United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2016 No. 109

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 7, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND WATER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to climate change, the data is in and the science clear: Our world is shifting. Sea levels are rising. Glaciers are shrinking. Oceans are becoming more acidic.

What is more? The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is 95 percent certain that humans are causing the current climate change trend. To sit here and deny the science simply because it inconveniences us does nothing but cause greater harm for our planet and future generations. Each day that passes without action on climate change is another day we are wreaking havoc on our world.

I think President Obama said it best when he stated: ''If anybody still wants to dispute the science around climate change, have at it. You'll be pretty lonely, because you'll be debating our military, most of America's business leaders, the majority of the American people, almost the entire scientific community, and 200 nations around the world who agree it's a problem and intend to solve it.''

It is hard to believe that some of my colleagues are so determined to deny climate science that they are willing to sacrifice the health and safety of Americans.

Nowhere is the sacrifice more evident than in our waterways. We use water for everything, from drinking and bathing to growing crops, shipping goods, generating electricity, and recreation. But climate change is creating profound changes to this precious commodity, threatening water availability, access, and quality.

Many areas of the United States, especially in the West, currently face devastating water supply issues. The amount of water available in these areas is already limited, and our demand will continue to rise as the population grows.

One of the greatest examples of this is the Colorado River system, a major source of water supply for the Southwest. In recent decades, water flow through this important river system has been lighter than expected given annual rain and snowfall rates. Not surprisingly, studies show that rising temperatures and climate change are the cause of this decreased water flow.

As greenhouse gas pollution continues to pile up, it traps more heat, continually raising global temperatures, and parches the Colorado River watershed. Researchers expect that for every degree of Celsius of global warming, the amount of water that gets evaporated and sucked up by plants from the Colorado River could increase 2 or 3 percent. With 4.5 million acres of farmland irrigated using the Colorado River water and with nearly 40 million residents depending on it, the incremental losses that are predicted will have a devastating impact.

As the West continues to experience less rain and an increase in the severity and length of droughts, greater impacts on drinking water supplies are projected.

Unfortunately, it is not just the western U.S. that is in danger. In my own region, the Great Lakes are under threat as they are warming at rates faster than the world's oceans. It is expected that the Great Lakes region will grow warmer and probably dryer during the 21st century, with temperatures in the region warming anywhere from 5 to 12 degrees Fahrenheit.

The impact climate change has on the five lakes will have serious implications for aquatic life, as well as high economic costs for our communities.

Several different climate models for the Great Lakes region all predict that lake levels will decline over the next century. Within another 30 years, Lake Superior may be mostly ice free in a typical winter and has already experienced increased water temperatures. Lake Erie water levels, already below average, could drop 4 to 5 feet by the end of this century, significantly altering shoreline habitat.

We are at the tipping point, and instead of addressing the root of the issue, climate change, my colleagues continue to deny the science.

Our waterways are national treasures. They serve as the backbone for our health, economy, ecosystems, and recreation. We cannot simply stand by while the course of the world is altered.

The science is clear, the data is pointing us in one direction: Now is the

Printed on recycled paper.

time to act on climate change. We are not given a planet with unlimited resources. It is our job to protect our waters and the people that rely on them, and that begins with finding real solutions to our climate crisis.

STOP SPENDING BILLIONS IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor again today with a prophetic political cartoon. In the cartoon, Uncle Sam is in a wheelchair, and he is at the edge of a cliff that is known as the fiscal cliff. Then, he has President Obama pushing him in the wheelchair; and then the donkey, representing the Democratic Party, is pushing Mr. Obama. And then the elephant, representing the Republican Party, is pushing the donkey and President Obama to push Uncle Sam off the cliff.

What is ironic is that Uncle Sam is yelling like he is excited: ''I can see Greece from here.'' Well, we know what has happened to the economy of Greece. It is in total collapse.

Mr. Speaker, we are $19.2 trillion in debt. I was here in the year 2000 when Bill Clinton left office. We were the majority in the House and the Senate. We were headed for a surplus. The debt in 2000 was $5.6 trillion. Now we are here 16 years later and it is $19.2 trillion.

The reason I bring this up is because we have an opportunity to stop spending billions and billions of dollars in Afghanistan. It is nothing but a waste. It is a waste of our young men and women in uniform. It is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Recently, in an article in The Washington Post titled ''Former Afghan Leader Karzai: Military Action Cannot Resolve Conflict in Afghanistan,'' the former President of Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai, told The Washington Post recently that he doesn't think a military effort will bring peace to Afghanistan. He said: ''We did it for the last 14 years and it didn't bring us that, so how do we know . . . military action will bring us that now?''

We are going on 15 years of being in that country—and the waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan is worse now than it has ever been.

I think about the needs of our veterans, I think about the needs of our children, I think about the needs of our senior citizens, and so many other needs. We passed a bill yesterday to help with the mental health issues of America, yet it is not funded. But, yes, we will find the money to fund Afghanistan so we can continue to waste and spend the taxpayers' money and get nothing for it. It is just absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the Department of Defense bill last week simply because there is another $43 billion in there going to Afghanistan. This is OCO funds, it is slush funds, and it can't even be accounted for.

The taxpayers are frustrated with both parties and fed up because we are not doing our jobs. We are not doing what is necessary. We ought to be debating Afghanistan on the floor of the House and we ought to be saying, ''Is it worth it or is it not worth it,'' and have an up-or-down vote. No, we just let it continue to go down this road with no end to it.

Mr. Speaker, I close this way, because to me this tells you more about Afghanistan than anything I could say today. Afghanistan is known as the graveyard of empires. Well, I know one empire that is headed for the graveyard, and it happens to be the United States of America. And if we continue to fund and waste the taxpayers' money in Afghanistan, then I hope that graveyard will have a headstone, and it will one day, that says ''USA,'' because we will be in the graveyard of Afghanistan.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a vice chair of the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force and in solidarity with the majority of Americans who are demanding that Congress take meaningful action to prevent gun violence.

We all know the statistics. Whether it is through mass shootings that make the headlines or the unseen violence that happens daily on our streets, gun violence takes the lives of more than 30,000 of our Nation's citizens each year, a number that far exceeds other industrial countries.

Now, all these countries have their share of violent extremists and madmen, but only our country gives easy access to weapons of mass killing. And that makes all the difference for America.

Rather than seeking out commonsense solutions to address this crisis, the Republican majority continues to cower to the gun lobby and the firearms manufacturers. Now they plead the Second Amendment, but Constitutional Law 101 would tell us that all of our rights, including the precious freedoms of religion and speech, must be balanced to protect innocent third parties and to protect the safety of the wider community.

One commonsense measure we should all agree on is background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. You can't shout ''fire'' in a crowded theater because of your freedom of speech, and neither should you be able to buy a weapon if you have a history of violence and criminality.

In fact, almost 90 percent of Americans, including the majority of gun owners, support universal background checks for all gun purchases. The problem is that our present background check system is rife with loopholes. Background checks are not required for private sales at gun shows. They are also not required for Internet sales.

Bipartisan legislation has been introduced by Representatives PETER KING and MIKE THOMPSON that would finally close this egregious loophole. It is an entirely sensible reform that would have a measurable impact on the safety of our schools, homes, and neighborhoods, without preventing law-abiding citizens from using guns for self-defense or recreational purposes.

Despite attracting 186 cosponsors, including several Republicans, the background check legislation has never been brought to the floor or even received a hearing in committee. It has been languishing for more than 15 months. Meanwhile, the shootings and the suicides and the massacres continue to accumulate.

My colleagues, we must do better. Our fellow citizens are totally fed up, both with the unspeakable killing and suffering and with a feckless Congress that hasn't lifted a finger to prevent it.

Now, this week, after intense public criticism and a historic protest by Democrats on the House floor, Republicans seemed for a while to be willing to hold a vote on legislation they claim would prevent suspected terrorists from purchasing firearms. After all, nearly 2,500 individuals on the terrorist watch list have successfully purchased weapons in this country.

