his comments. Okay. But here we are on the floor of the House passing a bill to jump on the Trump bandwagon, cynically exploiting a family's tragedy in San Francisco to score political points.

I have been very clear from day one, despite efforts to spear me by hard-line advocates, that the person, this Lopez-Sanchez, who pulled the trigger in San Francisco should have been deported and never turned over. I have no sympathy for him. I have said it on this floor, and I will say it again today: murderers should rot in hell.

The breakdown by the Federal Government—the Federal Government—to deport a known criminal, as they have done before, to keep them in jail, is what led to an American woman losing her life. She was just about the age of my daughters when she was killed. A tragedy, and a preventable tragedy, if the Federal Government had done what it is supposed to do, and preventable if this Congress had done what it was supposed to do and address immigration years ago, as my side of the aisle has been pleading for you to do.

But this Republican proposal is not a serious attempt at fixing the problem. Instead of piecemeal measures aimed at maximizing deportation, the long overdue solution is for Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform that combines smart enforcement at the border and in the interior with a clear plan for reducing the size of the undocumented population in America.

We do this by having a modern visa system so people can come with visas and background checks, not with smugglers or overstaying visas and just blending in. We do this by telling millions of people who have never committed crimes: Come forward; admit you are here illegally; go through a background check; and work your way to the right side of the law. Get the millions of immigrants inside the system and on the books so they no longer need to worry about their local police working with or without the deportation system.

If you get millions and millions of immigrants inside the law, then the ones who are criminals can't qualify to get inside the law. They will stick out like sore thumbs, not blend in to our communities across America and cause havoc, as they did in San Francisco.

But this is very specifically the approach the Republican majority refused to touch with a 10-foot pole because they see demagogues like Donald Trump.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. But this approach of bringing millions and millions of immigrants inside the law so that we can get after the criminals that stick out like sore thumbs outside of the law, this approach is what has been the approach that the Republican majority refuses to touch with a 10-foot pole because they see demagogues like Donald Trump firing up frustrated voters and want to take the easy way out.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague DUNCAN HUNTER for working with me in crafting this important piece of legislation. As the coauthor of this bill, I am very proud to see the House taking action on this front. I also want to thank leadership for bringing this bill to the floor.

We are hearing some strange rhetoric here today, especially from the other side of the aisle. I hear about vulnerable cities. How about vulnerable taxpaying Americans? I hear about sanctuary for thugs like the one that killed Kate Steinle. Shouldn't our cities be a sanctuary for law-abiding American citizens who have a right to walk on safe streets?

Make no mistake, this is a very, very important bill. From 2010 to 2014, the number 121 should stick in everybody's minds; 121 illegal immigrants with lengthy criminal records went on to commit murder after they were let out to do their heinous crimes.

That is why I was so appalled to hear one of my colleagues from across the aisle call the murder of American citizens like Kate Steinle and my constituent, Grant Ronnebeck, a little thing. Such disgusting remarks and flagrant disregard for life, especially the lives of those that we claim to represent, I find repulsive. In fact, such callous remarks only serve to highlight the fact that it is time for the majority of Americans who want to see government fulfill its most basic constitutional duties, protecting its borders and its citizens, stand up and take America back. It is time to stand up and be heard and demand that our government fulfill these most basic duties.

These sanctuary cities that refuse to uphold the law and openly broadcast the fact that they are flouting the law make our country less safe and only serve to perpetuate tragedies like the one that we saw in San Francisco. Not only are these supposed sanctuary cities ignoring the law, but they are broadcasting the fact to illegal immigrant felons like Kate Steinle's murderer, a seven-time felon who flat out admitted one of the reasons that he chose to stay in San Francisco—in fact, the predominant reason he chose to stay—was because he knew that they would protect him.

Well, who is going to protect law-abiding Americans? When will American cities be sanctuaries for Americans and not for illegal felons?

Unfortunately, these sanctuary cities are not being held accountable by this administration, which has demonstrated time and time again it has no interest in securing the border or upholding existing immigration law. With this in mind, I think that we have a responsibility to stand up and do what is right. This sanctuary cities policy and fixing it so that they have to abide by the laws that we pass here in Congress to protect our borders and protect our citizens has to be adhered to. It is just common sense.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to Representative LOFGREN and ask unanimous consent that she be permitted to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Madam Speaker, I would like to bring the perspective of my community, the community I have the honor of representing in Congress, El Paso, Texas, to bear in this discussion.

El Paso is the safest community with an over 500,000 population in the United States today, and it has been for the last 4 years in a row. That is, some people think, despite the fact that it is connected to Ciudad Juarez at the U.S.-Mexico border and despite the fact that it has a large number of immigrants in the community. I say, and the people who live in that community agree with me, that it is, in large part, because of immigrants who come to participate and contribute to the American Dream.

□ 1500

On issues and matters of law enforcement, I tend to defer to the experts. Big city police chiefs and county sheriffs, like the sheriff in El Paso, Texas, say for them to prevent crime and solve crimes, it is necessary to be able to work with everyone in the community without fear that they are going to be enforcing Federal law enforcement mandates to the exclusion of the public safety of the people that I have the honor of representing.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this proposal, a solution in search of a problem.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say, yet again, nothing in this bill requires any officer to ask any question of any victims of crime about their immigration status. All it does is prohibit cities and counties from ordering their officers not to communicate with ICE or to gather information status about individuals.

It is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for so consistently working on this issue of how we deal with the criminal illegal alien population and also with the sanctuary cities.

I thank Mr. HUNTER for the work that he has done on this bill. I chuckled when Congressman KING and the gentleman from Iowa mentioned the second generation of Hunters because, yes, we do know that his father was very involved in this issue and focusing on making certain that we keep our cities safe.

As we have this debate and as we look at these sanctuary city policies that certain counties and cities and State have exercised, we have come to realize that through the years, every State has become a border State and every town a border town because of the criminal illegal alien population that will gravitate to these sanctuary cities.

Los Angeles was the first sanctuary city in 1979. We hear people say, Oh, this is an issue that has been around for a long time. Mr. Speaker, that does not mean you do not address the issue. It means you solve the problem; you bring forward solutions, and that is what we are doing here today.

The U.S. Sentencing Commission recently released some data that I think is instructive to this debate. Illegal aliens accounted for almost 75 percent of Federal sentencing for drug possession and made up more than a third of all Federal sentences in 2014. That is why we are dealing with this issue.

Our constituents are saying, You need to put this on a front burner and deal with this issue. That is what we are doing here. Look at the State of Texas. I just recently read the stats from them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. In Texas, the department of public safety released a report that, between 2008 and 2014, foreign aliens committed over 600,000 crimes and almost 3,000 murders in the State of Texas. That is the reason that we come here to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the crime rate for illegal aliens in this country should be zero. It should be zero because it should not be tolerated.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The man who killed Kathryn Steinle should be punished to the fullest extent of the law. Perhaps more importantly, the officials who released the person who killed her—released this man from custody—dropped the ball, they should be held accountable.

This bill punishes the police in my city of Los Angeles, the police in the city of Knoxville, and the police in Manchester, New Hampshire. It punishes police that had nothing to do with the crime that occurred in San Francisco. It takes away money from the police departments in Los Angeles, in Knoxville, and Manchester, when we need to put people and police on the street to protect all of us.

This would deprive our cities of monies we have earned because we paid our taxes. Why? It is because the proponents of this bill say that our cities are violating the law. If we are violating the law, name the law we are violating. We are not violating any law. You just don't like the policy.

Don't take the Donald Trump bait. Don't punish others for the crimes of someone else. In our country, you go after the person who is criminally liable; you go after that individual and lock them up forever, but don't tell the police in Los Angeles, Manchester, or in Knoxville, Tennessee, or other cities that are trying to have a working relationship between their police and growing immigrant communities that they won't be able to collaborate so we can go after the criminals—because that is what you are doing.

You are taking money away from L.A., even though this crime did not happen in my city, and you are telling my police department and the men and women in uniform in L.A. that they will have fewer officers by their side because you are going to take money away because you don't like that some guy committed a criminal act. He killed someone; he should be punished for it, but we had nothing to do with it. Go after the folks that are accountable.

This is not the way we do justice in America, and it is wrong. It is wrong for you to tell all these communities who have a working relationship between their police officers and their growing immigrant communities that they are now going to lose funds to hire more police officers. That is the wrong way to do it.

That is the Donald Trump bait. Don't take it. Let's vote this down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that their remarks must be directed to the Chair.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman from California to tell him that the law that sanctuary cities are violating is title 8, section 1373 of the United States Code, communication between government agencies and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The failure to do that has resulted in 8,000 criminal aliens being released onto our streets just last year by sanctuary cities. Those 8,000 criminal aliens have since then already committed nearly 1,900 additional crimes. This is about not just San Francisco, but other States as well.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act because we have got to stop the madness of not enforcing our laws.

In the last weeks, we have seen coverage of two terrible murders that occurred because our laws went unenforced. My thoughts, prayers, and condolences go out to the families of the victims. Sadly, these tragedies are but a representation of a larger, deeper, and more troubling problem.

While I wish today we were also considering legislation by Mr. GOWDY to address the administration's abysmal lack of respect for our immigration laws, Chairman MCCAUL's bill to secure the borders, or Chairman LAMAR SMITH's bill to implement E-Verify to stop businesses from exploiting undocumented workers, this bill is a step in the right direction. It will stop the American people from subsidizing local law enforcement departments that refuse to do their jobs and enforce the law.

Let's take the emotion out of this. Let's take it out of the immigration and border security issue, which are emotionally charged. This is a fiscally responsible bill. If we were spending money for a defense contractor to develop a new weapons system and they weren't developing that weapons system, we would take the money back.

Well, here we are, giving money to law enforcement to work with ICE to deal with criminal aliens, and they are not doing it. Of course, we have got to take the money back. It would be foolish to do anything else.

Mr. Speaker, this horrible loss of life that we have seen is a result of the negligence and complete lack of respect for the rule of law that this administration and the mayors of sanctuary cities took an oath to uphold. It is appalling. Today, we are going to be able to deal with one part of that problem, and I am going to encourage all of my colleagues to vote with me to support H.R. 3009 and put our Nation back on the path to sanity.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 9¾ remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, we have only one additional speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Community trust policies result in more efficient policing. When State and local law enforcement agencies promote community trust policies, public safety is increased.

The current New York police commissioner and former chief of police in Los Angeles, William Bratton, said: ''When officers can speak freely with victims and witnesses, it goes a long way towards making every American neighborhood much safer.''

Here is a case study in New Haven, Connecticut. According to a 2010 report by the Police Executive Research Forum, New Haven, Connecticut, developed a community trust policy in which New Haven police assured immigrant communities that the police department's goals were to address crime and to make the streets safer.

They encouraged people to report crime and to cooperate, regardless of their immigration status. The city law prohibited immigration status inquiries of crime victims, witnesses, or others who approached police for assistance.

I would note that the bill before us would prohibit this policy, this law that New Haven adopted. The result of New Haven's policy and their other community trust policies were stronger ties between law enforcement and the immigrant community. Over the next several years, New Haven experienced a 46 percent decrease in murders and a 13 percent decrease in rape incidences. This policy, which this bill would prohibit, worked.

This was a very important result. After learning of it, the United States Conference of Mayors, a group that most of us trust pretty much, did a survey of cities around the United States who adopted the same trust policies.

They include Alameda, California; Augusta, Georgia; New Brunswick, New Jersey; and a whole host of others. They found that all of these cities also reported the same kind of reduction in crime after they adopted these policies. Adopting these policies is an important component of keeping communities safe, and this bill would prohibit that. It would prohibit it.

Now, I understand the outrage over Mr. Lopez-Sanchez. In fact, I share it. Obviously, he has been accused of murder. Even when we have a situation like this, we have to have a trial, but I believe personally that he is guilty, based on all the evidence.

I believe he should not have been out on that street in San Francisco. If you look at his record—and I will go through it a little bit—it actually makes certain points. I have heard people say, Well, we have got open borders, and that is why he was here.

In fact, that is not the case. This individual attempted to enter the United States repeatedly, and he was caught by the Border Patrol, just as they are supposed to do their job.

What happened then is he was deported repeatedly in the nineties, and then they started prosecuting him for felony reentry after removal. He served 16 years in Federal prison for the felony of reentering after removal.

Our laws went after him. He should not have been released in San Francisco, but I think some of what we need to do is see what policies would have kept him off that street, and I will deal with those later.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I took a look at the statute, the code section that the chairman cited as the authority that a law has been violated by San Francisco.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman will direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I will direct my remarks to the Chair.

May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if any of my time has been consumed as a result of the Chair's interruptions of my remarks?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It has not.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee made a statement that the law that had been violated by San Francisco, and the law that would be violated by places like Los Angeles that would cause this legislation to have my community of Los Angeles lose money for its police officers was a particular section in the code.

□ 1515

I have read the code. I am looking it up right now. That section relates to information being provided about the immigration status of an individual. We are not talking about the immigration status of an individual. We all knew that this individual was not documented. We knew his status. The information that was not conveyed in this particular case is that the individual is going to be released from custody. This bill doesn't change that.

There was no law violated by the city of San Francisco. Certainly, my city of Los Angeles didn't violate any law. The city of Knoxville, Tennessee, didn't violate any law. The city of Manchester, New Hampshire didn't violate any law. And I could name to you any number of other cities and towns in America who are trying to establish working relationships with their immigrant community who did not violate any law. But this bill would punish all those cities and towns simply because this legislation wishes to extract punishment for any city that has established a policy working with its immigrant community.

There is no State or city law in America that supersedes Federal law. Federal law is the law of the land. The chairman knows that. We all know that. And so, to pretend that somehow cities are violating Federal law is a farce. It is the sort of attack that Donald Trump is using right now as he goes out and campaigns for President.

We should not fall for that, and we should not deny our police departments funding because of a policy that some people don't like.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

I just want to close by posing some of the questions that this bill does not deal with and that I think should command our attention.

In this case, we had an individual who had a criminal record. He had attempted to enter the United States, was apprehended, deported, was prosecuted and convicted for illegal entry after removal. After serving over 4 years for the last felony prosecution, he was ready to be deported, but they found, even though he had been deported many times before with an outstanding bench warrant from 1995 where the underlying offense was marijuana possession, all of a sudden, this year, he was sent to San Francisco.

I think one of the questions we need to ask is: What is the process of outstanding warrants and its interface with the Bureau of Prisons when someone really should be deported?

Apparently, there was no communication between the Federal Government and the prosecuting attorney in San Francisco. He was sent to, apparently, San Francisco, but the district attorney did not see this matter until he was already in custody.

Now, I don't fault the district attorney for not prosecuting on a 20-year-old marijuana possession case. Where would you find the witnesses? And, in fact, in California today, marijuana possession is an infraction, not a misdemeanor. But the point is he should never have been in San Francisco to begin with.

So I think we need to take a look at the processes that we have to make sure that we don't have this kind of situation again. Clearly, he should not have been released when the district attorney declined to prosecute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I represent many small communities in California that have a lot of gang violence. It is mostly Hispanic young men against Hispanic young men. They are not undocumented. They are actually second-generation gangs, a lot of killings. In fact, it is labeled the murder capital of the world, or in the United States.

What the community has been trying to do is work out what we call community policing, where you really trust the cops. What happens is they asked them to be a sanctuary city, because what the local cops didn't like about the INS and la migra coming in is that they would just come in and do raids and they would round up innocent people, and there was just lots of confusion. Our office would get involved trying to trace people down, where are they, and all these things.

What the sanctuary city says is, look, let's not just turn over the name to everybody we stop on an infraction to the Federal cop. Let them come down and do what they call jail checks. Well, they don't want to do jail checks. That is not fun and fancy.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FARR. The problem is that this community policing, the problem is this bill just busts all that, all the trust that has been built.

As Congresswoman LOFGREN said, the San Francisco deal was a big screwup between law enforcement. But don't penalize all these other cities that are doing a lot of wonderful things to do community policing and lead to confidence in law enforcement, not disconfidence.

You are going to create more problems than you ever imagined, like people not wanting to report crimes, not wanting to talk to cops, and you are just using the heavy hand of government to bust good community relations.

I just think this is the wrong way to do it. Let's let this thing air out and address the problems that Congresswoman LOFGREN talked about and not adopt this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to both gentlemen from California.

First, with regard to Mr. BECERRA, the fact of the matter is that title 8 of the United States Code, section 1373, related to communication between government agencies and Immigration and Naturalization Service, is an important statute, and sanctuary cities violate that statute when they pass ordinances that prohibit—prohibit—their law enforcement officers from communicating with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

This yields situations like what occurred in San Francisco, because the sheriff there has a policy saying they could not communicate with the INS. Already, one San Francisco supervisor has called upon the city to change the policy so that they will communicate.

This bill, which cuts off funds to cities that have provisions that contradict and violate the United States law does the same thing by a different route, and it will save many lives in the future if local law enforcement will communicate with the INS.

Now, to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), I just want to repeat again what I have said several times here.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

There is nothing in this bill that requires any officer to ask any question of any victims of crimes about their immigration status or to reveal that information to the INS.

So I would urge folks to look at what this bill, very straightforward, simple bill says. Federal law governs immigration policy, and local governments shouldn't have hundreds of different immigration policies of their own.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I would just close by saying that we have been asked by law enforcement agencies, by domestic violence advocacy groups, by the faith community not to adopt this bill. I know we can come together to make a safer community. This bill is not the answer, and I urge Members to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), the chairman of the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee, to close our debate.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his leadership on this and so many other issues of significance on the Judiciary Committee. His steady hand and brilliant legal mind are without equal on our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the family of Kate Steinle for the grace that they have shown during this time of unspeakable grief.

Burying a child, Mr. Speaker, is what each of us who has ever been called Mom or Dad fears the most. After Trayvon Martin was killed, the President said, ''That could have been my son,'' Mr. Speaker.

And when I see a picture of a beautiful Kate Steinle smiling, that could have been any of our daughters. And it still can be, because what happened to her, Mr. Speaker, can and will happen again if we do not get serious about enforcing the law.

Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez, Mr. Speaker, had a quarter century's worth of lawlessness. Dating back to 1991, he committed local, State, and Federal crimes in five separate States, I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker. He was deported five times, and each time had so little regard for the law of this country that he reentered that border that we are supposed to have functional control over.

His procedural history, Mr. Speaker, is every bit as disturbing. In May of 2011, this defendant was convicted and sentenced to 46 months imprisonment for illegal reentry again. At the conclusion of that sentence, he was released from the Bureau of Prisons to a known sanctuary jurisdiction for the ostensible prosecution of an old drug case.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, San Francisco did not prosecute that old drug case. They dismissed it, which surprises exactly no one, and then they released this defendant.

They did not return him to the Bureau of Prisons. They did not return him to Federal probation. They did not honor the detainer that had been placed by ICE. They released him, who was not supposed to be in the country in the first place, with this horrific criminal history. They released him so he would be free to walk around and shoot someone's daughter, which is exactly what he did.

Mr. Speaker, we are given a litany of excuses. I have heard them this morning, Mr. Speaker, for policies like this. We are told that we need policies like the one in San Francisco so people will cooperate with law enforcement.

I want you, Mr. Speaker, to consider just how utterly illogical that comment is. We need to release known criminals back into society so society will help us catch known criminals. How absurd is that, that we are going to release people that should be deported, that are recidivist felons, so other people will help us catch those who should be deported and are recidivist felons?

For almost 5 years, Mr. Speaker, I have worked alongside Chairman GOODLATTE, and I have heard a litany of phrases, with almost catatonic frequency, as if repeating something enough will make it true—phrases, Mr. Speaker, like ''functional control over the border''—but I have yet to hear how somebody can reenter five times if you have functional control over the border.

I have heard we need citizenship for 11 million undocumented aspiring Americans, as if 11 million of any category can pass a background check.

I have heard arguments against empowering State and local law enforcement to assist in the enforcement of our immigration laws, Mr. Speaker.

Now, stop and think. We trust them to do murder cases, sex assault cases, kidnapping cases, narcotics trafficking. You even trust them to provide security, Mr. Speaker, at their own functions back in the district. But when it comes to immigration law, oh, no. No, sir. We don't trust you to enforce immigration law. Everything else, including our own security both here in Washington and back in the district, but God forbid we trust State and local cops to help us with immigration law.

The President says we need immigration reform so folks will, to use his words, Mr. Speaker, come forward, get on the books, get right with the law.

I want you to ask yourself, what in Mr. Lopez-Sanchez' background makes you think he would ever come forward? And why in the hell does he need to be on the books? He is in the Bureau of Prisons. You don't need him on the books. He is in the Bureau of Prisons. And you had him, and you let him go.

□ 1530

Which brings me to my favorite phrase, Mr. Speaker, ''sanctuary cities.'' It has almost a Utopian sound to it, doesn't it?

Well, as the Speaker knows, the definition of a ''sanctuary'' is a place of refuge or safety. And my question for folks in San Francisco and my colleagues who support this policy is: A refuge for whom? A sanctuary for whom? A refuge for Kate Steinle? A sanctuary for Kate Steinle? A refuge for a convicted felon with a 25-year-long criminal history?

So the phrase sounds benign, but it was no sanctuary for her. It may have been for him, but it sure as hell wasn't for her.

Mr. Speaker, my message to San Francisco would be simple: You won't honor our detainers, we won't honor your warrants. If detainers are too much trouble for you to handle, perhaps Federal money will be too much trouble for you to handle, too. If you can't honor our detainers, you are not going to get any more money.

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

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act. I am completely appalled by the tragic and senseless death of

Kathryn Steinle and those responsible should be held fully accountable. Dangerous criminals, including those who are in the United States illegally, should not ever be released into the community.

However, H.R. 3009 does not address this problem. In fact, if H.R. 3009 becomes law it will only make it more difficult for law enforcement agencies to prevent future tragedies like this one. The system failed to catch this felon, not because of our nation's immigration policy, but because there was a breakdown in communication between agencies. The suspect, who has confessed to the shooting, has seven prior felony convictions, and has been deported five times, was apprehended by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and turned over to the custody of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department at its request on an outstanding drug warrant. ICE issued a detainer, requesting to be notified before the suspect's release. Unfortunately, the suspect was released back onto the streets after the prosecutor declined to pursue the drug charges.

This individual should never have been released from the custody of law enforcement, and the events that followed reflect a systemic failure on the part of local law enforcement and prosecutors. And while I believe that Congress has a moral responsibility to prevent future tragedies like this from occurring in the future, this legislation falls far short in addressing any of the failings in our immigration system that led to it. If enacted, H.R. 3009 would not have required local law enforcement to certify that the suspect would be prosecuted before taking custody of him. Nor would it have required the Bureau of Prisons or ICE to consult with local law enforcement or prosecutors to determine whether justice would be better served by having the suspect deported rather than being transferred to face an unlikely prosecution for a 20-year-old drug possession charge.

H.R. 3009 purports to address this tragedy by stripping local law enforcement agencies of necessary federal funding to fulfill its responsibilities to the public. More specifically, the legislation would strip funding for state criminal alien assistance programs. Instead of aiding local law enforcement, this bill would cripple the efforts of these agencies to support federal law enforcement. In a naked attempt to score political points, this legislation deliberately ignores and neglects the roots of the tragedy. As such, a wide coalition of groups oppose H.R. 3009, including the Major County Sherriff's Association, the National Fraternal Order of Police, the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, AFL–CIO, AFSCME, ACLU, LULAC, and LCCHR. While I remain committed to substantive and constructive reform of our nation's immigration system, this legislation falls far short of what is necessary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary and on Homeland Security, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3009, the so-called ''Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act.''

I oppose this legislation because it undermines public safety, fails to address needed immigration reform, promotes a deportation-only approach, and will not achieve the Republican leadership's stated purpose in bringing the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in H.R. 3009 would have prevented the tragic killing of an innocent young woman in San Francisco.

Instead, this bill is being rushed to the floor for the sole purpose of exploiting that tragedy by scapegoating immigrants and undocumented persons, holding them responsible for the actions of one person, and avoiding action on comprehensive immigration reform.

It is undisputable that victims of murder deserve justice.

H.R. 3009 the ''Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act'' would push undocumented immigrants further into the shadows and create and an environment with heightened threats to our safety and ability to seek justice.

Stripping state and local law enforcement agencies of key funding and resources impedes their ability to combat crime and protect our communities.

Surely, House Republicans do not want to tie the hands of law enforcement when it comes to preventing and investigating criminal acts.

Rather than taking positive steps to promote better cooperation and communication between Federal, State and local authorities, where appropriate, H.R. 3009 punishes State and local law enforcement agencies that prioritize public safety and community policing over immigration enforcement efforts.

Nearly every major law enforcement association in the country, from the Major Cities Chiefs Associations, the Major Counties Sheriffs Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, opposes H.R. 3009 and the host of other similar and related proposals set forth by Republicans.

H.R. 3009 simply spreads the myth that all immigrants are criminals and threats to the public—despite decades of research that demonstrate the fact that immigrants are less likely to commit serious crimes than native-born persons and are less likely to end up in prison.

In fact, thousands immigrant populations throughout the country have resided within our country for decades as law-abiding, tax-paying, hard-working model persons who contribute to our nation's economy and culture of diversity and inclusiveness.

Additionally, thousands of immigrant populations are actually here seeking safety and refuge because they too are victims of horrific abuse, torture and massacre that plagues their native countries.

Yet, once again we are discussing measures that simply seek to enhance and promote mass criminalization, racial profiling and discrimination, and deportation of immigrants.

In just this past year, House Republicans have voted to:

1. Deport hundreds of thousands of Dreamers who came to the country as children and are American in all but name;

2. Deport millions of parents of US citizens who are playing by the rules, contributing to their communities and working to support their families; and

3. Deport without due process tens of thousands of unaccompanied children who came to the US fleeing persecution, extreme violence and trafficking.

Just this past Friday, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 1st Circuit issued an opinion dismissing immunity claims by ICE Agents who unlawfully detained an American citizen.

A U.S. citizen who was born in Guatemala and has resided here since the 1980s and was naturalized in 1995, was subjected to multiple ICE detainers in violation of her Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights.

On at least two occasions the plaintiff was detained by ICE and questioned about her citizenship—despite her repeated claims and assertion of her legal status.

No efforts were made to confirm or investigate prior to her detention by ICE which allowed her to be booked, strip-searched and held in jail for up to 48-hours.

''Detain first, question later'' practices and policies should not be supported—yet H.R. 3009 penalizes law enforcement for refusing to gather information about one's citizenship or immigration status where such actions are unwarranted.

President Obama issued a statement today advising that H.R. 3009 will get vetoed if presented to him for signature.

It cannot be said that immigration reform is being taken seriously, when proposals are rushed and fail to go through regular order.

Serious reform requires bringing to the floor for debate a comprehensive immigration bill that reforms our broken immigration system by making it fairer and more humane, and secures our Northern, Southern, and maritime borders and our ports.

The House Homeland Security Committee proved this can be done last year when it reported out of committee on a unanimous vote, H.R. 1417, the Border Security Results Act of 2014.

Instead of wasting time on legislation that is designed to attract publicity rather than have any realistic chance of becoming law, we should be bringing to the floor for debate legislation that will address the real problems and challenges facing the American people.

Instead of squandering valuable floor time on this irresponsible legislation, the House should be allowed to work its will on issues that matter, like raising the minimum wage, protecting the right to vote of all Americans, and passing criminal justice reform that builds trust and respect between law enforcement agencies and the communities they are to protect and serve.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3009, the so-called ''Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act.''

This misguided legislation is purportedly a response to the heartbreaking and tragic shooting of Kathryn Steinle earlier this month. However, the reality is that this legislation cynically uses this isolated incident to scapegoat all undocumented immigrants and undermine community policing. Specifically, H.R. 3009 would withhold critical funding for State and local law enforcement agencies as well as victims of crimes unless these jurisdictions bear the burden of enforcing Federal immigration statutes.

If passed, this bill would tie the hands of local law enforcement agencies who are working to promote safety and build community trust. Requiring local police to enforce Federal immigration laws often times dissuades undocumented individuals from reporting crimes, offering testimony, and serving as witnesses in court proceedings. For example, the evidence shows that victims of domestic violence will be afraid to report these crimes to police for fear of deportation. A survey conducted by the National Domestic Violence Hotline in 2013 found that nearly 50-percent of foreign born individuals were afraid to seek help because of their

immigrant status. As Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson testified earlier this month, ''mandating through legislation the conduct of sheriffs and police chiefs'' is not the way to go.

Instead of pushing these failed policies, we need to come together and pass bipartisan legislation to address our broken immigration system. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to HR 3009. First and foremost, my heartfelt sympathies go out to the Steinle family for the loss of their daughter, Kate. There is no question that her death is tragic and unjust.