But rather than embrace existing bipartisan legislation to actually fix the problem, Republicans put forth a woefully inadequate proposal that would require law enforcement and courts to grapple with unworkable processes, unreachable standards, to be completed in an unreasonably short period of time.

Their bill would allow suspected terrorists to receive firearms by default after only 3 days if the court is unable to work through a complicated process. That is the same flaw that allowed the White supremacist Charleston shooter to obtain the weapon that he used to murder nine people at Emanuel AME Church.

In other words, the bill is totally inadequate. Now, under pressure from their most extreme Members, Republican leaders refuse to even put this bill on the floor.

What should be on the floor is bipartisan legislation, H.R. 1076, that would permit the Attorney General to block gun sales to suspected terrorists. This legislation, based on a proposal from the Bush Justice Department, would still allow individuals to challenge the government in court to restore their gun ownership rights.

We don't have to choose between protecting our communities and respecting due process.

□ 1015

And so, Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues how much longer must we

wait? How many more people have to die to move us to act? How many more American towns and cities must be added to the constantly growing list of places like Orlando and Columbine and Aurora and Charleston and Newtown?

Moments of silence aren't enough. Thoughts and prayers are not enough. In fact, the Scriptures teach us that such pieties give grave offense when they mask a refusal to do what we know is right. We need action. I call on my colleagues to bring these commonsense proposals to the floor for a vote.

ONGOING PEACE PROCESS IN COLOMBIA

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud and encourage the ongoing peace process in Colombia.

Over the last 52 years, Colombia has witnessed an armed conflict between the government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC. The conflict has taken a serious toll on the country: 220,000 people have been killed and more than 6.8 million people have been forced from their homes. The fighting has been especially difficult for the rural areas of the country.

But a new day is on the horizon for the people of Colombia. The country is on the verge of a historic peace agreement with the FARC. In fact, the government and the FARC signed a ceasefire agreement on June 23. This was seen as one of the few remaining roadblocks to a final peace agreement.

With all that is going on in the world today, it would be easy to miss the important progress taking place in Colombia. The peace process isn't garnering the media attention that some other foreign affairs are, but it is going to have just as important an impact on global affairs.

Last year, I had the opportunity to travel to Colombia with the Committee on Armed Services and my colleague from Arizona, Mr. GALLEGO, whose mother is from Colombia. It didn't take long for me to realize that Colombia is a beautiful and fascinating country, and I was very impressed with the hospitality of the Colombian people. It also became clear during my trip that the majority of Colombian people want things to be better in their country, and they are committed to the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, Colombia is our closest and strongest ally in Latin America, so the peace process is very important not only to Colombia, but also to the United States. Their future opportunities are also ours.

Colombia has a growing economy with immense potential based on their abundant natural resources and a culture that values hard work. A more stable Colombia will allow the country to further expand their economy, which would be a benefit to us right here at home.

At a time when there are so many foreign policy challenges around the globe, Colombia is a rare success story. The country was literally on the verge of becoming a failed state, but now they are a leader in the region. The United States maintains significant bilateral relations and has provided important diplomatic assistance to the Colombian Government, but we have done so without becoming overly involved in their local affairs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize my strong support for the Colombian peace process, and I call on every Member of this House to also lend their support to that process. We need to encourage our neighbors in South America. I want to commend President Santos for his leadership and his commitment to a lasting peace.

I also want to highlight the important work of Ambassador Pinzón. I appreciate his friendship, and I applaud his work to strengthen the partnership between the United States and Colombia.

Ultimately, only the people of Colombia can reach the lasting peace agreement that restores justice and order to their country, but the United States can—and I believe we must—stand ready to assist the Colombian Government as they finalize this process and then as they move their country out of conflict and into a period of stability and lasting peace.

ANOTHER AMERICAN SHOT DOWN BY THE POLICE

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to talk about something else this morning, but the events of the last 12 hours changed my plans.

I watched this morning on TV and online—like a lot of Americans—another of our fellow Americans shot down by the police. This time it was in St. Paul, Minnesota. Earlier this week, it was in Baton Rouge. But we know it is everywhere—in Chicago, in Baltimore, in South Carolina.

It seems that every week or month another Black man is shot by the police, and we always have the same reaction: Oh, it is a tragedy; there should be an investigation. A lawsuit is filed, and another settlement. Oh, the Justice Department and the FBI need to oversee the investigation because we cannot trust the police to police themselves. And then we go back to business as usual, and nobody actually does anything.

State by State, city by city, and county by county, we might make this reform or that reform, but there is no national strategy to stop police from killing people, especially Black people, especially Black men.

I wept this morning as I watched the mother of Philando Castile describe her son. She said he had a job, he served children in the cafeteria, and that he was a calm young man. She also said that he was not a thug.

Why does a Black woman in the 21st century in the United States of America, while a Black man sits in the Oval Office, almost 50 years after Martin Luther King, Jr., was gunned down, why does she have to start her description of her son with ''He was not a thug''? She said: ''We are being hunted.''

Mr. Speaker, this is another sad chapter in American history.

I do not feel compelled to say in describing my grandson Luisito: Well, first and foremost, he is not a gang banger, he is not a thug. But for this Black mother and for a lot of African American mothers in this country, that is something they feel a necessity to say.

This mother did everything right. Her son was still shot dead by the police. This young man was riding in the passenger seat of a car with his fiancée and 4-year-old little daughter in the backseat.

He had a permit to carry a weapon, which he announced to the police. So he had gone through the background check, gone through the training, and had the concealed carry permit. But he was shot dead in front of his loved ones, his fiancée and daughter.

Why is it in 21st century America we have to have a conversation about how to avoid being shot by the police? Why do I have to instruct my grandson about deescalation if he comes in contact with the police, about strategies to prevent a sworn public servant, an officer of the court, a trained member of law enforcement, and I have to instruct my teenage grandson how to prevent that person from shooting him to death for no reason? Why, Mr. Speaker?

We have no national strategy, no national conversation. When Americans are literally crying out in the streets that, yes, Black lives matter, we have no response from the Congress, the people's House. None.

The head of the FBI announces he won't press charges against a candidate in the Democratic Party. Stop everything; we need to have hearings, congressional hearings. Benghazi, let's spend millions on hearings, political hearings. Planned Parenthood, let's form a special committee to do what the majority party feels is important from their political point of view.

But a young Black man is shot by police in his car in cold blood? Nothing. Young men are shot by police, videotapes are withheld from the public, and nothing happens.

Mr. Speaker, I think Black lives matter. I think the lives of young men in inner cities across this country matter. And I think this Congress should be the place where America comes together to decide what we are going to do about young Black men getting shot by the police. Not next week, when it is going to happen again. Not next month, when it is going to happen again. Not waiting safely until after the election,

when it happens again, again, and again.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to come together and lead, and we need to start right now.

RESTORING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ACT

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Restoring Access to Medication Act, introduced by my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman LYNN JENKINS.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Missouri families have suffered from the never-ending financial burdens and health consequences imposed by the Affordable Care Act. From limited access to physicians to skyrocketing premiums, ObamaCare has failed our country and our people.

For years, Missouri families have used health savings accounts and flexible spending accounts as an important tool to save and help pay their medical expenses, including over-the-counter drugs. In the United States, more than 20 million individuals and families have taken advantage of HSAs and FSAs. They have counted on them to help protect against unexpected healthcare expenses and better plan for medical costs throughout the year.

Under ObamaCare, the administration did its best to get rid of these HSAs and FSAs by limiting the amount of savings people could contribute to them and how that money could be used. They even mandate that funds in HSAs and FSAs cannot be used to purchase over-the-counter medications without a prescription from a physician. Simply put, this administration added yet another layer of ''Washington knows best'' red tape to how to spend your money and how to manage your health care.

As a mother of three, I remember sick children, cold and flu seasons, and late-night runs to the drugstore for cough syrup and fever reducers. I know that these unexpected expenses directly impact families that are fighting to make ends meet. Adding another doctor's visit just so you can use your already saved money to purchase over-the-counter medications is unfair, it is wrong, and it is downright senseless.