However, this bill neither avenges her death nor effectively prevents similar tragedies from happening in the future. Absent comprehensive immigration reform, we are forcing local police to act as federal immigration officials. That is wrong, wrong, wrong.

I represent one of the largest agriculture districts in CA that is dependent on migrant workers who toil the fields to feed our nation. We also have a significant gang violence problem in ''the Salad Bowl of the World'', yet, I am not aware that any of our local law enforcement officials think this bill is a good idea.

In some of the harshest neighborhoods, our local law enforcement officials have established satellite facilities and programs for the kids in the neighborhood that provide alternatives to joining gangs. This type of 21st Century Policing encourages community partnerships, problem-solving and organizational transformation.

Mr. Speaker, we have already seen the willingness of the Republicans to shut down the government over immigration issues by failing to fund the Department of Homeland Security for 4 months. While compromising the safety of our communities and the effectiveness of our local police might be good for Donald Trump, it is bad for America.

I urge a no vote.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the recent killing of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco is a tragedy, and my thoughts are with her family during this very difficult time.

Unfortunately, the Majority has chosen to politicize this tragedy by bringing this misguided and unacceptable bill to the floor.

H.R. 3009 would withhold Department of Justice grants specifically targeted to enhance public safety, support community policing, and assist crime victims from states and law enforcement agencies that do not collect information regarding a person's immigration status.

We can and should ensure that serious criminals who are dangerous and enforcement priorities for ICE are not released from the custody of local law enforcement. However, it is misguided and counterproductive to force local law enforcement officers to inquire about a person's immigration status at any time and for any reason in order to be eligible to receive critical public safety funding.

It is also wrong and irresponsible that this bill misrepresents the immigrant community as one comprised entirely of criminals. In fact, decades of research show that immigrants are less likely to commit serious crimes than native-born persons.

Earlier this year, many Republicans insisted that our Homeland Security Appropriations bill include anti-immigrant riders, and threatened to shut down the Department of Homeland Security if they did not get their way. Sadly, H.R. 3009 is just more of the same from the Majority, who apparently think it is more important to incite hatred of our immigrant population for political purposes than it is to keep our communities safe and secure.

If we truly want to deal with our broken immigration system, we must pass comprehensive immigration reform that treats immigrants humanely, focuses on deporting those who threaten our safety and national security, and better secures our borders. Unfortunately, the House Majority has no interest in passing such reforms and instead chooses to rob local law enforcement of the money they need to keep our constituents safe from harm.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am opposed to it in its current form.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Jeffries moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3009 to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC.____. PROTECTING LOCAL COMMUNITIES FROM CUTS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The Attorney General may not reduce or eliminate, under this Act or the amendment made by this Act, any sums provided to a State (or a political subdivision of a State) if the Attorney General determines that such reduction or elimination would result in—

(1) an increase in the overall crime rate in that State or political subdivision, including an increase in domestic violence, sex trafficking, or crimes against children; or

(2) a decrease in the number of trained law enforcement officers in that State or political subdivision, including community police, that are available to protect the public.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

The murder of Kate Steinle in San Francisco was a national tragedy that certainly shocked the conscience of America. We must continue to mourn her passing. We must continue to stand behind her family.

We must continue to make sure that her killer is prosecuted to the full extent of the law, but we should not respond with irresponsible public policy.

Our Founders indicated that the House of Representatives is supposed to reflect the passions of the people, but the passions should be properly channeled into an appropriate legislative vehicle.

On December 14, 2012, 20 children were brutally gunned down in Sandy Hook Elementary School. More than 30,000 additional Americans have died as a result of gun violence since that fateful day. Mr. Speaker, 952 days have passed. This House has done nothing.

On June 27, 2013, the Senate passed a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, 52 Democrats, 14 Republicans, 2 Independents. That bill would have secured our borders. That bill would have reduced the deficit by more than $850 billion over 20 years. That bill would have required undocumented immigrants to learn English, pay back taxes, pass a criminal background check, and then get at the back of the line. Mr. Speaker, 757 days have passed. This House has done nothing.

Instead, we are here today considering a misguided legislative response to a terrible tragedy. That is why I offer this amendment, which will prevent the elimination or reduction of funds to State or local law enforcement organizations if the Attorney General determines that the elimination of funding would result in an overall increase in the crime rate, particularly with respect to domestic violence, sex trafficking, and crimes against children, or if it would result in a decrease in the number of trained law enforcement officers on American streets.

The COPS and Byrne-JAG programs are essential to public safety and should not be used as a blunt force weapon to carry out a reckless and irresponsible antiimmigrant agenda. That is why the National Fraternal Order of Police, the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, and the Major County Sheriffs' Association of America all oppose the underlying legislation.

In a letter dated July 15, the National Fraternal Order of Police expressed their ''strong opposition to any amendment or piece of legislation that would penalize law enforcement agencies by withholding Federal funding or resources from law enforcement assistance programs in an effort to coerce a policy change in so-called sanctuary cities.''

In offering this amendment, I stand with law enforcement. In offering this amendment, I stand with the Statue of Liberty that sits in New York Harbor with the inscription ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.''

In offering this amendment, I stand with the United States Constitution and the 10th Amendment limitation on the Federal Government's ability to commandeer State or local police authorities into the service of Federal areas of enforcement.

In offering this amendment, I stand with the Scripture in Matthew 25:35, where it says: I was hungry, and you gave me food. I was thirsty, and you gave me drink. I was a stranger, and you welcomed me.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit. It would give the discretion to the Attorney General of the United States and the ability to determine whether or not such reductions provided in this legislation would take place.

This is the same Attorney General of the United States who is new to the position, but has already indicated her unwillingness to enforce title VIII, section 1373, of the United States Code related to the requirement that cities and all other government agencies communicate with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act helps to address one of the main factors contributing to the collapse of immigration enforcement in the United States.

Hundreds of sanctuary cities are violating Federal law by prohibiting their law enforcement officers from sharing information with Federal immigration authorities to enable the removal of unlawful and criminal aliens.

This bill will finally establish penalties to persuade these jurisdictions to comply with longstanding Federal law.

Sanctuary cities present a clear and present danger to their citizens. In the first 8 months of 2014, they released 8,145 aliens who the Department of Homeland Security wanted to deport.

Very quickly, almost a quarter of these aliens were arrested again for new criminal offenses. Most recently, San Francisco's refusal to honor a DHS detainer resulted in the tragic death of Kate Steinle.

This is not an isolated incident. This is something that will continue again and again and again unless these cities start cooperating with law enforcement.

And, yes, there are many other things that need to be done to protect American citizens from unlawful criminal aliens besides this bill. Those should be brought to the floor as well.

But this bill represents an important first step in making rogue jurisdictions comply with Federal law and safeguard their communities. We will take further steps in the months ahead to ensure enforcement of immigration laws, but we have to start today.

Federal grants—and there are three categories of grants covered by this legislation—are not entitlements to the States. They are gratuities that Congress has chosen to give to the States.

The Supreme Court has held that Congress can place restrictions or conditions on the receipt of Federal funds to further policies that are aimed at protecting the general welfare.

I support these law enforcement grants, but the solution to potential loss of these funds is simple: eliminate the policies that violate Federal law, eliminate the policies that prohibit information sharing with the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, and they will receive this funding. They will also receive safer communities, communities that are sanctuaries for law-abiding citizens, not sanctuaries for criminals.

This legislation must be passed to protect American citizens and do right by them and do it in honor of people like Kate Steinle, who gave her life because of these bad policies.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit, support this legislation, 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 239, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—181

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

NAYS—239

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

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (UT)
Brady (PA)
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Collins (NY)
Denham
Hinojosa
Israel
Kaptur
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Schakowsky
Speier
Stewart

□ 1607

Messrs. CONAWAY, FINCHER, STIVERS, and JOHNSON of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. GABBARD and Mr. SHERMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—241

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

NOES—179

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

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (UT)
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Conyers
Hinojosa
Israel
Kaptur
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Speier
Stewart

□ 1619

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 466, I was unable to vote due to a malfunction of my voting card. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted yes on rollcall 466.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015, sponsored by Representative TODD YOUNG.

Last year Federal regulations burdened job creators with trillions of dollars in costs. This bill, commonly referred to as the REINS Act, will ensure that Congress has a say in whether

major rules should be imposed on the American people.

The House will also consider H.R. 1994, the VA Accountability Act, sponsored by Chairman JEFF MILLER.

Getting the best possible service to our Nation's veterans starts with having the best possible personnel in charge VA programs.

This critical bill will give the administration additional tools to turn things around at the VA and ensure veterans have the kind of care they deserve.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information with reference to the two bills that will be considered next week.

We are coming now to the end of the scheduled work period, and we will be going into the August break. We just passed a bill, Mr. Leader, which dealt with a tragedy—or purportedly dealt with a tragedy—that occurred in San Francisco.

Every Member of this House believes, I think, that a mistake was made by the sheriff in San Francisco in releasing this individual who had been convicted of numerous felonies.

We also believe, if we had passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill similar to the one the Senate passed in the last Congress, that this problem itself would not be solved—because we believe that the sheriff should not have released this individual irrespective of the status of immigration reform—but we believe this would go a long way towards enhancing the ability of both law enforcement and of communities to deal with the immigration issue as well as giving confidence to people of their status.

Does the gentleman believe that there is any possibility of a comprehensive immigration bill being considered in the next work period?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my friend for yielding.

What happened in San Francisco was not just a mistake. This individual had seven felonies. It is not miscommunication. Kate lost her life and should not had to have.

Sanctuary cities are made up of individuals who believe they can make their own law and disregard the law of the Federal Government.

I think today's bill was a good first start. I do look forward to continuing the conversations on both sides of the aisle on immigration reform, but I have nothing scheduled at this time.

Mr. HOYER. Just to make it clear, the mistake was the sheriff's. He should not have done what he did. It was a tragedy. We all agree on that.

Very frankly, we don't think that he was compelled to do so by the sanctuary law that San Francisco had in effect.

I will tell the majority leader that we had a difference of opinion in a previous bill, the Violence Against Women Act, where you did not include protection for immigrants when they came forward to law enforcement authorities and complained of domestic violence.

We had a disagreement on that, and the disagreement was that we thought they ought to be protected, which is why so many law enforcement officials opposed the bill that was brought forward.

I will tell you again, Mr. Leader, that we do not believe that the statute that was in San Francisco compelled or led to the actions of the sheriff in releasing a felon who had committed the numerous felonies and should not have been released. It was a tragedy.

Let me go on, Mr. Leader, to the appropriations process.

There are no appropriation bills listed on your schedule for next week. We have after next week some, I think, 16 legislative days left between now and the end of the fiscal year.

Again, for the next period that we are going to be back and in light of the fact that we know what it is going to be at least—and I will have some questions on some things that may be on, but we know what is scheduled for next week—does the gentleman believe that our Members ought to anticipate the further consideration of appropriation bills prior to the end of the fiscal year?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I mentioned last week, yes, it is our intention to get back to the appropriation process as soon as possible.

As the gentleman knows, we are halfway done. We should finish our job, but I will make sure to keep the Members updated on the appropriation bills as they are scheduled and continue to be considered.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader. I am pleased to hear that.

I know the Speaker observed—and I think he is probably right—that there will have to be a CR. In light of that, I would hope that the majority leader, in league with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, perhaps with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and with the Speaker, would initiate the conversations now in preparation so that we would not have a crisis on September 30, but would, in a logical and, hopefully, a cooperative way, have gotten to what action would be taken with respect to a CR. I would urge my friend to pursue those discussions.

I would be glad to participate with him in those discussions with others on our side who will be involved in that process—our ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, our ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, and our ranking member on the Budget Committee.

I yield to my friend if he wants to make a comment.

Mr. MCCARTHY. No.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman and I have had discussions about highways. We know that next week the highway authorization ends. We are planning on leaving here, if the schedule is kept, on Thursday of next week.

Will the gentleman tell me what he believes is the status of the highway bill?

I know the Senate is discussing a longer term highway bill. Neither the majority leader nor I are very enthusiastic about that bill as I have learned in my discussions with you.

Will you tell me what your plans are with respect to the highway bill so that we don't leave here without some sort of authorization having been passed?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1630

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his discussions with me regarding highways. Just last week, we passed a bipartisan bill that would ensure critical infrastructure projects continue throughout the year.

I know the Senate has their debate. Our bill goes to the end of the year with a long-term solution. The Senate currently is debating a bill that is not funded long term. I think the best bit of advice is to urge the Senate to accept our bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Lastly, as the gentleman knows, I have been very much involved with the authorization of the Export-Import Bank through the years. As the gentleman knows, Mr. Cantor and I worked together and came up with a bipartisan proposal in 2012 that passed this House overwhelmingly with approximately 140 Republicans and about 185 or more Democrats, so it passed overwhelmingly.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is any possibility of assuring that the majority of this House can work its will and the majority of the Senate—and I say that because MITCH MCCONNELL, the leader of the Senate, is quoted as saying the supporters of the Federal Export-Import Bank have the Senate votes to revive it and will get a chance to do so.

Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said, It looks to me like they have the votes—and I am requesting to give them the opportunity. MCCONNELL, who opposes the Bank, said he expects supporters to try to attach the reauthorization to a highway bill.

Assuming that we get a bill from the Senate with the Export-Import Bank attached to it, does the majority leader believe that we will have the opportunity—and I think the majority of the Members of the House would vote in favor of it—will have the opportunity to vote on the Export-Import Bank before we leave here on Thursday?

I yield to my friend

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank my friend for his weekly questions. I think you may have asked these questions actually more times than we repealed ObamaCare, but my answer remains the same.

Mr. HOYER. I could not possibly stand on this floor long enough to do that.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. My answer still remains the same to the gentleman. There is no action scheduled in the House on Ex-Im.

Mr. HOYER. I keep asking that question, and I keep getting the wrong answer. I will be faithful to asking that question.

I say that with humor, but the gentleman knows that I believe this is an extraordinarily serious issue. The gentleman knows I agree with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. BOEHNER, that we are losing jobs right now as a result of our failure to extend the authorization of the Export-Import Bank past June 30.

The gentleman knows I believe that 165,000 jobs are at risk. The Indian director of their export-import bank is quoted as saying in the paper, just the other day, that he believes they are going to pick up jobs and orders because of the failure of the Export-Import Bank to be reauthorized.

I think this is not something that is not real. It is a loss of jobs and a loss of competitive status for our country if we do not reauthorize this and do so as quickly as possible.