The Restoring Access to Medication Act will repeal this portion of the law that unfairly targets pocketbooks and reduces access to everyday medications like aspirin and allergy relief. This legislation will put Americans back in the driver's seat, restoring control of the family's day-to-day health expenses and needs.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this legislation increasing access to over-the-counter medications that families need, it allows Americans to, most importantly, increase the amount of money they contribute to their health savings accounts. While doubling the amount both individuals and families can contribute to their accounts in 2017, this new law will also have a net decrease of $2.2 billion for our Federal budget over the fiscal years 2016 through 2026.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled that the House has passed this bipartisan, commonsense legislation which places the healthcare needs of families above the liberal interests of bureaucrats in Washington. It will save families money and put them further in control of their healthcare decisions, something the ever-failing Affordable Care Act will never do.

HISTORY OF THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, during my 28 years representing Seattle in the Congress, there have, unfortunately, been several mass shootings in my district, including one in 2006 at the Jewish Community Center and another one in 2014 at Seattle Pacific University. I know the pain and the frustration that members of the delegation from central Florida are feeling 3 weeks after the shooting in Orlando.

As a psychiatrist, I know and understand the trauma that these types of violent events inflict on individuals and communities. As someone who was around Congress in 1994 when the first assault weapons ban was passed, and in 2004 when it expired without action, I thought it would be useful to talk for a few minutes today about the history of that ban and how Congress capitulated to the gun lobby and allowed weapons designed for killing to flood our communities.

Congress began consideration of an assault weapons ban after two mass shootings in California. In January, in 1989, a disturbed man with a long criminal history walked into the Cleveland Elementary School in Stockton, California, and fired 106 rounds in 3 minutes from his semiautomatic rifle, killing 5 children and wounding 32. Nothing happened. It is no surprise that we have the same thing happen in Connecticut and nothing happens.

Four years later, in 1993, a failed businessman opened fire in the Pettit & Martin law firm in San Francisco with a pair of semiautomatic pistols, shooting hollow point ammunition.

□ 1030

The predictable public outcry and strong support for an assault weapons ban following these shootings led Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN to put forward legislation that would ban semiautomatic weapons. In an unprecedented show of bipartisan support, former Presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, and Gerald Ford joined together to publicly urge Congress to ''listen to the American public and to the law enforcement community and support a ban on the further manufacture of these weapons.''

A ban on assault weapons eventually passed the Congress in 1994 as a part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. However, in order to get that legislation through the House, a costly consensus was made to gun rights supporters and the NRA that allowed the ban to sunset or expire after 10 years. So, despite the importance of the assault weapon ban, it was allowed to expire.

From 2003–2008, Senator FEINSTEIN led numerous efforts to reauthorize the ban, but not a single bill left her committee. We had the same here in the House. Carolyn McCarthy made the plea over and over again. Her husband and son died on a Long Island Railroad train from a guy who came into the train and shot up the aisle and killed them. One hundred four people were gunned down during this time period in mass shootings, and all Congress did was to send a message that weapons designed for use in the theater of war were acceptable for use on our streets.

While I certainly do not want to minimize the loss of lives, I find it important to point out that Congress felt compelled to act on an assault weapons ban in 1994, following two shootings that killed a combined total of 13 people. For some reason, this body can't seem to summon the courage to act after 27 are killed in Connecticut, 24 in San Bernardino, 9 in Oregon, 12 in Colorado, and 49 in Orlando. And I could go on and on and on for my entire speech.

The question you have to ask is: Have we become so numb to the pain of mass shootings that, no matter how many innocent people are gunned down, we won't find the will to act? Has the NRA desensitized my Republican colleagues so much that the slaughter of children in a kindergarten doesn't even result in a single vote on the floor, a denial to bring the issue out here and debate it in public?

What is the price that the American people must pay before Republicans quit this obstruction? 100 killed? 200? Fifty doesn't seem to hit threshold.

I understand reinstating the assault weapons ban will be tough, but, Mr. Speaker, we must have that debate if we are going to have a society in which we all feel safe.

BRING THE BILLS FOR A VOTE

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I don't like being here. I had meetings I had to cancel. I had phone calls I had to put off. But I am committed to doing everything I can to get two votes on the floor—just two. They are simple issues: no fly, no buy, and closing the gaping loopholes in background checks for the purchase of a gun. That shouldn't be a

problem. I don't know anybody who opposes those items.

We can't get a bill on the floor because the Republican majority is afraid of their own position. They are scared to let the American people know where they stand on these issues.

Just yesterday, we had to use a legislative gimmick called a motion to recommit, which nobody in America understands—I didn't understand it before I got here—but it was the only way we could get the issue on the floor. And even then, when Mr. THOMPSON offered it, it was ruled out of order.

Through machinations of rule on rule on rule, we weren't even allowed to vote on that. The item was ruled nongermane and a motion was made to lay it on the table. The only vote we got was to overrule the ruling of the Republican chair to lay it on the table.

The people who voted to lay it on the table yesterday voted to allow terrorists to buy weapons. The people who voted to lay it on the table yesterday voted to allow criminals and terrorists to continue to buy guns under our current gaps in the background check law. That is what that vote was.

Now, I know no Republican who voted that way will go home and explain it to their constituents. They will say: Oh, no, it was just a procedural motion. And many of them will probably get away with it. That is a shame.

What I don't understand is why people claim this is somehow against due process—and, by the way, the bills have due process in them; written by a Republican during a Republican Presidential administration—when there is plenty of due process. If anybody wants to add more, we will add more.

No one was concerned about due process when they voted for the PATRIOT Act that allowed the NSA to listen to everybody's cell phone conversations. No one was caring about due process when Americans grabbed people from around the world and kept them under lock and key for as long as we want. But now we are concerned about it. God forbid we offer an amendment to deal with their concerns.

All I want is a vote. All I want is Members of this body to have the courage of their convictions. If you think those bills are bad, bring them to the floor and vote ''no'' and go home and explain it to your constituents. I do it all the time. That is why I came here. I thought that is what we did.

We are not supposed to be the people who hide. We are supposed to be leaders. Lead. Don't cower in fear behind political nonsense and gimmickry because you haven't got the courage of your convictions.

This issue will not go away. The American people are tired—and have been for a long time—of politicians who refuse to stand up and be counted for their principles.

We don't mind disagreements. I don't mind losing on an issue here and there. I do mind not being given the opportunity to debate and vote on the important issues of the day, issues that everybody in America wants. Mr. Speaker, that is why I am here.

We will debate the merits another time—if we are lucky—but it will not go away, and you cannot hide from your refusal to allow a vote on these two simple, commonsense proposals.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the outstanding comments of my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO). I couldn't agree with him more.

I am, proudly, a member and co-chair of our task force against gun violence. I proudly support every American's right to own a firearm. I believe as strongly as anyone in this room that all we are trying to do here is get a vote, a simple vote—let the votes fall where they may—a simple vote on closing loopholes as they relate to background checks and making sure terrorists can't buy guns if they can't even fly.

Now, over the last many months, I have spent many 5-minutes talking about all those who have died because of mass shootings in this country. I have a memorial wall outside my office that is filling up quite quickly with all the lives that have been lost because of mass shootings.

During our sit-in on the House floor last week, we read the names of those in Orlando who were victims. Today, I am going to remember the 54 other victims last month in 51 other mass shootings that took place in the month of June. Even excluding Orlando, so many people last month were affected by mass shootings that I don't have time within my 5 minutes to list those who were injured but survived.

Here are those who died in mass shootings in June that were not victims in Orlando:

Devonne Burton, 28; Sean Pointe, 27; and Derrius Woods, 27; were killed on June 4 in Denver, Colorado.

Brian Harris, 44, and Robert Sykes, also 44, were killed when a gunman opened fire in a motel on June 5 in Phoenix, Arizona.

Jeremy Taylor, 54, and Sean Strickland, 26, were killed when a gunman opened fire in a convenience store on June 7 in Cape Coral, Florida.