I will keep asking the question because I feel it is so very important to our country and to our competitiveness, but I appreciate the gentleman's faithfulness in his answer. I am hopeful that it will change.

Mr. MCCARTHY. We will keep repealing ObamaCare.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I didn't notice that ObamaCare had been repealed. I simply noticed the Supreme Court said it was a constitutional piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2015, TO MONDAY, JULY 27, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 27, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, it is painful to hear the words in the recently released video showing Planned Parenthood trafficking in body parts.

At one point, the doctor talks about a customer wanting ''lower extremities,'' that is legs in everyday language.

''I don't know what they are going to do with it. Maybe they want muscle,'' she says.

These are legs that will never run to a mom or a dad, never run to a brother or a sister, never run to a spouse, never run to protect another child.

It has been 42 years since the Supreme Court did what Justice White called an exercise of raw judicial power. Since then, we have seen more than 55 million abortions in this country; yet we are still shocked by what these videos show.

This is a teaching moment, Mr. Speaker. There is a lot of pain implicit in these videos, pain for kids, pain for moms, pain for dads and families. Perhaps these videos can become the moment where our Nation can begin to heal that pain.

Stopping taxpayer dollars flowing to organizations responsible for this horror is a good place to start that healing.

FALLEN HAYWARD POLICE DEPARTMENT SERGEANT SCOTT LUNGER

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that this House honor Sergeant Scott Lunger, 48 years old, who was murdered tragically yesterday as a Hayward police officer while on routine patrol.

His murder is a reminder that the work we call our police officers to do puts them and their lives in jeopardy every day, every stop, not knowing if it is going to be their last or if they are going to return home to see their families.

Sergeant Lunger leaves behind a wife, two daughters, a brother, family, and friends; but he died doing what he loved, his second career working as a police officer.

For 15 years, he did so to help people in the community. He served on the SWAT team and on the gang unit. He was described by his police chief as a warrior cop, an ethical police officer. He was described by others as that ideal officer, that go-to guy. A lieutenant said: He is the best cop and crimefighter I have ever seen.

The East Bay and Hayward community mourns the loss of Sergeant Scott Lunger. Long live the memory of Sergeant Scott Lunger. May God watch over his soul, our community, and his family.

HONORING DANIELLE GREEN

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize former Notre Dame basketball player and Army veteran, Danielle Green, who was recognized at last week's ESPYs ceremony with the Pat Tillman award.

The award is named after former NFL player Pat Tillman, who joined the Army Rangers following 9/11, served several tours in combat before he died in a friendly fire incident in Afghanistan in 2004. It recognizes an individual with a strong connection to sports who has served others in a way that echoes Pat's legacy.

Danielle Green could not be more deserving of this prestigious honor. While bravely serving her country in Iraq, she lost part of her left arm from a rocket-propelled grenade attack. Upon her return, Green earned the Purple Heart for injuries suffered in combat. She now works with returning veterans as a readjustment counselor in South Bend, Indiana.

Danielle's sacrifice to protect our freedom and her contributions to Indiana veterans deserves recognition. She is an inspiration to Hoosiers everywhere.

Today, I thank Danielle Green and all of our servicemen and -women for the sacrifices they make in the name of freedom.

THE EQUALITY ACT

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleague Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, an unparalleled champion for LGBT rights, introduced the Equality Act. I rise today as a proud cosponsor in support of this bill.

Recent gains, from public opinion to the Supreme Court, have undoubtedly accelerated our ongoing civil rights march, but real justice will be served in this country when the LGBT community is guaranteed—not just legal equality, but lived equality.

The ability to experience everyday life without fear of discrimination is something most of us take for granted. Walking into a gas station without worrying about being denied service because of your gender identity, heading into a movie theater without fear of being turned away because of the hand you held when you walked in, that threat of judgment, rejection, and prejudice is injustice in its purest form.

Today, through the Equality Act, we can help root out the dangerous intolerance that continues to define too many American lives. I urge all of my colleagues to join this fight, cosponsor this bill, and get it signed into law.

SECRET SIDE DEALS WITH IRAN CONCERNING INSPECTION OF THEIR NUKES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it seems the Iranians are not the only ones we can't trust. Apparently, there

are some secret side deals with Iran concerning inspections of their nukes. The administration conveniently withheld this from Congress.

Susan Rice said:

> These documents are not public, but nonetheless, we have been briefed on those documents. We know their contents. We are satisfied with them, and we will share the contents of those briefings in full in a classified session with the Congress, so there is nothing in that regard that we know that they won't know.

Let me get this straight. We are supposed to trust the person who lied to the American people on national television about Benghazi?

Mr. Speaker, what else are they hiding? Maybe the details of the side deal are stored on a server somewhere. We know we can't trust the Iranians to follow the deal.

Now, we can't trust the administration to let us know what is in the deal. Let's hope these secret side deals are not as hard to get a hold of as the former Secretary of State's emails.

And that is just the way it is.

INDIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Indian Independence Day and the 11th Annual New Jersey India Day Parade, organized by the Indian Business Association.

On August 15, 1947, India won its freedom from the British Empire, raising the Indian national flag at the Red Fort in Delhi.

On August 9 of this year, New Jersey's vibrant Indian American community will celebrate that milestone with one of the largest events in the world, drawing more than 35,000 attendees.

Oak Tree Road, between Edison and Iselin, will be filled with dozens of floats, marching bands, musicians, and dignitaries, concluding with a cultural program that will offer everyone present the opportunity to see the beautiful traditions of India in addition to modern culture.

New Jersey is home to one of the largest Asian Indian populations in the United States, behind California and New York in number, but second to none as a percent of our overall population. They are a thriving group that contributes to our State's economic growth and strength in diversity.

I wish everyone well as they prepare for the August festivities and send early Indian Independence Day greetings to all those celebrating in my district.

HONORING FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY STUDENT CRISTINA GOMEZ

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Cristina Gomez and thank her for her kind, generous, and caring spirit.

It has been a little over a year since this promising young woman from South Florida suffered a serious traumatic brain injury after she fell while jogging. Before her tragic accident, Cristina was a senior at my alma mater, Florida International University. She was studying to be a teacher and donated much of her free time to help others.

Cristina's family has established the Cristina Gomez Traumatic Brain Injury Foundation to help other families in similar circumstances and to carry on Cristina's legacy as she recovers.

Christina, the thoughts and prayers of our community are with you and your family. Get well soon. Florida International University misses you and wants you back.

□ 1645

JORDAN MICHAEL FILLER FOUNDATION

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the efforts of the Jordan Michael Filler Foundation in their fight against an unseen killer: addiction.

One person dies every 3 days in the Chicago suburbs because of a heroin overdose. Jordan Filler was 23 when his addiction to heroin tragically took his life. His family started the Jordan Michael Filler Foundation in his honor to help others combat addiction. The foundation works tirelessly to provide vital education to children and their families on addiction.

Mr. Speaker, heroin is an epidemic in our community, and unfortunately, there is no silver bullet to end drug abuse. As the co-chair of the Illinois Suburban Anti-Heroin Task Force, I am committed to working with local organizations like the Jordan Michael Filler Foundation to prevent drug overdose. There are no easy solutions to the drug abuse epidemic, but I am committed to putting in the hard work required to make progress alongside our many community partners.

I offer my sincerest thanks to the Jordan Michael Filler Foundation and other community organizations for their lifesaving work.

HONORING MIKE ZAHN

(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 Mike Zahn, a friend, public servant, and leader in the Springfield, Illinois, community.

For several years, Mike has been involved in the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 965 in Springfield. His father was an operating engineer and served as the branch's business manager.

Following in his father's footsteps, Mike first joined in 1974 and spent nearly 30 years with Local 965, eventually becoming the business manager for the branch himself.

In addition to his time with Local 965, Mike also immersed himself in public service. He served as the chairman of the Illinois State Council and was a member of the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce Diversity Development Council. Mike has been a strong voice for improving our infrastructure, as a frequent visitor to this great city.

After over four decades with Local 965, Mike announced he is going to retire as an operating engineer. He and his wife, Jacki, have two children, Steve and Jessica.

I am proud to honor my friend Mike Zahn for his work on behalf of the people of Springfield, Illinois, and this great country. I wish him the best in his retirement.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by looking at headlines. All you have got to do is just read the headlines that are blaring at us, coming at us in print, over our Internet, and others. They say things like: ''Five children among 94 crucified, flogged, and caged by ISIS for eating during Ramadan''; ''Hundreds Killed in Nigeria Anti-Christian Violence''; ''ISIS Plants Land Mines in Christian Civilian Homes, Ancient Ruins Across Iraq, Syria.''

If we have the stomach for it that particular day, we may read the article that follows. We might say a prayer or silently wonder at the brazen face of evil. But ultimately, we go on with our lives. We do not fear for our personal safety or that of our families because of systemic religious violence.

Yet millions of our brothers and sisters around the world do not have the luxury of walking away from real religious persecution. They don't read the news stories; they live them day in and day out. They have watched family

members die. They have had friends simply vanish into thin air, never to be heard from again. Their homes and businesses are seized by the government. Even as they place their hope in eternity, they fear for their future here on Earth.

Today, my colleagues and I come to the House floor to tell our stories. We come because this body and this administration have a responsibility to use our position to promote religious liberty around the world. Millions of lives are literally depending on America's willingness to export our most precious commodity, religious freedom, and it is time to step up our efforts.

As a pastor and currently a chaplain in the United States Air Force Reserve, defending religious liberty at home and abroad is near and dear to my heart. I have had the honor of serving folks of many faiths, as well as those with no faith, and I am convinced that the foundational importance of religious liberty is not just in America, but in every country.

No nation is truly free unless its citizens can practice their religious beliefs without fear of losing their life or livelihood because of state-sponsored opposition or unchecked persecution by their neighbors. Yet even in democratized societies, we are witnessing a sharp increase in violent religious persecution worldwide.

If America is to be a shining city upon a hill in the 21st century, we must redouble our commitment to fighting for those around the world who do not enjoy the basic right to worship as they choose.

I am grateful that my colleagues who share my passion for religious liberties have joined me for this Special Order, and I am especially grateful to my friend from California, Representative VARGAS. We have gotten to know each other and travel, but on this issue, party lines are diminished, party lines are laid aside. When we think about our own freedoms and religious liberty, he is a champion for that.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) as we continue to discuss this issue.

Mr. VARGAS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, Representative DOUG COLLINS, for his opening remarks and especially for his courage to speak out for religious freedom around the world and also for his courage serving our Nation in uniform.

At this moment, religious freedom around the world is in a state of emergency. The recently released International Religious Freedom annual report describes ''humanitarian crisis fueled by waves of terror, intimidation, violence,'' and ''the horrific loss of human life, freedom, and dignity that has accompanied the chaos.''

From the brutality of ISIL in Iraq and Syria to Boko Haram's mass murders at mosques and churches and the displacement of over 140,000 Rohingya Muslims and 100,000 Kachin Christians in Burma, the past year has seen unspeakable violations of the basic right to practice one's religion. Additionally, blasphemy laws, the vast displacement of religious minorities, and the persistent attacks on religious communities and places of worship should all be a cause for concern.

Today, I would like to highlight the plight of religious minorities in ISIL-held territories a year after the fall of Mosul.

The Nineveh plains have been inhabited by Christians for the past 2,000 years and was first settled in 6000 BCE. In the Bible, the Prophet Jonah was ordered by God to ''Arise, go unto Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee.''

Based in modern-day Mosul, with the Tigris River to the east, the Nineveh plains is rich in cultural history and religious diversity. Before the fall of Saddam Hussein, the number of Christians in Iraq had been estimated to be between 800,000 and 1.4 million. This included Armenian Catholics, Chaldean Christians, Assyrian Church of the East members, and Protestants. In 2013, the Christian population was estimated at 500,000 and shrinking significantly.

Last year, the world watched in horror as a transnational Sunni insurgency initiated a political and religious insurrection in the name of establishing a caliphate across Iraq and Syria.

After ISIL established its control over northwestern Iraq, these Islamist insurgents warned religious minorities living under its jurisdiction to either convert to Islam, pay a cumbersome religious tax, or be executed. These religious minorities included Christians, Yazidis, Turkmen, and Shabak, all of which have a long and rich history in the region and have historically coexisted peacefully with Muslims.

Since ISIL's declaration, thousands of families have packed their belongings and fled to neighboring communities in Kurdistan, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan. Many thousands have been murdered or abducted, and an unknown number of women and girls have been sexually assaulted and forced into marriage.

We all witnessed in August 2014 thousands of Yazidis fleeing to Mount Sinjar to escape the brutality and persecution as ISIL advanced in the surrounding areas. I would like to read the testimony of a Yazidi recounting that horrible time:

> Hours later, ISIS forces attacked the Yazidis in Sinjar. The Yazidis in towns and villages of the south side of Mount Sinjar had some light weapons, such as AK–47 rifles, with a small amount of ammunition. They fought against ISIS forces for 4 or 5 hours. While this minimal defense was proceeding, many Yazidis fled to Mount Sinjar.
>
> Finally, the defenders ran out of bullets and our positions were overrun. The lucky few Yazidis who made it to Mount Sinjar stayed for several days without any food or water. Hundreds then died from starvation and dehydration, especially infants, young children, sick people, and elders.
>
> On August 6, while ISIS forces flushed other Yazidi and Chaldo-Assyrians from their Nineveh plain homes, ISIS also advanced toward Mount Sinjar. Then the Yazidis had no choice but to flee by foot, a journey that took days.
>
> On Friday, August 15, more than 210 Yazidi families in Kocho village, which is just south of Sinjar City, received an ISIS order to convert to Islam or be killed. In that village, the ISIS militia beheaded more than 70 young men, killed hundreds, and took all women, girls, and children to Badush Prison near Mosul. The women and children were sold as sex slaves by ISIS commanders.

While American leadership assisted in providing humanitarian relief as events unraveled, little was done to alleviate ISIL's reign of terror. Since then, over 2 million people have been displaced, and thousands continue to face crimes against humanity. These include torture, enslavement, rape, forced prostitution, imprisonment, and extermination.

Additionally, as a means to eradicate the history and heritage of these different groups, ISIS has led a campaign to destroy cultural and religious properties. Assyrians and other Christians have seen the destruction of the statue of the Virgin Mary at the Immaculate Church and the tomb of the Prophet Jonah, and numerous churches have been destroyed, looted, and burned down.

In closing, I would like to echo the words of Pope Francis, who eloquently stated: ''Our brothers are being persecuted, chased away, they are forced to leave their homes without being able to take anything with them. I assure these families that I am close to them and in constant prayer. . . I know how much you are suffering. I know you are being stripped of everything.''

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I think what you have stated shows what we are dealing with here. What we are finding is the intolerance, something that is just so atypical of what we find here in America.

I think the reason we are here today and actually talking about this is to again raise that level and to understand that this is not something in the past, not something beyond. It is something that is going on right now.

It is not easy to hear about, but you had spoken of it as well, the ISIL victims who reject forced conversion. As we think about that in our religious freedom context, just because they say, ''I am not going to convert to your faith,'' Mr. Speaker, is what they are saying, they are crucified, beheaded, tortured, raped, and countless other atrocities, sold into slavery, simply because they stand on their own faith and won't be forced into the faith of another.

ISIL, frankly, is just evil. They hide behind the cloak of religiousness. The problem is evil is just evil. You call evil what it is. Religious freedom has to be protected, and we have to be purveyors of that.

When we look around, just in the Iraq community alone, just a few years

ago, there were 1.5 million Christians in Iraq. Now, the best estimates are 200,000, at best estimate. And it just continues to drive. This is something that we are going to have to continue, I believe, to watch.

There is a dear friend of mine here tonight who is a fighter for not only religious liberties, but I have fought with him for the lives and the birthdays of newborns everywhere. He is a fighter for religious liberties. The gentleman from Arizona speaks with authority on these issues because he has been there and he has been fighting on the front lines for a while.

It is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) to continue this discussion on the need for religious liberties.

□ 1700

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is a privilege for me to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight with Congressman COLLINS and Congressman VARGAS.

I consider them both precious friends and colaborers in this vital struggle for religious freedom, which is the cornerstone of all other freedoms; and without which, there can be really no other kind of freedom to exist for any length of time.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I fear more for my colleagues and my fellow Americans than the danger of growing numb to the evil that incites these horrific atrocities being committed against people around the world today based on their faith.

I submit that we are, in these days, witnesses to some of the most glaring and brutal attacks on this universal right of religious freedom in all of our history.

The Islamic State, that metastasizing cancer spreading throughout the Middle East and north Africa, is especially targeting Christians, Yazidis, and other ancient religious minorities and communities for extinction.

The world has watched this insidious campaign of terror unfold day by day for over a year. More than 407 days now have passed since the ancient city of Mosul fell into the hands of the Islamic State.

Their campaign of terror drove hundreds of thousands of Christian men, women, and children out of the land of their spiritual heritage, which dates back for nearly 2,000 years.

Nearly 1 year has passed since the Islamic State's attack on the Yazidi community. Thousands were slaughtered, Mr. Speaker. At least 5,000 women and young girls were taken captive as sex slaves. Nearly 1,000 boys between the ages of 4 and 10 were captured and forced into ISIS training camps.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room for Christians, Yazidis, or other dissidents in the Islamic State's self-proclaimed caliphate. Innocent men, women, and children are forced to choose between their deeply held religious beliefs and their lives.

They are subject to torture, mass executions, beheadings, and crucifixions. They are drowned and burned alive in cages. They are raped, abused, and sold as commodities in a modern day slave market.

They are tied to chairs and thrown off high-rise buildings. They are desecrated, violated, humiliated, and stripped of their dignity. Their ancient places of worship and sacred sites are destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, how many more unimaginable atrocities must occur before this administration takes off its heartless blinders and finds the courage and determination to decisively address this evil slaughter of innocents based on their religious beliefs?

German Lutheran pastor and anti-Nazi dissident Dietrich Bonhoeffer said: ''Silence in the face of evil is evil itself. God will not hold us guiltless. Not to speak is to speak, and not to act is to act.''

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration can no longer remain conspicuously silent on the plight of religious minorities caught in the wake of the Islamic State. It is vital that America and the world make the necessary responses to stop this campaign of terror and preserve these ancient religious communities from extinction.

In the middle of this scourge, the administration has allowed the Special Envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia position to remain vacant now for nearly a year. Very little effort has been made to equip regional security forces to protect these communities from ISIS' advance.

This administration's response is shameful and an astonishing failure, and it only affirms the Islamic State's barbaric strategy and encourages what they proudly boast to be a ''battle between faith and blasphemy, truth, and falsehood.''

Mr. Speaker, I would just adjure the President of the United States not to continue to stand by and let this evil relentlessly proceed.

The assault on religious freedom we are witness to in the Middle East is just one of the many attacks against this most sacred and basic right of religious freedom. There are thousands of innocent people around the world who are antagonized, oppressed, tortured, and killed because of their belief or disbelief in a particular religion or ideology.

I know these are challenging subjects, Mr. Speaker, but God help us to remain committed to echoing the voices of these innocents in the halls of Congress.

May we all be relentlessly committed to pursue that day when the light of hope will fall across all of the lonely faces of God's children all over this world and that this ''most inalienable and sacred right of true religious freedom will be the possession of every last human being, and the destiny of future generations will be to walk in the sunlight of liberty for as long as mankind inhibits the Earth.''

May it be so.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank you again, Congressman FRANKS, for your friendship. Thank you for your outspokenness on this issue for many years, and I think we continue to bring this forward as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I want to overlook before I turn it over to another colleague is the area of Pakistan—and this is something that is many times overlooked when we start, but in Pakistan, blasphemy laws carry a potential death sentence.

Now, think about this for just a second—and, again, in our area, we get numb to the fact because of what we have—but blasphemy laws there carry a potential death sentence for anyone who insults Islam or professes another faith.

In November 2014, two Pakistani parents were burned alive because of their Christian faith. These individuals were accused of burning a Koran and subsequently killed by a mob of their countrymen.

A Pakistani court also convicted a Christian woman, mother of five, Asia Bibi, of blasphemy and sentenced her to death. Yesterday, after much prayer and concern from the Christian community, Reuters News reported that the Pakistani Supreme Court temporarily suspended her death sentence.

While the suspension is welcome news, the international community desires that Ms. Bibi is released from prison because of the trumped-up charges.

These are just two examples of persecution in a nation in which all minorities must grapple with the devastating impact of the notorious blasphemy law, as well as the danger posed by Islamic militant organizations that enjoy a strong foothold in the region.

We must, as Congress and the administration, implore, put pressure—whatever we need to do—to say to Pakistan: This is something that has got to be removed. This is something that needs to be done away with. These blasphemy laws must be put away, to be a part of a free and orderly society that actually recognizes the beliefs and religious liberties.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my friend and fellow pastor to speak on this issue and bring his perspective on what he has seen across the world, but also in his time in Congress.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Congressman COLLINS. I appreciate you raising this issue and bringing it to the House floor. It is one of a growing concern internationally, that we have seen organizations like Boko Haram and others who have done great damage to those, really, to the least of these.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the right to believe and to live according to one's beliefs, and our commitment to allow people to live out their religious values without fear of discrimination is really the cornerstone that developed our country into a force for freedom; but this liberty isn't just an American right. It should be a foundational element for all people groups.

Who would have ever thought that we would be in a position to reference the United Nations? This right is so universal that it was included as article 18 of the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Article 18 recognizes that the right of all people to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion—this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, freedom to manifest his belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

However, members of the very institution that is supposed to subscribe to this declaration proactively seek out and punish individuals in groups for their very own religious beliefs.

In violation of international law—and his inherent human rights—Iran is currently imprisoning a gentleman by the name of Saeed Abedini for the mere fact of being a Christian, a man who was working with children who had little hope, if any.

I have communicated on multiple occasions with his wife, Naghmeh, whose children have pleaded and begged this administration and Iran to be able to release.

In fact, in 2012, the history, during a visit to Tehran to meet with his family to talk about helping out with orphanages and building board members, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard arrested Saeed for his Christian faith.

Without any due process, Saeed was summarily given a sentence of 8 years. Throughout Saeed's imprisonment, he has spent weeks in solitary confinement. The prison guards have allowed other prisoners to come and beat him. He is denied medical treatment for infections that resulted from beatings because he is labeled an infidel.

I am more than proud that this House unanimously passed H. Res. 233, that demands the immediate release of Pastor Saeed, along with former U.S. marine, Amir Hekmati, and Washington Post journalist, Jason Rezaian; but we need to do more. We need to return Pastor Saeed to his home family now.

As I was thinking about this whole process and speaking about it, I actually thought back to the original Mayflower Compact, so I looked it up. The words—it is amazing—still ring true, Mr. Speaker.

Allow me remind us just for a moment of those words. It reads:

> IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King James, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, etc., Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid: And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general Good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience.
>
> IN WITNESS whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape-Cod the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, 1620.

Ronald Reagan—in closing—said it best. He said:

> The most essential element of our defense of freedom is our insistence on speaking out for the cause of religious liberty.

That is why we are here today, and I hope and am proud to stand with Representative COLLINS in continuing to stand for those who cannot stand for themselves.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate those words, and I think it is not just in faraway places. We are also dealing with this kind of issue in this hemisphere as well.

Just a little closer to home, southern Mexico even has experienced growing religious tensions over the past year. In a country in which 90 percent of Mexico's population identifies as Catholic, the Mexican Constitution even has long protected freedom of worship.

There is growing hostilities against Protestantism. In fact, the highlands of southern Mexico have a history of sectarian violence. Just a few decades ago, conflict led to hundreds of deaths and the displacement of 30,000 Protestants.

Right now, the conflict has arisen once again. Protestants have had their lands seized, utilities cuts, and appeals for government assistance has fallen on deaf ears. There are also reports of violence, death threats, and forcible expulsions of hundreds of victims from communities in recent years.

You don't have to go all over the world to see that we have this rise of religious intolerance around. That is a basic right, as Congressman WALKER stated. Even in the U.N., it is one of those rights that is laid out in article 18, that everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

A right includes freedom to change his religion or belief in freedom, either alone or in a community with others or in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my dear friend from California, Representative VARGAS, for more, as we have been hearing from our friends.

It is all over, and we need to continue to shine this light.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank Mr. FRANKS from Arizona and Mr. WALKER from North Carolina and especially you, Representative COLLINS, for your remarks and your leadership on this issue. Thank you.

I would also like to conclude my remarks today by highlighting a few other key issues. According to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, there are more than 50 million refugees around the world, half of which are women and children.

Religion is a key factor in humanitarian crises worldwide, as we saw earlier this year, with a record number of refugees attempting to cross the Mediterranean to seek asylum.

□ 1715

In this Congress, I have also introduced legislation—the Protecting Religious Minorities Persecution by ISIS Act of 2015—to address the plight of religious minorities in ISIS-held territories.

Additionally, there are far too many people imprisoned for religious belief and religious freedom advocacy. We heard already about Mr. Saeed Abedini.

I would also like to take a moment to focus on the issue of prisoners of conscience around the world by highlighting the plight of Behnam Irani of Iran, as detailed in the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom's Defending Freedom Project Prisoner's List: Behnam Irani is an evangelical Christian leader from Iran who led a 300-member church of Iran in Karaj, a city less than 15 minutes outside the capital of Tehran. In 2011, Irani was sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment for his Christian activities after a raid on a house church in Karaj. In September 2014, Mr. Irani was hit with 18 additional charges, including Mofsed-e-filarz, which means ''spreading corruption on Earth,'' a crime punishable by death. However, in October 2014, this charge was dropped and Irani was sentenced instead to 6 years' imprisonment due to his alleged acting against national security and forming a group to overthrow the government. In total, Pastor Irani is expected to serve a total of 12 years in prison and is, therefore, due for release in 2023. Mr. Irani has faced numerous health problems while in prison, including severe bleeding due to stomach ulcers and colon complications. Mr. Irani is married and has a daughter and a son.

Lastly, I would like to bring a spotlight to the increase in anti-Semitism in Europe. According to numerous reports, there has been an increase of anti-Semitic acts in France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Austria, Italy, and Germany between 2013 and 2014.

These include violent acts and attacks with an anti-Jewish motivation. Earlier this year, the world saw four Jewish patrons being murdered during an attack on a kosher supermarket in Paris, France.

We must continue to partner with and support Jewish communities around the world to mitigate these anti-Semitic attacks.

With that, I again would like to thank my Republican colleagues and all of my colleagues for their support on this issue. Again, I would like to thank, in particular, my colleague and friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you for being here, Congressman VARGAS.

I think there are many things that we can stand for. Nothing, I think, more basic to our liberties not only here in our country, but around the world, is just standing for, as Congressman WALKER just said, those who can't stand for themselves, who are right now being persecuted simply for the act of a conscious belief, the act of having a faith that others disagree with.

I think that is why we are here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to talk about this in terms of things that we can do and things that we can highlight.

One of the issues that is concerning to me—and it is going to be debated in this Chamber later—is, when we are dealing with countries who have—and we have talked about this today with Iran—dealing with countries who encourage religious persecution. They have issues with this. And we yet enter into agreements without discussing those.

My concern is, in matters of trade and business, all international leaders come to our President, our Ambassadors, our State Department, our government officials. Whenever they come and trade in business—and they want to do business because this is the market that everybody wants—then this is our time to bring this up.

It is in those times that we bring up the persecution. It is in those times that we bring up the five that are held in Iran. It is in those times that we stand for them while they are shackled and cannot stand for themselves.

We have to get over this ridiculous notion that we shouldn't bring up religious liberty in certain contexts because we don't want to offend anyone.

We are worried about causing offense while men, women, girls, and boys are being raped, killed, crucified, and losing their lives. No American faces a barbaric State-sponsored death sentence simply because he or she believes a different religion than a neighbor.

Mr. Speaker, this is part of the freedom that we have. It is a part of the freedom that has been given to us by those who have passed before us.

I have always believed that we stand on the freedoms in this country today of the Constitution and the charters that have gone before us and not only what they did to sign their names to the Declaration of Independence, to sign their names to the Constitution, but to say that we will fight for those rights and those men and women who have died over the years, to say these are worth fighting for.

There have even been issues in our own country of intolerance. And what we have to understand, from my perspective even as an Air Force chaplain, is there have been more discussions on what is right and how we are going to stand up for what we believe.

As an Air Force chaplain, I am there not only from my faith background that I have, but for all, whether they have a hard-and-fast faith, a faith that is just being developed or they have no faith at all.

That is what a chaplain is there for, is to present encouragement and to preserve the religious freedoms and protections that we have.

If we back up on that, if we back up on the basic freedoms such as religious liberty, freedom of conscience, these things that we take for granted, this human rights issue in our country, then what else are we going to back up on? If we start messing with the fundamental pillars, where will it end?