Raekwon Brown, 17, was killed outside a school on June 8 in Dorchester, Massachusetts.

Adrian Potts, 20, was killed outside of a university apartment complex on June 11 in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Stephanie Gonzalez, 17, and her sister, Kimberly Gonzalez, 13, were killed by their mother's ex-boyfriend on June 11 in Los Angeles, California. The shooter also wounded their mother and brother.

Cynthia Villegas, 34, and her daughters, Yamilen, 14, Cynthia Janeth, 11, Abby, 7, and Ida, 3, were killed by their husband and father on June 11 in Roswell, New Mexico.

An unidentified 30-year-old man was killed outside an ice skating park on June 11 in Stockton, California.

Reggina Jefferies, 16, was killed as she was attending a memorial service on June 14 in Oakland, California. She had just performed a praise dance honoring two boys who drowned.

Robert Marto, 54, and Jason Moore, 41, were killed outside of a bar on June 18 in Warren, Ohio.

Cameron Wilkins, 21, and Felicia Williams, 32, were killed in a housing complex on June 18 in Waycross, Georgia. Cameron had seven children.

Ronald Graves, 30, was killed in a house on June 19 in Exmore, Virginia.

Gary Porter, 41, was killed at a party on June 19 in Syracuse, New York. He had four children.

Monte Compton, 24, and his cousin, Donte Jefferson, 29, were killed on June 21 in Louisville, Kentucky.

Gerald Berkey, 36, Jackson Edens, 28, and Terron McGrath, 31, were killed in a trailer on June 22 in Lacey, Washington. Terron leaves behind two daughters, 8 and 12.

An unidentified man was killed on June 22 in DeKalb County, Georgia.

Carlina Renee Gray, 50, Jan Marie Parks, 55, and Allen Rowlett, 60, were killed on June 24 in District Heights, Maryland.

Treavon Lewis, 22, and Jordan Larkin, 18, were killed at a dance club on June 25 in Fort Worth, Texas.

Fernando Wingfield, 44, was killed outside a bar on June 26 in Atlanta, Georgia.

An unidentified man was killed on June 26 near a pool in Houston, Texas.

Ruben Rigoberto-Reyes, 60, Edmundo Amaro-Bajonero, 26, and Katie Gildersleeve, 30, were killed on June 27 on a blueberry farm in Woodburn, Oregon.

Phoukeo Dej-Oudom, 35, and her children, Dalavanh, 15, Xonajuk, 14, and Anhurak, 9, were killed by their husband and father on June 29 in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Chanda Foreman, 37, was killed while sitting in her car on June 30, in Chicago, Illinois. It was her birthday and she was going out to celebrate.

This carnage must end. Just give us a vote on two modest bills to help stem the bloodshed.

A MESSAGE 68 YEARS IN THE MAKING

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I love my country. No one says the Pledge of Allegiance with greater enthusiasm than I. No one sings ''God Bless America'' with more love for country than I.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a preeminent privilege to stand in the well

of the Congress of the United States of America to address some of the great issues of our time.

Mr. Speaker, the message that I deliver today has been 68 years in the making. The message that I deliver today had its genesis with my mother, who cautioned me that I must behave a certain way in the presence of the constabulary, the police; a mother who was concerned for her son, who always made it very clear to me that I had to say yes, sir and no, sir, and that I had to always accept whatever the police said to me.

This message is 68-plus years in the making, Mr. Speaker. The message is, in part, based upon what my uncle, who was a deputy sheriff, shared with me about my behavior in the presence of the police; that I must always, always yield to the police; submit to the police; never challenge the police. Sixty-eight years in the making, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy after what has happened over the last 2 days to Black men in the United States of America. My heart is heavy. I had the unfortunate circumstance of seeing what happened to that man in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on the ground with his hands flailing, blood flowing from his chest.

I heard the young lady this morning pleading to God: Jesus, God, don't let him be dead. Maybe not her exact words, but very much what she said: Don't let him be dead; don't let this happen.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do something about the killing of Black men at the hands of the constabulary in this country. If you don't want to investigate the police, if you don't want to investigate the system, the culture that causes it, investigate Black men. Find out why they want to run out in front of bullets.

Let's find out why they are the ones who are consistently, and with some degree of systemic order, forcing themselves upon the police such that they find themselves dead. Investigate us.

I am a Black man in the United States of America. I have lived what I am saying. Sixty-eight years in the making, that is how long this speech has been made. I don't need a written piece of paper. I know what is going on. I was a judge for 26 years. I saw it. I can give firsthand testimony about what is going on. It is time for us to investigate what is happening to Black men in this country.

Black lives do matter. These people are trying to tell us something, these young people. We must listen to them. Let us not ignore what is going on. The camera's eye doesn't lie. If you look at these videos and you use your common sense, you know that there is something going on, and we need to investigate it.

And it is pervasive, it is not just one-off circumstances that we are having to contend with. These things are happening across the length and breadth of this country. Every venue has some account that can be called to our attention. It is time for us to do something.

Mr. Speaker, I call on you. Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker of the whole House. Mr. Speaker, I call on you to assemble the House so that we can address the issue of Black men dying at the hands of police in this country. And we ought to investigate it to the extent that we come to conclusions about the people that are involved in these tragedies. We should not have to have another mother to have her child in the car, 4 years of age, when her boyfriend is killed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I thank God for giving me 68 years to develop this message. And I pray, Mr. Speaker, that you will do something about what is happening to Black men in this country.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CHANHASSEN HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chanhassen High School girls softball team on their State championship.

After finishing their regular season with a record of 17–3, and in second place in the West Metro Conference standings, the third-seeded Storm went on to win four games straight to win the Section 2 championship. And then, as Section 2 representatives in the State tournament, the Storm won over Forest Lake, Hopkins, and Buffalo, outscoring their opponents 19–5 on their way to the championship.

Mr. Speaker, it is accomplishments such as these that are a testament to the skills and the values that all high school athletics teach, and these young ladies demonstrated determination and toughness on the field as well as drive and responsibility in the classroom.

Balancing schoolwork and athletics can be challenging, but these student athletes proved themselves to be both leaders on the diamond and in the classroom. The families, teachers, friends, and our entire community are very proud of these young ladies. I congratulate the Chanhassen High School softball team on their win.

LIFE AS A BLACK MAN IN AMERICA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my topic today was going to be on the issue of gun violence, mass shootings, the need for Congress to take some action to keep America safe, the fact that 90 percent of the people of this country want Congress to take some action. I was going to speak about that today.

But I would be remiss, as a Black man in America, to pass up the opportunity to comment about life as a Black man in America, in an urban setting, particularly when it comes to police community relations, you see, because we live in a gun culture, and nowadays, everybody has a gun.

Some folks have a culture of growing up shooting, hunting. Nothing wrong with that. Take the kids to the gun show, the family, on a Saturday afternoon. And at the gun show there is a bunch of unlicensed gun dealers there selling weapons of mass destruction to any and everybody. That is a part of the culture because everybody wants a gun.

Well, it is time for universal background checks. That is a simple piece of legislation, closing the gun show loophole, which that loophole is bigger than the Goodyear Blimp traveling sideways. That loophole is so big that you could fit the Goodyear Blimp through it sideways, and it is worth nothing because unlicensed gun dealers can sell guns to any and everybody. Any and everybody can purchase a gun over the Internet, no background check required. We need to close that gun show loophole by passing legislation that enforces the notion that there will be universal background checks.

I wanted to talk about that today, and I still think that is important. But even if we have universal background checks in this country, there is still a problem for Black folks who decide to arm themselves.

I mean, we had the case of Philando Castile in Falcon Heights, Minnesota, yesterday, pulled over for a busted taillight. Here is a working man in the car with his girlfriend and her 4-year-old daughter, and he is armed, as everyone else in America is. But he is a Black man riding in the streets of a city in America, and so he must not be allowed to have that gun or, at least, if he has one, everybody is in such fear that they develop a trigger finger. And when he reaches for his license, then he gets blasted four times and his life is snuffed out. That is what happens to Black folks in America.