The light that shines brightest here is the one that shines brightest across the seas. We cannot let this issue continue to just become dull to us by simply reading headlines on a page, maybe saying a prayer for those in need, or believing that a book of martyrs is something that used to happen and not anymore.

Today there are those around the world who are simply dying or being persecuted because of their own conscience, because of their belief that they hold. That is wrong.

It is time for us to use all of our resources here in the freest country in the world, to say: We are not going to stand for it. We need to make this the light.

I thank Congressman VARGAS again and those who have come in to be a part of this, to make sure that this light is not dim. It is something that will continue to shine brightly.

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

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today on this fifth anniversary of Dodd-Frank to reflect a little bit on a signal piece of legislation that, to this day, remains controversial.

Dodd-Frank, of course, was a response to the worst economic meltdown that we have seen in this country since the Great Depression of the 1930s.

I want to reflect back on what led to the need for Dodd-Frank, the impact that that Great Recession, as we have come to call it, had on Americans and American families all over this country and then think a little bit about what Dodd-Frank has and has not done in the 5 years since its passage.

It remains a controversial piece of legislation. All you have to do is look at the steady stream of press releases from the majority party on financial services.

I have a few here:

Dodd-Frank has enshrined too big to fail into law.

Obama claimed Dodd-Frank would lift the economy. It has done the opposite, despite the fact that we learned today, of course, we have got one of the lowest jobless rates in a very, very long time.

Financial crisis was caused by Washington's dumb regulations. That would come as a surprise to pretty much anybody with economic know-how who saw the long chain of malfeasance and irresponsibility in the mortgage market that actually led to the crisis.

Dodd-Frank is setting the stage for the next crisis.

''Dodd-Frank Act leaves America less stable, less prosperous, less free.''

These are truly extravagant claims.

So let's back up a little bit and remember January of 2009. That happens to be the month that I was given the privilege of serving in this Chamber.

It came after the last quarter of 2008 in which the United States' economy actually shrank at an 8 percent rate on an annualized basis.

The economy was very literally melting down. The stock market was half of what it is today. Businesses were closing.

Americans saw literally trillions of dollars of value—let's talk for a second about what ''value'' means.

''Value'' means that retirement fund that you were relying on in order to retire. It means the money that you had set aside in a brokerage account to educate your children.

It means those savings that you had accumulated over many, many years of foregoing that vacation or scrimping on the budget, those things. All of that, for many Americans, was wiped out or cut in half, devastation.

And, by the way, in January of 2009—I remember this—though the bailout had passed this House what was known as the TARP, the Troubled Asset Relief Program, and though that had been put into place by the United States Congress and seemed to have stabilized the market, at least temporarily, we worried day in and day out as to whether this—let's face it—obnoxious measure—I don't think there is anybody who thinks in a free market system there should be bailouts—this obnoxious, politically toxic measure which, nonetheless, reasserted some stability in the financial services sector—nobody really knew if it was enough.

I remember wondering whether we might not see a bankruptcy in a money center bank, a moment, perhaps, in which ATMs wouldn't have money in them. This was January of 2009.

Most importantly—there are a lot of big words—asset values, this, that, and the other thing, money center banks—this meant devastation for millions of

Americans who lost their jobs, for families who weren't going to be able to send their kids to school, who were going to have to postpone retirement, unemployment going into double digits, meaning that—and I spoke to one of my constituents yesterday who has an Ivy League degree who found himself working as a clerk at Home Depot, surrounded by other people with lots of education who were fortunate to have that job back in 2009, 2010 because the economy had been devastated by a financial services industry and, yes, by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and insufficient regulation and irresponsibility on the part of some of the regulators had devastated the economy and left the American people holding the bag.

So what happened? We went to work. We went to work in 2009. In 2010, we passed the Dodd-Frank Act. The Dodd-Frank Act is a complicated, big thing, but it addressed every stage of that chain of irresponsibility and malfeasance, starting with the selling of toxic and explosive mortgages to families that brokers and others knew couldn't possibly repay those mortgages to the bundling of those toxic mortgages into complicated securities which, frankly, you needed a Ph.D. to understand, to the fact that some of the credit rating agencies then put investment-grade AAA ratings on these toxic securities, to the fact that derivatives were then written on these securities, derivatives that were largely unregulated as the result of an act of this Congress, a long line of malfeasance and irresponsibility of insufficient regulation and of regulation insufficiently enforced, a terrible market practice.

And, of course, in the middle of 2008, the chickens came home to roost and the economy was devastated and the American people, almost without exception, suffered.

□ 1730

We saw the Troubled Asset Relief Program—the bailout—passed. Imagine how shocking that is to the American people. I have lost my job; I have lost my home, and there is a bailout of these institutions that I don't know a whole lot about; but I suspect, correctly, were at the heart of this crisis.

No wonder we had political upheaval in this country after that happened. Every step in that chain, Mr. Speaker, from toxic mortgages to securities that nobody understood, to credit rating agencies doing an awful job in evaluating those securities, to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac acting irresponsibly, to regulators being asleep at the switch, Dodd-Frank addressed every element of that set of problems which combined to devastate the American economy and to hurt American families.

Did it do it perfectly? Of course, it didn't do it perfectly. We were legislating under conditions of great fear and heightened emotions, and at the end of the day, we are mortals addressing very, very complicated issues.

It was a good-faith effort to address what had clearly caused this problem. This notion that the Republicans are peddling that it was caused by Washington's dumb regulations is beyond insane because Dodd-Frank looked at what actually caused the problems of 2008 and addressed them.

What happened? We were told that Dodd-Frank would be a job killer. This was back in 2010 when anything that the then-Democratic Congress did was going to be a job killer.

The Affordable Care Act which, as it turns out, has provided health insurance to 16 million Americans, was going to be a job killer. Dodd-Frank was going to be a job killer. Everything was going to be a job killer. When we turned the lights on in this room, it was a job killer.

You don't hear that much anymore because, since those fantastic descriptions of job-killing legislation, we have added almost 13 million jobs to the economy. The unemployment rate today is as low as it was before the meltdown of 2008.

The stock market has doubled since then, business confidence is up, business investment is up, and our capital markets are healthy. This idea that it was going to be job-killing was just flat-out wrong, certainly compared to the crisis, which was the true job killer.

Mr. Speaker, the other accusation that was made, of course, was that Dodd-Frank was going to crush credit markets, that the sources of financing that a family needs to buy a home or to send a child to college, the sources of financing that give rise to startup companies, companies like Google which didn't exist 25 years ago, venture capital, the stock market that, of course, gives equity to our businesses to grow and expand and employ more, those were going away because of Dodd-Frank. The criticisms leveled and the predictions made about the credit markets were apocalyptic.

Let's take a look at what actually happened. I assembled a little bit of the data here just to show what has happened in the credit markets. We all love venture capital, that iconic image of the entrepreneurs in the garage developing a product that grows into a multibillion-dollar corporation that provides an electronic device that changes our lives and that makes our lives better—venture capital.

Here is the line. Venture capital at the start of Dodd-Frank and, today, that is a line running up and to the right.

Let's look at total consumer credit. You want to buy a car; you want to buy a television set. Consumer credit, we all use it. At the start of Dodd-Frank, 5 years ago—and today—a dramatic increase in consumer credit.

Stock market—the stock market, of course, is where established companies go to raise money and where we put money hoping it will grow. What has happened there? A near doubling of the stock market—robust.

Commercial and industrial loans—what if you are a business and you don't want to raise money in the stock market, you want to borrow money? Commercial and industrial loans—every one of these lines which capture most of the financing mechanisms and how healthy they are running at the point in time when Dodd-Frank was started to today is running strongly upwards.

All of those criticisms that it was going to crush the credit markets are completely rebutted by pretty much anything that is happening in the credit markets today.

Let's just spend a minute, Mr. Speaker, on what was actually in Dodd-Frank because this is pretty complicated stuff. What was actually in Dodd-Frank were a couple of important ideas, that we should have something called a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that says to credit card companies, No, you can't switch the order of a purchase to make it look like somebody overdrew an account or spent too much money so that you can charge a $25 fee; that said to mortgage brokers, No, you can't put somebody into an inappropriately risky or high-cost mortgage just because you make more money for doing so.

Mr. Speaker, we have standards in our country. You can't buy a toaster that will burn down your house. You can't buy a car that will explode when you turn on the ignition. That happens because we have minimum safety standards.

If you can't buy a toaster that will burn down your house, why should you be allowed to be sold a mortgage that very clearly will cause you to lose your house? That is what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau does, and it has returned literally millions and millions of dollars to the American public as a result of its telling those cheats, those people who would prey on the financial naivete of the American people: You can't do that anymore; and if you do it, we are going to shut you down, and you are going to give the money back.

That is what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is doing today.

Mr. Speaker, the second important thing that Dodd-Frank did was to say, for the first time, that maybe we ought to regulate this derivatives market. Now, derivatives are a fairly complicated financial instrument.

Most Americans don't use derivatives directly and don't necessarily know what they do. They are essentially bets, and that is okay. If you want to bet that oil prices are going to go up or down because you use oil, you ought to be able to take that bet to hedge your risk. That is okay.

But in the early 2000s, the derivatives market had become very literally nothing but a betting game for people who simply wanted to roll the dice on the mortgage market or on the direction of a corporate credit or on the stock market.

You could take any bet. People would lend you money; you could place that bet, and off you went. That is, of course, what brought down what was otherwise an iconic American insurance company, AIG. This was truly a storied insurance company that got into the derivatives business and touched off the crisis.

Shockingly, by law, the derivatives market, even though it is more complicated and larger than the stock market, by law, was not regulated. When you wanted to buy or sell a derivative, you picked up the phone; you called your broker; you did the deal, and nobody necessarily knew about it.

That obviously doesn't happen in the stock market. You go through a broker; the trade gets registered, and the SEC looks over the shoulder of the market to make sure it operates in a safe and sound fashion.

By law, the derivatives market was unregulated and untransparent, and Dodd-Frank said that does not make sense and said that, if you are going to trade derivatives, you are going to do it over an exchange, the way we trade stocks. If you are going to trade derivatives—particularly risky ones—you are going to put up capital against the bet you are taking so that if you lose, you can pay it off.

That is what happened with AIG. They took a whole lot of very big bets that they had no ability to pay off when they lost.

Who lent them the money to take those bets, Mr. Speaker? It was banks and brokerages who, when they found out that the bet they thought they won, there was no money coming to them, that is when we got into real trouble at places like Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers.

We said, crazy though it may sound, a market as complicated and as large as the derivatives market ought to be subject to the same transparency and regulation that the stock market has been subject to since the 1930s. That is what Dodd-Frank did.

Finally—Dodd-Frank did a lot, but this is another really big thing—Dodd-Frank said we ought to actually have a mortgage market that is a little friendlier to the American people because, for most Americans, the savings that they have is in their homes.

For generations, until 2008, generally, home prices had gone up. Let's face it, the middle class works pretty hard not making a lot of extra money. The growth in the value of their home was the way you amassed a nest egg to retire or to buy that vacation cabin, whatever it was you aspired to do; yet by 2008, this had become yet another dangerous casino.

It was true at the time, though it is not true anymore, that a broker could sell a mortgage to a family that was a lot more expensive and a lot riskier than it needed to be because that broker could get paid more in commission for selling that more complicated, more risky mortgage than that broker would get paid for selling a plain vanilla mortgage.

Those days are gone. Those days are gone, and that is a very, very good thing for the American people. Remember, homes are where people—most people—have their savings. That is what Dodd-Frank was.

My friends on the Republican side who have these incredible statements, like the financial crisis was caused by Washington's dumb regulations, fail to see that Dodd-Frank was actually a proportionate and targeted response to a truly devastating financial crisis that had real impact on an awful lot of families.

I am sorry about that. The reason I am sorry about that is because Dodd-Frank, of course, is not perfect. There are clearly issues around some things like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which Dodd-Frank was silent on.

Today, the vast majority of American mortgages are still explicitly backstopped by the Federal Government because we didn't reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Shame on both parties for that, by the way. We had a lot to do when the Democrats were running the show, and we didn't get to that point. In the many years since the Republicans have been controlling this Chamber, they have not taken that up. We should take that up. I am very proud to be, along with Congressman DELANEY and Congressman CARNEY, a sponsor of legislation which would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, there is still difficulty for Americans who should probably qualify for a mortgage in getting that mortgage. It is possible that Dodd-Frank swung the pendulum a little far in the mortgage market in a way that we ought to look at and be very, very careful about because, remember, at the core of the crisis in 2008 were mortgages that an awful lot of people shouldn't have been in, an overcommitment on the part of public policy and others to make every American a homeowner, to make it cheap, and to have outrageously complicated mortgages so that could happen. Carefully, we ought to look at what is happening in the mortgage market today.

Mr. Speaker, there are more technical issues. There are questions about whether there is enough liquidity in the mechanisms, particularly bonds, that companies use to finance themselves.

There are fair questions about whether we have adequately dealt with the question of too big to fail. Dodd-Frank certainly put profound strictures on large institutions. It gave the government unprecedented authority to look into the so-called too-big-to-fail institutions and say: Sorry, you have got to shrink down. You have got to get out of this business.

It put additional capital—in fact, just this week, the Federal Reserve announced the additional capital that large institutions will be required to set aside. It is a fair debate as to whether or not we have truly dealt with the question of too big to fail.

Mr. Speaker, this is the rub: as long as the discussion we have about Dodd-Frank is a near religious discussion with my friends in the Republican Party making statements like Dodd-Frank should be repealed, the Dodd-Frank Act leaves America less stable, less prosperous, and less free; and, yes, frankly, as long as the Democrats don't open the door to the notion that we may not have gotten it perfectly right on each one of its pages, we won't be able to come together to do something which is essential in any piece of legislation, but particularly in financial regulation, which is to adapt and allow the regulatory structure to change to reflect changing conditions.

There are very few markets as adaptive, that change more rapidly, that innovate for good and for ill, as rapidly as the financial services market. As a result, we need a regulatory apparatus that adapts along with the market, that looks for new threats, and that realizes that the regulation of 40 years ago actually doesn't make a lot of sense today.

This near religious conflict that we have with the Republicans saying, You ought to do away with the whole darn thing—they say that, of course, they have never actually brought legislation forward to repeal Dodd-Frank which should cause you to ask, Mr. Speaker, how serious they are about truly repealing it, but as long as that is the conversation—repeal or don't change a word of this legislation—we give up the opportunity to make it better and to make it change with the underlying conditions that it seeks to regulate.