Now we find out that the man had a valid license to carry that firearm. In many States now, due to what the NRA lobby has done, you don't even need a license to carry the firearm in your car. So the man was acting lawfully. He gets blasted. He is no longer with us.

The day before, Alton Sterling got a little hustle going on. He is selling CDs at the store, at the corner store. Why shouldn't he be allowed to have a weapon? He has got a weapon in his pocket. Everybody else has got a weapon in their pocket. But no, he is a Black guy, and so we automatically develop a trigger finger when the police approach. Take him down hard, two on one, throwing him all across the car. You saw the video.

If the man had wanted to shoot, he would have pulled the gun out much

quicker than when they threw him across the car and had him on the ground pinned to the ground. And he ends up getting shot in the back and in the chest.

This is life in America. This is our culture of gun violence that this Congress has allowed to manifest itself in this way.

We shouldn't have to live like this. Nobody should have to live like this. People walking around afraid of what their neighbor is going to do to them because they know that he has got a mental problem and he should not have a weapon, but he was able to get it over the Internet or through the gun show, unlicensed firearm dealers.

So weapons have proliferated into our society. We are now at war, not with a foreign enemy, but with ourselves, with our neighbor. It is not fair to any of us.

But I tell you, when America coughs, Black folks have always gotten pneumonia. Nowadays, when America coughs, Black folks die, and it really has to stop, ladies and gentlemen. This is not the way that we should live.

A CALL FOR MEANINGFUL ACTION ON GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call for meaningful action on gun violence. The key word in that sentence is ''meaningful.''

The tragedy in Orlando served as a dark wake-up call to all Americans. Across the Nation, in every major city, to every small town, Americans are speaking with one voice saying: ''Enough is enough.''

The American people are demanding a no fly, no buy bill that prevents those on the terror watch list from purchasing firearms.

How have Republicans responded?

They have put together a weak, unworkable, and convoluted bill that will not address the real problem.

Imagine, under this legislation, law enforcement must convince a court within 72 hours that the buyer ''has committed or will commit an act of terrorism'' before it could block a gun sale.

Is this your idea of homeland security? Really? Is this how you protect the homeland?

Mr. Speaker, the standard is simply unreachable and unworkable. Now, one has to wonder where Republicans got such an unfeasible idea.

□ 1100

The answer is as simple as it is sad. The NRA, which represents large weapon manufacturers, wrote this legislation. We need a real, effective no fly, no buy bill that stops those on the terrorist watch list from purchasing firearms. The Republican legislation is simply a giveaway to the NRA that will hobble law enforcement. We also need a system of effective, universal background checks that keeps guns out of the hands of those who would do us harm.

Once again, House Republicans are standing in the way. They are preventing consideration of this measure that is supported by 90 percent of the American people. Why? Just to keep their friends in the NRA lobby happy with them. Why? Follow the money.

Mr. Speaker, this is unconscionable. The week after the Orlando slaughter, I read on this floor the names of the victims. At that time, I said that while we will never forget them, their memory will inspire us to real change. But this is not real change. We do not honor the victims of Orlando by passing legislation written by the NRA and gun manufacturing lobbyists. In fact, if anything, this legislation is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Well, I have news for you. The American people see through this, and they are not buying it.

I urge my colleagues: do what is right. Reject this unworkable NRA-backed trick so that we can vote on real, meaningful legislation to address gun violence in this country.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I joined with my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, and we took an extraordinary action. We sat in, we rallied, we challenged the Republican leadership, and we spoke out about gun violence in a way that we had never done before.

We said to the leadership: Enough is enough; we have got to do something about these mass murders; we have got to do something about these guns.

We challenged the leadership because we all know that the gun lobby has too much influence and too much control in this House. We also know that too many of our Members will not confront this issue on the opposite side of the aisle because, as it has been said, they are the handmaidens of the NRA. So we gathered, we spoke out, and we were talking about two simple bills that we wanted them to vote for.

We are trying to educate the American people that those who do not want to go against the gun lobby will have the American citizens believe that we are trying to take away their guns. We are not trying to take away anybody's guns. This is not about the Constitution or the Second Amendment. We simply said we want to bring to the floor two simple pieces of legislation.

One is no fly, no buy. What does that mean? It simply means if you are on the list of persons who are prevented from flying because you are suspected of being a possible person involved in terrorism or something of that sort, you cannot get on an airplane. It is something about your background, what you have done, and the connections that you have that will not allow you to place our people on the airplane at risk.

So what we are saying is if you can't fly because you will place fliers at risk, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. So that is what no fly, no buy is all about. If you are too dangerous to fly, then you shouldn't be able to go and purchase a gun. That is very simple.

The other is universal background checks, and that is very simple. We have some background check laws, but still there are people who sell guns out of the back of their car at these gun shows, and they have no background checks. They could be murderers, they could be people who are involved with serious domestic violence, they could be people who are dangerous, and they could be mentally ill. We are saying we have to have universal background checks.

What is controversial about those two bills? But they won't pay attention. They will not take up the bill. As a matter of fact, the leadership is threatening us. They want to charge us with violations of the House rules, take us to the Ethics Committee, and have us sanctioned in some way because they say we have violated the rules.

Well, I say to them: I won't be intimidated. I am not afraid of them or the Ethics Committee. If they want to take us to the Ethics Committee, come on, let's go, because we are going to stand up for what we believe in, and we are not going to be intimidated by being charged with violation of the rules of the House.

Now, while I am talking about not being intimidated by anybody, I want to congratulate and thank Mr. AL GREEN of Texas for what he says has been a 68-year journey where he got up in our caucus today, and he took this floor in a way that I have not seen any Member of Congress in the years that I have been here take the floor and just bare their hearts and just say what is on their mind. I have never seen a Member of this House come to tears and beg us to do something about the killing of Black men, in particular, that is going on.

While we are dealing with gun violence—and we are dealing with gun violence to protect everybody—I want to tell you, I have been here when we have had the mothers up here from Newtown. I went to Charleston, South Carolina, where the Emanuel Nine were killed, and I stayed up all night with people placing flowers in front of the church. I literally went to Mr. AGUILAR and sat with him when the San Bernardino massacre happened. We were here when Columbine happened, and we all thought at that time that we have got to do something. We have done nothing.

Then there is Orlando, Florida; there is Aurora; there is Arizona; there is

Virginia Tech; and on and on and on. We have been fighting to do something about these massacres. The police should be with us. The police should not complicate our job by doing what is being done.

You have heard about the latest two killings in Baton Rouge and in Minnesota. They are absolutely heartbreaking. I listened last evening to this woman crying, screaming, and saying: ''God, please don't let him die.''

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Well, you may stop me now because my time is up. But I will be back. I will not stop on these two issues: massacres and the killing of Black men in particular.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as someone who supports the Constitution, including the Second Amendment. I stand here today as someone who believes in protecting our national security. In fact, I have risked my life to defend it. I stand here as someone who supports the will of the American people because that is my job.

In my previous job, I was an infantry officer in the United States Marine Corps. Over the course of four tours in Iraq, I used guns every single day to do my job. In fact, guns saved my life. I do not want to take away guns from me or any other law-abiding American citizen. But I do want to make sure that terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill do not get guns they shouldn't have.

All we need to do to accomplish that are two simple, commonsense things: background checks for all sales of guns with no loopholes that criminals and terrorists can exploit; and, second, if you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy.

These simple, commonsense gun safety measures are supported by nine out of 10 Americans. So if we are going to do our job here in Congress, if we are going to follow the will of the American people, if we are going to protect our national security, and if we are going to continue to uphold the Constitution, then we should do these things.

The reason that they are so important is because of the Americans who have been killed by senseless gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a list of mass shooting victims from just 2016 alone:

Antoine Bell, age 17.
Raymon Blount, age 29.
Ira Brown, age 20.
Joshua Steven Morrison, age 18.
Randy Peterson, age 64.
Sean Marquez, age 19.
Marvin Douglas Lancaster, III, age 21.
Jennifer Jacques, age 42.
Ernesto Ayber, age 29.
Carlos Bates, age 29.
Isaiah Major, III, age 43.
Dwight Hughes, Jr., age 21.
Trisha Nelson, age 28.
Armando Curiel, age 17.
Raul Lopez, age 19.
Angel Lopez, age 20.
Officer James Lee Tartt, age 44.
Manuel Ortiz, age 28.
Mary Lou Nye, age 62.
Dorothy Brown, age 74.
Barbara Hawthorne, age 68.
Rich Smith, age 53.
Tyler Smith, age 17.
Emma Wallace, age 37.
The Buckner family, including mother, Kimberly; father, Vic; 18-year-old daughter, Kaitlin; and 6-year-old daughter, Emma.
A deputy sheriff, Corporal Nate Carrigan, age 35.
Renee Benjamin, age 30.
Josh Higbee, age 31.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has the responsibility under clause 2 of rule I to preserve order and decorum. As the Chair ruled on June 12, 2003, an exhibition involving Members trafficking the well is a breach of decorum.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

Every day work is done on this Hill that is building toward legislation meant to improve the lives of Americans and guarantee a future of hope for our children.

On this day, the eyes of our citizens are especially focused here. May the day be marked by openness, clarity, and goodwill, so that as these months lead up to an election that will give us the confidence to believe that You are with us throughout, and that for those who love You and place their trust in You, as we claim to do, all things work for good.

Bless the Members of the people's House with wisdom and patience this day.

And may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO MITCH HERRICK ON HIS RETIREMENT

(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 would like to congratulate a dear friend and a patriot, Mitch Herrick, who will be retiring after 30 years of invaluable service to our great country, first as a U.S. marine, and then as an air traffic controller.

I have known Mitch for almost a decade, when he began working at the Miami air traffic control tower at Miami International Airport, located in my congressional district. During his time there, Mitch has also represented the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, or NATCA, as its local facility vice president and also as its local facility legislative representative.

Representing NATCA on Capitol Hill and in my south Florida district has been a labor of love for Mitch, almost as much as he loves his dogs and his old Mitsubishi Galant.

In 2013, NATCA was proud to present its highest legislative affairs honor, the Trish Gilbert Legislative Activism Award, to Mitch.

I thank Mitch for his exceptional service and his commitment to public safety. I wish Mitch and his wife of over 20 years, Michelle, all the best on this well-deserved retirement.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 90 people a day are killed by a firearm in the United States of America. That is more than 33,000 families devastated by gun violence last year. Those are statistics. I want to tell you and read the names of real people in my hometown whose families got that dreaded, unimaginable knock on the door:

Jacob Walsh, age 25;
Greg Bryant, Jr., age 21;
Zedward Jackson, age 52;
Gary Martin, age 52;
Ledarius Fitzgerald, age 18;
Herman Denis, age 18;
Jack Bellino, age 28;
Courtney McGriff, age 29;
James Cartigiano, age 16;
Anne Nau, age 21.

And the list goes on. Who will get the next knock on the door?

ISIS IS A REAL THREAT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago, an American of Afghan descent shot and killed 49 people in Orlando. He did so while pledging allegiance to ISIS. In the words of the actual gunman, this was a terrorist attack.

What is worse is that many of my colleagues across the aisle have attempted to hijack facts and muddy the conversation. Why? Because this attack further disproves the President's narrative that ISIS is contained.

Don't even get me started on the fact that the President won't say the words ''radical Islamic terrorist.'' The administration even attempted to remove mention of ISIS in the 9/11 transcription.

Folks, ISIS has declared war against our American way of life, and we need to work together to protect all Americans from future attacks, and our Commander in Chief finally needs to come up with a strategy to defeat ISIS.

THE TIME FOR BOLD ACTION IS NOW

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Republican majority has pulled a bill from the floor agenda that would have created a new loophole allowing terror suspects to get a gun. That is good news. The bill they pulled was the Cornyn-NRA gun lobby bill, and we are pleased that they pulled that bill. It is a terrible proposal that will only make matters worse in our country.

But now it is time to bring up the meaningful bipartisan bill, the no fly, no buy legislation, and the meaningful background check legislation. And know this: until you do so, Mr. Speaker, we are not going away. We are not going anywhere because this issue is not going away.

Putting aside Orlando for a moment—the last gentleman's comments—since the House gaveled back in on Tuesday, nearly 200 people have been killed or injured due to gun violence. I don't know how many more people must fall victim to gun violence before this body, before House Republicans will get the message.

The time for bold action is now. I do know my Democratic colleagues and I are prepared to keep up this fight for as long as we have to to get meaningful gun legislation passed.

THE THREAT OF RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM

(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 express grave concern over the threat of radical Islamic terrorism.

What we need is a comprehensive strategy to destroy terrorist organizations like ISIS. Instead, the administration is ramping up the release of Guantanamo Bay detainees.

Make no mistake, these detainees are the worst of the worst. One former detainee has become a leader of al Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen. Another, released last month, was Osama bin Laden's bodyguard. Just weeks before the Olympics, here we are again. Authorities in Brazil are on the hunt for a former detainee who went missing.

With another two dozen detainees cleared for this summer, I worked to include key safeguards in next year's National Defense Authorization Act, like requiring written agreements with foreign nations that accept these GTMO transfers. I introduced legislation with Senator STEVE DAINES to block all GTMO transfers until these safeguards are signed into law or until the end of the year.

The President wants to empty GTMO and bring the remaining terrorists to U.S. soil. Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow these terrorist detainees to put American lives at risk.

CLOSE THE CHARLESTON LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again call upon Members of Congress to enact some commonsense gun reform because I really believe that we are misusing the word ''reform'' every time we talk about this issue. Reform means a change for the better. It doesn't mean just to go through a process. It means a change for the better.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen that our gun laws need to change. I am very emotional for nine souls in my congressional district who lost their lives because of an inadequate, nonsensical background check law that says that no matter what the situation might be, if you wait for 3 days, you can go get the gun. Irrespective of your mental condition, irrespective of your background, irrespective of your intentions, you can still buy the gun.

We need to close this Charleston loophole, and we need to enact a law that says, if you are not qualified to buy a plane ticket, you are not qualified to buy a gun.

A FAILURE OF OUR JUSTICE SYSTEM

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the revelations of the last few days have been, at best, an injustice and, at worst, government corruption of the highest degree.

Earlier this week, FBI Director James Comey acknowledged that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton sent or received 110 emails that contained classified information through her unsecured server. He went as far as to say that Secretary Clinton's actions were ''extremely careless.'' Despite the FBI Director's harsh criticism of Secretary Clinton's ability or inability to protect highly sensitive material, it appears she will walk away without punishment.

In an era where cybersecurity has become one of the most important pillars of U.S. national security, this carelessness is totally unacceptable. What is even more unacceptable is that the Nation's top prosecutor met with Secretary Clinton's husband, former President Bill Clinton, in private 1 week before the Justice Department decided not to press charges.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible Secretary Clinton threatened the security of this great country. There are those who have committed far lesser crimes who have faced far harsher consequences. The Attorney General's decision not to prosecute Secretary Clinton is a failure of our justice system.

In God we trust.

NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, last week on this floor, I told a story of a 911 call that I took where an 11-year-old girl was murdered at the hands of her uncle. Her name was Yajaira. Today I want to tell you about Ethan Esparza.

In 2006, when I was mayor of Pomona, Ethan was shot and killed while he was playing in his front yard during his birthday party. He would have turned 4 years old the next day.

The murders of Yajaira and Ethan were completely senseless, but they are not rare. Every day, 91 people are killed because of gun violence. In the United States, you are more than 10 times likely to die because of a firearm than in any other developed country.

We have a problem, a problem that isn't going to be solved by simply putting our heads in the sand. It is time to stop this silence. We aren't going to solve this. Now is the time to act. Now is the time to have a discussion about it.

REMEMBERING PENN STATE STUDENT MADISON HILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of 19-year-old Madison ''Maddie'' Hill, a student at Penn State University, who, sadly, passed away after a long battle with cancer last week.