□ 1745

That is where we need to go. We need to acknowledge that Dodd-Frank has done some very, very good things, that it has addressed some catastrophic problems, that it took on behavior that is embarrassing to contemplate when looked back 5, 10 years, but that maybe we didn't get it 100 percent right and start that conversation.

We should do that to make sure that American families are never put in the position they were put in back in '09. We should do that because the truth is that the financial services industry is crucial to prosperity in this country.

If you want to buy a house, educate a child, buy a car, invest in a company, start a company, grow a company, you have to have access to capital. One of the competitive advantages of this country is our incredibly liquid and efficient capital markets. It is a big part of why we are as prosperous as we are today.

But if we can't acknowledge that the regulatory structure has to adapt and change, we risk either putting Americans at risk one more time or damaging these incredible capital markets that are truly a national competitive advantage of the United States, one of the reasons we are the center of innovation on the planet.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we can get that balance right. I think we just need to take the temperature down, approach this from the standpoint of what makes sense, acknowledge that we all have good ideas, and move forward so that we remain innovative, we keep our competitive advantages, but we never, ever allow the American people to suffer the way they did starting in 2008.

So looking back over 5 years, I think Dodd-Frank was a tremendous accomplishment. It really addressed a cataclysmic problem. But it doesn't stop there. I urge my colleagues to recognize that we have taken a very big step in the right direction, but the next step demands us to be constructive and remember that we can find a balance between innovation and liquid and strong capital markets and the protection of our constituents.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had a statement from the White House spokesman yesterday at a White House press briefing in which he had said that the Republicans have ''no one to blame but themselves.''

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be helpful if we looked at the statements he made about the vast amount of crime in America disproportionately being committed by people who are illegally in the United States.

First, the White House spokesman said it included—and he is talking about the President's bill and how if the House had passed that, then all our problems are over. And he said about the President's bill, it included a historic investment in border security.

Well, let me help. Obviously, he is just not up on what the law said. He hadn't read it as I had. But what it did is it set forward a plan to have a plan made by Homeland Security within so many months. It has been a good while since I looked at it, but they had all kinds of time to put together a plan. And then that would be looked at by GAO, the Government Accountability Office, as I recall, and then they had so much time, a vast amount of time, to analyze that to see if the situational awareness and occupational control would be adequate under the plan that was being proposed by Homeland Security, the very people that have not secured the border so far.

And then as time went on, I believe at the end of 5 years, it got really serious. If the border occupational control and situational awareness were not adequate, then there was a real tough penalty, and that was that the, I believe it was, Secretary of Homeland Security had to give a report on why it was not adequately controlled.

Look, the Senate bill was a disaster. It did nothing to control our border. It was the same kind of gobbledygook we have been dealing with for quite some time from the White House.

And we have said consistently, as Republicans in this House, most of us, if the President will secure the border, we will pass an immigration bill that takes care of everything else. It is pretty basic: secure the border, then we will deal with the people that are here illegally.

Until the border is secured, then you are going to keep having people like Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez coming back across. So it won't matter how expansive a bill is and how much situational awareness there is on our borders or in our country; it won't matter because people like Mr. Lopez-Sanchez will keep coming back.

We have got to have border security. That is all there is to it. Once the border is secure, we can work everything else out. And I pointed out many times what I have learned on the border, what I have heard repeatedly from our immigration officers, our border patrolmen, that they are not allowed to properly secure the border.

We had this massive influx of people coming in, and apparently it is expected to grow some more again this year, but we are not securing the border. We let them come in. And once they are on our side of the border, then we go ahead and ship them off. This had been going on for some time.

One of the border patrolmen told me that, among the drug cartels and the gangs in Mexico, the Homeland Security Department is called ''logistics,'' after the commercial. I forget if it is FedEx or UPS, one of them that say: Hey, we are the logistics. You give us your package, and then we get it wherever you want it to go.

I asked just in the last couple of weeks the Secretary of Homeland Security: Are you still shipping people all over the place? I didn't get an adequate answer. I am afraid the answer is: There is still the logistics. We won't stop you at the border if you come across the river, we are not going to have people out there at the river to stop you from coming onto United States property. Now we are going to let you get onto United States property, and then we are going to take you where you need to go. You may have to stay in a facility here or there. That's the kind of thing that was going on that was luring more and more people.

And as the border patrolmen, multiple, told me, Chris Crane has testified about himself that every time somebody in Washington talks about amnesty, talks about legalizing people that are here, it becomes a massive draw, a lure to people to come into this country illegally. That lures people to their deaths. It lures young girls into situations where they end up being sex slaves, we are told, that the sex trafficking is horrendous, and that young girls coming up here are often raped on the way by the gangs bringing them.

And as one border patrolman had said, since he was Hispanic and he spoke better Spanish than many of the people coming across, he would ask them the question they are required to ask about why did you come to America, and 90 percent of the time he said they would say to get away from gang violence. He would say in Spanish: Hey, some gringo may accept that, but you and I both know you paid a gang, some gang to bring you up here. So don't be telling me you came to get away from the gangs; you used a gang to get here.

And 90 percent of the time, their responses were: Well, yeah, that is true, but we were told to say we are getting away from gang violence.

Well, the spokesperson for the White House also said about the Senate bill it would also have ramped up Interior enforcement of immigration laws against dangerous individuals.

Well, in Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez' case, the immigration laws were being enforced to some extent, not completely, but to some extent. He had been to prison a number of times. He violated the immigration laws and had illegal reentry, been deported five times. So at least on five occasions, the Interior enforcement was happening. The issue was that the Bureau of Prisons released him to a sanctuary city of San Francisco and not to ICE, and San Francisco released him then to walk freely.

So, even if we followed the White House advice and ramped up Interior enforcement, which clearly this administration has no intention whatsoever of doing—and I have stories to back that up shortly—then it would not have changed, in all likelihood, the outcome of that case. For those who are tempted to say, ''You are making a big deal about one case where a sweet young daughter was shot dead by somebody deported five times, a criminal, a felon, multiple-time felon, but it is not that big a deal,'' well, it is a big deal.

Just recently, we had an article, the 7th of July of this year, written by Caroline May, headline, ''Illegal Immigrants Accounted for Nearly 37 Percent of Federal Sentences in FY 2014.''

According to fiscal year 2014 USSC data, of 74,911 sentencing cases, citizens accounted for 43,479, or 58 percent; illegal immigrants accounted for 27,505, or 36.7 percent; and legal immigrants made up for 4 percent of those sentences.

As far as drug trafficking, illegal immigrants represented 16.8 percent of all drug trafficking cases. They represented 20 percent of the kidnapping and hostage taking cases. They represented 74.1 percent of the drug possession cases, 12.3 percent of money laundering cases, and 12 percent of murder convictions.

Of the Federal murder convictions in America, 12 percent would not have happened. Since this President has taken office, there are thousands of people who would not have been murdered if we enforced our immigration

laws and had a secure border. It is not just this precious girl in San Francisco.

It is not a race issue. There are Hispanics being killed. There are Hispanics being taken hostage. There are Hispanics being raped.

□ 1800

There are Whites, Blacks, Asians—you name it. They are victims of illegal immigrant criminal activity.

It is absolutely outrageous for anyone in a government position to belittle thousands of people being murdered, raped, kidnapped, and to be so cavalier about it.

The White House says, well, the bill that they were plugging for would have enhanced penalties for repeat immigration violators with sentences up to 20 years for certain illegal aliens who were convicted of felonies.

Look, there were laws in place, and they were violated. He had been to prison. Until you secure the border, people like Mr. Lopez-Sanchez are going to keep coming back. You have to secure the border.

He also said the bill would have increased penalties for passport and immigration document trafficking and fraud.

Yes, like that would have stopped him. He came back across illegally five times. It wasn't a passport issue. It is just pretty dramatic what kind of things have occurred.

I also filed a bill today—we have got some cosponsors—regarding the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia, by authority of the Constitution, was empowered to Congress. We set up local control.

Some would say: Well, wait a minute. If you are trying to punish a sanctuary city like the District of Columbia, the only real Federal city in the country, the only real city under congressional, constitutional control, why don't you just leave it to the locals?

We did, and the local officials allowed it to become a sanctuary city that was not enforcing the law.

So the bill that was passed today wasn't near as tough as I felt like it should have been. It wasn't near as tough of a bill as the King amendment had been that we had previously passed with plenty of votes.

We could have passed it again today, but that is not the bill that was brought. It is a good first step. It is a step in the right direction.

That is why I ended up voting for it even though it was not as strong as the original King amendment. It is important to avoid having sanctuaries, refuges, for people who are felons, like the man who killed Kate Steinle.

Then we have this story from July 22 by Elizabeth Harrington. It points out that the Obama administration is not only planning on not enforcing the law, despite all the hogwash coming out of the White House press room, and not only are they not going to enforce the law, but here is what is coming out.

The article points out:

''The Obama administration is moving forward with plans to expand a waiver program that will allow additional illegal aliens to remain in the country rather than apply for legal status from abroad.

''The Department of Homeland Security issued a proposed rule on Tuesday that would make changes to a waiver program created by President Barack Obama's executive action on immigration in 2013,'' unconstitutional as it was.

''The action created a waiver that primarily allowed illegal immigrants with a U.S. citizen spouse or parent to stay . . . '' and it goes into the specifics. ''The new rule expands eligibility to a host of other categories of illegal immigrants.''

Jessica Vaughan, director of policy studies at the Center for Immigration Studies, said:

'' 'It's a very bad policy. It makes it possible for illegal aliens to avoid the consequences established by Congress to deter people from settling here illegally and then laundering their status by adjusting to a green card.'

''Vaughan, who has been following the issue for over 2 years, said the changes to the waiver program would increase fraud.

'' 'It is a slap in the face to the many legal immigrants who abide by the law, follow the process, and wait their turn,' she said. 'In addition, it will increase the likelihood of fraud in the marriage categories, which produce tens of thousands of new green cards each year.'

'' 'The President should not be issuing executive actions that serve only to expedite the legalization process for those who have ignored our laws. This legalization gimmick is undermining the integrity of our legal immigration system, and Congress should take steps to block it.'

''The public will have 60 days to comment on the proposal.''

It appears to be yet another unconstitutional act by our President, still seeming to thumb his nose at the judge in south Texas who had put an injunction on the last amnesty that was issued by the President. So they are just going to keep going, apparently.

This article by Julia Preston has a title from The New York Times: ''Most Undocumented Immigrants Will Stay Under Obama's New Policies, Report Says.''

''Under new immigration enforcement programs the Obama administration is putting in place across the country, the vast majority of unauthorized immigrants—up to 87 percent—would not be the focus of deportation operations and would have 'a degree of protection' to remain in the United States, according to a report published Thursday by the Migration Policy Institute.

''The report found that about 13 percent of an estimated 11 million immigrants without papers, or about 1.4 million people, have criminal records or recently crossed the border illegally, making them priorities for deportation under guidelines the administration announced in November.''

It makes it very clear that there is so much disingenuousness coming out of the White House.

Oh, yes, if we had passed this ridiculous bill that the Senate passed, which really was not going to address the issue of enforcement adequately, we were going to have studies and plans.

If it did not work in 5 years, heck, we would let the Secretary give us a report on why it didn't all work. I mean, it is absurd. Secure the border. It is very basic. The President has got the power, and he has got the money.

Heck, they just blew off the $4 billion virtual fence a few years ago that we had appropriated money for. What are they doing with that money? Why haven't they secured the border with that? They could do it.

Just when you think news about people acting illegally and being given amnesty couldn't get much worse, this story by Steven Green, on July 20, by PJ Media, reads:

''Iranian worshippers chant slogans during their Friday prayer service at the Tehran University campus in Tehran, Iran, Friday . . . The main prayer service in the Iranian capital has been interrupted by repeated chants of 'death to America'—despite this week's landmark nuclear deal with world powers that was welcomed by authorities in Tehran.''

The devastating revelation from Mitch Ginsburg and the Times of Israel reads:

''Mojtaba Atarodi, arrested in California for attempting to acquire equipment for Iran's military-nuclear programs, was released in April as part of back channel talks, Times of Israel told. The contacts, mediated in Oman for years by close colleagues of the Sultan, have seen a series of U.S.-Iran prisoner releases''—not exchanges, but releases—''and there may be more to come.''

I mean, it is incredible. We are told we have seen the deal. Oh, yes. There are parts, like the IAEA has got to work out its side deal that we don't see here in Congress, but it is a good deal.

Let's not forget my friend who spoke last from the other side of the aisle was talking about how great the Dodd-Frank bill is. Let me just say this quickly about that.

As for the Dodd-Frank bill that was passed, supposedly, to punish those evil investment banks on Wall Street, what has it really done? It has punished the community banks that didn't do anything wrong.

They weren't invested in mortgage-backed securities. They weren't doing all kinds of machinations to try to create new forms of legalized gambling on Wall Street. They weren't engaged in that.

Yet, Dodd-Frank has so punished community banks that every month

there are fewer community banks. They are getting gobbled up by the guys who caused the problems. That is what Dodd-Frank did.

It added so much expense and burden on the local banks, and it provided a lot of benefits to the biggest banks. They are the ones that could absorb the parts of the law. We are losing banks constantly.

As far as the great economic news, we know we have at least 93-plus million people for the first time in our history—94 million people, maybe, now—who have given up looking for jobs. It has never gotten that high before.

It had gotten close once before, I think, under Carter, but it has never gotten this high before. People have just given up looking for jobs. You have got more on food stamps than ever before. Is that really something to be proud of? It is if you want indentured servitude of the people of the United States.

The middle class, we hear now recently, is growing smaller. The gap between the ultra rich and the poor is growing bigger under this President's redistribution model because it doesn't work.

The most troubling economic statistic that anybody should have been seeing over the last few years—over the last 2 years—came out in 2013, that, under President Obama, for the first time in American history—ever—95 percent of all of the income went to the top 1 percent income earners.

It still bothers me greatly. But I read, actually, that, even though the top 1 percent is making 95 percent of all the income, it was a slower growth to them than in the last two expansions.

So it really was not that great of news for them. Well, it isn't great for America when 95 percent of the income is made by the top 1 percent.

It is just this wink and nod with Wall Street from this administration of: We are going to call you fat cats. We are going to punish you. We are going to hit you with Dodd-Frank.

And what happens? You kill the smaller banks. You hurt the middle class. You overburden the middle class. You make it more difficult for them to live. More people end up on food stamps. It is a disaster.