Madison was not originally from Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. In fact, she was a native of York County, but she was no stranger to Penn State University even before she started classes there as a student.

Following her cancer diagnosis, Madison benefited from the Penn State IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon, or THON, the largest student-run philanthropy in the world, which raises funds and awareness for the fight against pediatric cancer.

Upon enrolling in Penn State, Madison worked to provide that same support for other cancer patients as a volunteer and family relations co-chair with THON. She was also a member of the university's Blue & White Society.

I join the entire Penn State community in mourning the loss of Madison and offer my thoughts and prayers to her family and friends.

□ 1215

FOUR-YEAR-OLD BOY SHOT IN ALTADENA

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning, I woke up to the news that, overnight, a 4-year-old boy in my district, in Altadena, California, became one of the latest victims of gun violence.

Salvador Esparza III was sitting on his front porch with a family friend when a car drove up, fired at least 13 rounds, and drove off, leaving two bodies. Hours later, we finally heard the tragic news. Little Salvador was dead. I was heartbroken.

Now, I know the doctors did everything they could to save his life. But what are we doing in Congress? Nothing. Another life cut short, another family torn apart, another day of silence from Congress.

The NRA tells us the solution is more guns. Well, we already have more guns than any other country in the world, and it is not working. Having more guns would not have helped 4-year-old Salvador. But we could have.

Enough is enough. We must pass no fly, no buy and we must pass universal background checks.

AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, this week marks Aquatic Invasive Species Awareness Week.

This is a good time to consider the threat that invasive species pose to all of our districts. Northern Michigan's economy depends on the Great Lakes and our beautiful outdoors. Invasive species represent a direct threat to our way of life.

Even before I came to Congress, I was working on invasive species issues. I live on an inland lake, and we had a really difficult invasive weed get out of control. I have been working for years with my neighbors to control it, so I know just how difficult, and important, it is to get local buy-in for this fight.

Volunteers throughout northern Michigan are working right now to attack invasive species on the ground. State officials are working to educate the public on how we can lessen the chance of spreading these invasive species.

These efforts are in addition to the great work in my district by professionals at institutions like Northern Michigan University and the Hammond Bay Biological Station.

I hope this week we will bring further attention to this fight and help Congress to focus more resources on this issue.

ADDRESSING THE URGENT NEED TO PASS NO FLY, NO BUY AND BACKGROUND CHECKS

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to stress the urgent need to pass legislation to keep our communities safe from those with evil intent and who wish to harm innocent Americans.

I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, and I believe we must uphold the tradition of my home State of New Hampshire for responsible, law-abiding gun ownership. But as we saw in Orlando, it is far too easy for individuals with evil intent to get ahold of firearms and target innocent American lives.

That is why I strongly urge my colleagues to pass legislation to ban those on the terrorist watch list from purchasing guns. What is more, we must increase background checks to prevent tragedies like the one in my home State of New Hampshire in 1997, when an incredibly disturbed man fatally shot Judge Vickie Bunnell, two State troopers, and a newspaper editor. Individuals like this should not be given access to lethal weapons. Rather, we should give access to mental health treatment.

Let's put aside party politics and do what is right to keep our communities safe.

NETWORKS' COVERAGE OF ORLANDO ATTACK BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Media Research Center recently issued a report highlighting the three major news networks' slanted coverage of the Orlando terrorist attack.

The Center found that ABC's, NBC's, and CBS' broadcast network programs ''flooded their shows with statements favoring gun control over gun rights by a ratio of 8 to 1.''

The Orlando attacker was a radical Islamic extremist who pledged his allegiance to ISIS before committing the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil since September 11, 2001. Instead of focusing on gun control, the liberal national media should tell the American people the full story about the Orlando attacker's radical Islamic views as the cause of these killings. Not a single gun control measure in Congress would have prevented his actions.

GUN LOBBY

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, gun violence permeates every aspect of our lives, from the streets of Chicago to law enforcement officers to Congress. Everybody is affected by what is going on. But we can do something about it by passing two bills that we have been talking about: the no fly, no buy and universal background checks. Neither is a solution to the entire problem, but both are good steps.

The reason we haven't done anything is simple: the $15 million a year gun manufacturing industry. And by preventing action here through their campaign donations and Capitol Hill lobbyists, they are controlling the discussion.

When I can't act, when you can't act, this House is being controlled by the gun industry. We—all of us, on both sides of the aisle—are looking to blame each other when the real culprits are the gun manufacturers.

REPLACE OBAMACARE

(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, ''Do Democrats really realize how difficult it has been on working-class Americans to finance ObamaCare?''

This question was asked at a townhall with a Democratic nominee by an Ohio woman who saw her premium more than double, from $490 a month to $1,081 a month. The answer she received? Just keep shopping on the exchange until she finds a better deal.

For the millions of Americans who continue to see their costs skyrocket, this is not an acceptable answer. From losing coverage, soaring premiums, and excess regulations, this system is simply unsustainable.

Rather than propping up a failing system with temporary, costly fixes, let's replace it with the patient-centered policies that actually work. That is what Republicans are proposing to do. One with more choices, not mandates, one that increases flexibility in coverage, spurs competition so rates will go down and not up, and puts doctors and patients, not D.C. bureaucrats, back in charge of healthcare decisions.

These are just some of the commonsense ideas Republicans are advancing, and they really do represent a better way for people's choices.

ObamaCare has not, is not, and will not work. Let's start giving people more choices and the answers they deserve.

KEEP AMERICANS SAFE FROM GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge Speaker RYAN to bring commonsense gun violence prevention legislation to the floor this week.

Justice will never be served for the victims of Tucson, Aurora, Newtown, Charleston, San Bernardino, and Orlando as long as this body refuses to act and once again accepts the status quo.

I support the Second Amendment and the right of Americans to own firearms, but I believe it is the responsibility of this body to ensure effective laws are in place to keep all Americans safe from gun violence. Congress did nothing after 20 children were fatally shot in Newtown in 2012, and nothing following what happened in Orlando, where 49 innocent people were murdered.

Congress must pass legislation that will require comprehensive background checks and close the gun show loophole. That is why I am a cosponsor of the Thompson-King legislation. We must make progress in gun safety and mental health awareness and support gun safety lock laws.

PRAYERS FOR BEN CRAIG

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ben Craig, a longtime community leader in Overland Park, in my district, who is, sadly, battling liver cancer. Ben is known around town as the ''Grandfather of Overland Park'' and ''Mr. Johnson County.''

As a founder of the Overland Park Chamber of Commerce, he helped develop and expand Johnson County Community College, a crown jewel in the metro area. As a member of our Rotary Club, Ben has set the bar pretty high, with 52 years of perfect attendance.

Ben truly embodies our Rotary motto ''service above self.'' Whether it was raising money for the college, Harvesters, or for one of my family's favorite destinations and landmarks in Overland Park, the Deanna Rose Children's Farmstead, he encourages others to step up and be part of our community and to give back.

I consider Ben a mentor and friend, and I am grateful to know him. His impact will be felt for generations.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saying a prayer for Ben and his family in these hard times as he fights against this horrible disease.

VOTE ON COMMONSENSE LEGISLATION

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Massachusetts has enacted some of the most comprehensive gun violence prevention laws in the Nation, including universal background checks.

Thanks to these commonsense reforms, Massachusetts has one of the lowest rates of gun deaths in the Nation. Nevertheless, lax gun laws in other States make us a net importer of firearms, and we are certainly not immune from the tragic impacts of gun violence.

Americans have a right to be free from violence in our own communities, in our homes, in our schools, in our churches, and in our workplace. But it is clear that the States cannot do it alone. Congress must do more to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. You can't know if someone falls into one of these categories without a background check.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents sent us here to cast a vote on their behalf, and that is what we should be doing. Let us have a vote on commonsense, bipartisan legislation that allows background checks for all gun sales.

WHERE THERE IS HELP, THERE IS HOPE

(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, today, there are over 11 million Americans struggling without proper treatment and care for mental health illnesses.