That is why it was no surprise in the last couple of days when we saw a report that there is a great majority of Americans who feels like this President has hurt the economy more than he has helped it. I don't know that that is true, but I do know that more people, according to the poll, are saying that.

Capital markets and Wall Street, oh, they have done well. Yes, that is what happens when we create more money than at any time in American history. We are creating money.

Notice, Mr. Speaker, I am saying ''creating money'' because I learned it was improper to say we are printing more money than ever before.

I was told by someone with the Fed—some years back when I asked: ''How much more money are we printing than we have ever printed?''—''Oh, none, really.''

''But there is more money in the system.''

''Oh, yes. We couldn't possibly print all of the money we are creating.''

Are you kidding me? We are just adding numbers. We aren't even bothering to print it anymore as we are increasing money so fast. It is an outrage what has happened.

The bottom line is Americans are suffering. Government does not make things better. It is better when they get a job, not more food stamps.

It is time that we knock Dodd-Frank down to size where it does deal with the investment banks that caused the problem of 2008 and doesn't punish the banks that didn't get us in that trouble.

In the time I have left, I have just got to go back to this horrendous Iranian deal. It is putting the United States and all freedom-loving people at risk.

Iran cannot be trusted, and I am still concerned about the language, like, if you say in a bill or in the Iran agreement, oh, yes, you can't use ICBMs or develop them for 8 years or, at the broader conclusion of the IAEAs, that nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes, whichever is earlier.

□ 1815

That concerns me about the 8-year requirement. Is it really an 8-year requirement, seriously? I mean, what does that mean? I went down and cleared that that was not classified, so I could speak of that. There are a few places where I have seen that that language, the broader conclusion by the IAEA, holy cow, that is completely out of our control. That is one of the time deadlines that some of the important timing can be?

Iran continues to make clear, as this story from July 12 from Adam Kredo says, that Iran is saying, ''We will trample upon America.''

''Iranian cleric Ayatollah Mohammad Ali Movahedi Kermani, who was handpicked by the Islamic Republic's supreme leader to deliver the prayers, delivered a message of hostility toward the United States in the first official remarks since a final nuclear deal was signed between Iran and world powers in Vienna last week.''

''Analysts who spoke to the Washington Free Beacon about the anti-American tone of last week's prayers said it is a sign Tehran believes it bested the United States in the talks.''

You think?

The article further down says: ''Iran's defense minister on Monday said the deal also will prohibit all foreigners from inspecting Iran's 'defensive and missile capabilities' at sensitive military sites.''

You don't have to have my SAT scores to know they are going to be classifying as many sites as they can as defensive sites that we cannot have inspected.

It is time to say ''no'' to the deal. Americans need to rise up and demand it, and let's crush the Iranian deal before Iran crushes Israel and the Great Satan, United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

EXPENDITURES BY THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 676, 113TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, DC, July 23, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, Pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 676 of the 113th Congress, as continued by section 3(f)(2) of H. Res. 5 of the 114th Congress, I write with the following enclosure which is a statement of the aggregate amount expended on outside counsel and other experts on any civil action authorized by H. Res. 676.

Sincerely,

CANDICE S. MILLER, *Chairman,*
Committee on House Administration.

AGGREGATE AMOUNT EXPENDED ON OUTSIDE COUNSEL OR OTHER EXPERTS—H. RES. 676

July 1–September 30 2014	.....
October 1–December 31, 2014	$42,875.00
January 1–March 31, 2015	50,000.00
April 1, 2015–June 30, 2015	29,915.00
Total	122,790.00

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 27, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2271. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department intends to assign women to certain previously closed positions in the Army, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 652; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2272. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; MI, Belding; 2008 Lead Clean Data Determination [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0407; FRL-9930-

81-Region 5] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2273. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, 2011 Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Washington DC-MD-VA Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0759; FRL-9930-96-Region 3] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2274. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for the State of Alabama: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0313; FRL-9931-24-Region 4] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2275. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Electronic Reporting Consistent With the Cross Media Electronic Reporting Rule [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0172; FRL-9931-09-Region 6] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2276. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon; Grants Pass Second 10-Year PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0323; FRL-9931-16-Region 10] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2277. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Oregon: Grants Pass Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0322; FRL-9931-13-Region 10] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2278. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0354; FRL-9930-84] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2279. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Jacksonville, FL; Savannah, GA; Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD; Richmond, VA; and Roanoke, VA, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AN15) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2280. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277 as codified in 5 U.S.C. 3345 et seq; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2281. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2015 to June 30, 2015, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 114—52); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2282. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD744) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2283. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD717) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2284. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's modification of fishing seasons — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #3, #4, #5, and #6 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XD976) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2285. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper [Docket No.: 0907271173-0629-03] (RIN: 0648-XE003) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2286. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XD672) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2287. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2015 Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 141002820-5113-01] (RIN: 0648-XD536) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2288. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 7; Correction [Docket No.: 120328229-5064-03] (RIN: 0648-BC09) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2289. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology Omnibus Amendment [Docket No.: 140904749-5507-02] (RIN: 0648-BE50) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2290. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report entitled, ''Debt Collection Recovery Activities of the Department of Justice for Civil Debts Referred for Collection Annual Report for FY 2014'', pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3718, Contracts for collection services, and the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2291. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Virginia: Augusta County, Unincorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8389] received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Homeland Security.

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. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2604. A bill to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid (Rept. 114–224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1994. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–225, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1994 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3173. A bill to promote conservation for the purpose of enhancing hunting, fishing and other outdoor recreational opportunities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JONES, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3174. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 3175. A bill to assure equity in contracting between the Federal Government and small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 3176. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a criminal violation for injuring or destroying property under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3177. A bill to simplify the application used for the estimation and determination of financial aid eligibility for postsecondary education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 3178. A bill to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 3180. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide students with increased flexibility in the use of Federal Pell Grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3181. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to permit border States to designate certain funds for border infrastructure projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3182. A bill to advance United States leadership in planetary science and space exploration though education and outreach; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3183. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to expand and make permanent the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 3184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the medical expenses of dependents who have not attained age 26 to be paid from a health savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIMES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VELA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 3185. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOODALL (for himself and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3186. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3187. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3188. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to end speculation on the current cost of multilingual services provided by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 3189. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to establish requirements for policy rules and blackout periods of the Federal Open Market Committee, to establish requirements for certain activities of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to reform the manner in which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is audited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KIND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 3190. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to enhance the Federal Government's planning and preparation for extreme

weather, and the Federal Government's dissemination of best practices to respond to extreme weather, thereby increasing resilience, improving regional coordination, and mitigating the financial risk to the Federal Government from such extreme weather; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CHABOT:

H.R. 3191. A bill to amend the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 with respect to funding available for fiscal year 2015 for certain general business loans authorized under the Small Business Act, to amend the Small Business Act to modify loan limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3192. A bill to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3193. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require that covered persons develop and implement emergency contingency plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 3194. A bill to protect and promote international religious freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3195. A bill to establish minimum standards of disclosure by franchises whose franchisees use loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 3196. A bill to establish minimum standards of fair conduct in franchise sales and franchise business relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LONG, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. AMASH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 3197. A bill to prohibit Federal funding to entities that do not certify the entities will not perform, or provide any funding to any other entity that performs, an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 3198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to small employers for certain newly hired employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 3199. A bill to prohibit statutory sanctions relief by the United States with respect to Iran unless the Senate provides its advice and consent to ratification of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3200. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transfer unobligated amounts previously made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs to the medical accounts of the Department to improve the furnishing of health care to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3201. A bill to support the integration of immigrants to the United States into the economic, social, cultural, and civic life of their local communities and the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 3202. A bill to amend section 42 of title 18, United States Code, popularly known as the Lacey Act, to add certain species of lionfish to the list of injurious species that are prohibited from being imported or shipped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 3203. A bill to require prompt responses by mortgage owners of homes in foreclosure to short sale offers to purchase such homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3204. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to reduce the testing requirements for part A of title I of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3205. A bill to establish the History Is Learned from the Living grant program to enable communities to learn about historical movements in the United States in the past century through the oral histories of community members who participated in those movements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. FARR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 3206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income student loan indebtedness discharged in connection with closures of educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3207. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national program to conduct and support activities toward the goal of significantly reducing the number of cases of overweight and obesity among individuals in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3208. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the timing of deposits relating to the Civil Service Retirement System with respect to crediting military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REICHERT, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 3209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the disclosure of certain tax return information for the purpose of missing or exploited children investigations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3210. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary contributions to the United Nations Democracy Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3211. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3212. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make 100 percent bonus depreciation permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 61. A joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 372. A resolution recognizing the importance of the 2015 Special Olympics World Games hosted by the United States of

America in Los Angeles, California; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 373. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need for Congress to have the power to implement and enforce limits on when money can be spent on campaign activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. VELA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H. Res. 374. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of Singaporean independence and reaffirming Singapore's close partnership with the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 375. A resolution honoring the victims, survivors, and those who responded to the Eastland disaster—a shipwreck which resulted in the deaths of 844 passengers and crew—on its centennial; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H. Res. 376. A resolution to refer H.R. 3133, a bill making congressional reference to the United States Court of Federal Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, of certain Indian land-related takings claims of the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan and its individual members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAT:

H. Res. 377. A resolution recognizing ''National Atomic Veterans Day'' on July 16; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H. Res. 378. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2015 as ''National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. OLSON, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H. Res. 379. A resolution reaffirming the role of the House of Representatives in the review and approval or disapproval of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action relating to the nuclear program of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

102. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 218, urging President Obama and the United States Senate and House of Representatives to reauthorize the United States Export-Import Bank before June 30, 2015; to the Committee on Financial Services.

103. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 9, to establish a sustainable energy-abundance plan for Ohio to meet future Ohio energy needs with affordable, abundant, and environmentally friendly energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

104. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 9, to establish a sustainable energy-abundance plan for Ohio to meet future Ohio energy needs with affordable, abundant, and environmentally friendly energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

105. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 32, urging the United States Congress to expedite natural gas exports; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

106. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, urging the President of the United States, members of Congress, and the United States Department of Labor to update regulations implementing an executive order prohibiting discrimination by federally-assisted contractors and subcontractors; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. WALZ:

H.R. 3173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 3174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 3175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 3176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 3177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 3178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 3179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 3180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 3181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States . . .''

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sect. 8

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 3184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 3186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution which, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, also allows Congress to prevent or prohibit federal interference with Americans' ability to slaughter and process meat. This act is also justified by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution, which recognize that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and to the States.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, and to pay the debts levied by such expenses.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:
H.R. 3189.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes); Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 (To coin money, regulate the value thereof; and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures); Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 (To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department thereof).

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 3190.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)
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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHABOT:
H.R. 3191.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constiution

By Mr. HILL:
H.R. 3192.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 3193.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ELLISON:
H.R. 3194.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:
H.R. 3195.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3.

By Mr. ELLISON:
H.R. 3196.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3.

By Mrs. BLACK:
H.R. 3197.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AGUILAR:
H.R. 3198.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRAT:
H.R. 3199.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article II, Section 2 gives the President the ''Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur.'' Article I, Section 8, clause 18 grants Congress the Power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.'' It is necessary and proper to clarify that the matter addressed by this legislation is a treaty and must be considered under the relevant requirements of the Constitution.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:
H.R. 3200.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, this legislation is authorized by Congress' power to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.'''

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:
H.R. 3201.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, 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;
To borrow money on the credit of the United States

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:
H.R. 3202.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;''

By Mr. HIGGINS:
H.R. 3203.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ISRAEL:
H.R. 3204.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:
H.R. 3205.
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, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:
H.R. 3206.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause I of Section VIII of Article I: ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States''

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 3207.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:
H.R. 3208.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 3209.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 3210.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. SCHRADER:
H.R. 3211.
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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:
H.R. 3212.
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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H.R. 3213.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:
H.J. Res. 61.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 169: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 183: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 217: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 333: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 335: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 339: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COLE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COOK, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 342: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 381: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 430: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 449: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 540: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 546: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 578: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 592: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 653: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 692: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 703: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 721: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 775: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 799: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 815: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 825: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 828: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 829: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 836: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 842: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 855: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 885: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 890: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 894: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 902: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 918: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 921: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 932: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 940: Mr. WOODALL and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 973: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 999: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1062: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1095: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1100: Ms. GRANGER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MICA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1107: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1148: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1155: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1192: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1194: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1202: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1209: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1211: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1258: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1270: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1288: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 1301: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1309: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1320: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 1344: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1371: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HARDY.
H.R. 1384: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1387: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 1391: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1401: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1421: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1427: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1434: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 1462: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1475: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1545: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 1546: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1553: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1559: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1567: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1571: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1594: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1608: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1610: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 1624: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 1655: Mr. NEAL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1670: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1736: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 1752: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1769: Mr. PETERS and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1784: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1814: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1830: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1856: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1875: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1901: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1981: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1994: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1995: Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 2005: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2043: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2050: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 2061: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 2063: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2066: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2082: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2096: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2125: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2217: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2229: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 2241: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2247: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 2259: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2266: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2287: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2290: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2292: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2293: Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2315: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BERA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BUCK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2355: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2366: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2382: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 2391: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2400: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2403: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KATKO, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2404: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2407: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 2408: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2410: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2494: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2530: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2545: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2602: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NEAL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2622: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2643: Mr. JONES and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2646: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2652: Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 2657: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2661: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2663: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2680: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2689: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2698: Mr. COOK and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2702: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2711: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2744: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2769: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2799: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2802: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 2805: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2823: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2835: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2847: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2871: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2894: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2896: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2903: Mr. PETERS and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2911: Mr. NEAL and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2915: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2942: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2948: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2954: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2965: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2974: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2992: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2994: Mr. POCAN and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2999: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3011: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3025: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3033: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 3036: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3039: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 3047: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3051: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3052: Mr. BABIN and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3060: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3068: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3071: Mr. GALLEGO and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3084: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. YOHO, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3089: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3091: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 3092: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3093: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 3095: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3100: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3105: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3110: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 3114: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3115: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3119: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3120: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3126: Mr. BABIN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3132: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 3134: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3136: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3139: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3148: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3151: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3161: Mr. HARPER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HILL, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 3163: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3164: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3165: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3170: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. PALMER.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.J. Res. 51: Miss RICE of New York.

H.J. Res. 59: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. LABRADOR.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 130: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H. Res. 140: Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 318: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Res. 343: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 354: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COOK.

H. Res. 365: Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 366: Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 367: Mr. MARINO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HARDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. RIGELL.