Our system is riddled with inefficiencies, as various agencies patch together different programs with little to no coordination. Because of this massive failure, patients far too often end up in the criminal justice system or on the streets, because the services are just not available.

This week, Congress took decisive action to fix this problem by passing a bill that I helped introduce with Representative TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, 422–2. Our bill will genuinely save lives and improve the quality of life for families all across this Nation.

The bipartisan Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act is a perfect example of what we can accomplish when we set aside partisan differences and get to work for the people that we represent. This bill prioritizes treatment to proactively prevent tragedy, emphasizing programs and resources that focus on getting patients the care they need.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill takes mental illness out of the shadows of ignorance, because we know that where there is help, there is hope.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I joined my colleagues in an historic sit-in on the House floor, demanding action on gun violence in the wake of yet another mass shooting. Since then, I have heard from hundreds of Rhode Islanders who, like over 80 percent of Americans and a high percentage of gun owners themselves, support our efforts for commonsense legislation to keep guns out of the wrong hands and to address this public health crisis.

Frustratingly, sadly, and inconceivably, Republican leaders in this Chamber continue to ignore the demands of the American people and, most especially and sadly, continue to ignore the pleas of so many victims of gun violence and their families.

Republicans trot out old, tired arguments, saying that we oppose the Second Amendment, that we oppose due process, that backgrounds checks are ineffective. Mr. Speaker, these assertions are simply not true. But rather than allow an open debate and a vote, Republicans continue to follow the playbook of the gun lobby.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will not allow silence to fill that void of leadership.

Until the House acts on meaningful gun violence prevention legislation, my colleagues and I will continue to speak for Americans who demand action. We will be silent no more.

□ 1230

MICHELLE KELLY-LOVE WAS NOT JUST A NUMBER

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, this is a photo of my former coworker, Michelle Kelly-Love. Michelle and I worked together at the same company in Los Angeles in the early nineties, and she was kind and funny and warmhearted, a person who was very generous, and a dear friend of mine.

On February 27 of this year, Michelle was dropping off her son, Jordan, at his home in a quiet neighborhood in Carson, California. They were parked in her car in front of the house when they were attacked by a drive-by shooter. Both Michelle and her son were struck multiple times and died at the scene. Michelle's mother, the grandmother of Jordan, was in the back seat and survived.

Michelle's funeral was one of the saddest I have ever attended. She and her son were taken from us so randomly and so suddenly.

You have heard a lot of numbers and statistics related to gun deaths, but Michelle was not just a number. She was friend and a mother and had a long life ahead of her. Her 27-year old son was not just a number.

We cannot stand by and do nothing as our friends and neighbors continue to die. We have lost too many lives to gun violence. The time for action is now. Please.

GUN VIOLENCE LEGISLATION

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I also rise on behalf of the families who have lost loved ones to gun violence, including in my very own district in Isla Vista, California, on May 23, 2014. That horrific act killed 6 and injured 14—young people full of life and promise: Katherine Cooper, Veronica Weiss, Christopher Martinez, Cheng Yuan Hong, George Chen, and Weihan Wang.

When these lives were tragically cut short, our community banded together to say ''Not One More'' life should be lost due to gun violence. But that message has fallen on deaf ears with the leadership of this House, resulting in countless Americans wondering each day if their community will be next. This is simply unacceptable. We cannot delay action any longer.

Mr. Speaker, this House must vote on a bill to address the gun violence epidemic in our country. Americans deserve a bill that will truly make our country safer, and they deserve a bill that seeks to ensure ''Not One More'' can become a reality.

BIPARTISAN, COMMONSENSE LAWS TO PREVENT GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I joined with many of my colleagues here on the House floor to demand a debate on commonsense gun legislation to increase background checks and keep terrorists from buying guns.

Despite the fact that the microphones and C–SPAN cameras were turned off, the discussion we held over the next 24 hours was seen and heard by millions of Americans. It was seen and heard because my colleagues and I took out our smartphones, and we took photos and streamed video, and we tweeted. We posted to Facebook and we broadcast on Periscope.

We call this Chamber ''the people's House.'' In the time that I have been serving here, there has never been a moment that has felt more like the people's House than that 25 hours. Yet now we hear that some are calling for us to be punished for bringing that debate and discussion to the American people. It is ''behavior unbecoming'' of the House of Representatives, they say.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what my colleagues and I did, and if that is what it takes to get us a vote on bipartisan, commonsense laws to prevent gun violence, I hope we will do it again.

GUNS AND OUR PRIORITIES

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong with the priorities in Congress. Time and time again, this body is choosing to put political posturing above the interests, safety, and well-being of the American people.

Earlier today, I attended an Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing that was termed an emergency because the committee Republicans did not approve of a decision by career officials at the FBI and Justice Department to end the email case involving Secretary Clinton. In this hyper-partisan era, that counts as an emergency.

But the continuing plague of gun violence, one that takes over 32,000 innocent lives a year, has been, once again, put on the back burner. There is no sense of urgency. No bill, no vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to take care of the American people's interests.

GUN SAFETY

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, ''Teen killed in shooting that led to crash near ER in Charlotte.''

''Man shot and killed in uptown Charlotte.''

''Man found shot to death in Thomasville July 4th.''

''Man shot in Freeman Mills Shopping Center.''

''Shooting outside Florida Street Grocery Store in Greensboro.''

''Winston-Salem woman caught in crossfire.''

The media and my Republican colleagues have focused attention on which words we have used instead of the need to define the terms. As a former educator, let me define the word ''epidemic.''

Webster defines it as something ''affecting a disproportionately large number of individuals within a population, a community, or a region at the same time.''

The headlines I cited earlier define the term ''gun violence epidemic,'' an epidemic faced in my home State of North Carolina and across this country, an epidemic so vast that it took the life of Kevin Rodas, a 7-year old boy shot while playing in the front yard of his Charlotte home.

Let's cure these epidemics. Pass sensible, bipartisan gun safety legislation to prevent future acts of gun violence like Orlando or the one that took little Kevin's life back in my district.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) 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 7, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 7, 2016 at 11:56 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 38.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 524, COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 809 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 809

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 524) to authorize the Attorney General to

award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution—

(a) the House shall be considered to have: (1) taken from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2943) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; (2) stricken all after the enacting clause of such bill and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4909, as passed by the House; and (3) passed the Senate bill as so amended; and

(b) it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 2943 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from 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. BYRNE. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 809 facilitates the process to allow us to go to conference with the Senate on the National Defense Authorization Act. The resolution also provides for consideration of a conference report related to our efforts to combat the opioid crisis that is wreaking havoc in communities all across the United States.

I want to talk first about the need to get to conference with the Senate on the National Defense Authorization Act. For 54 straight years, the House and Senate have come together to fulfill our most important responsibility: to provide for the common defense.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about regular order. Well, there is no greater example of regular order than the National Defense Authorization Act. This legislation has gone from the subcommittee level to the full committee, to the full bodies of both Houses; and now we need to continue the process by allowing for this House to enter into negotiations with the Senate.

Between the House and the Senate, hundreds of amendments have been adopted to this legislation. Members from both sides of the aisle have had an opportunity to have their input on this legislation, and the separate bills passed both by the House and the Senate have bipartisan support.

Now, there are some differences between the House and the Senate versions of the National Defense Authorization Act, and that is why we have to have the conference committee process. This will allow us to iron out our differences.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I can personally attest to just how important it is we get a strong, reform-based NDAA signed into law this year.

Our military is in the midst of a readiness crisis. Aircraft cannot fly due to maintenance issues. There are even reports of mechanics having to take parts off of planes inside museums in an effort to repair damaged aircraft.

Think about that for a minute. The United States, home to the greatest fighting force on the face of the Earth, is having to use plane parts from museums in an effort to keep some of our aircraft operational. That is simply stunning.

And readiness is so important these days given the serious threat posed by radical Islamic terrorism. Every morning, it seems we wake up to reports of another attack. Whether it is in Bangladesh, Baghdad, Istanbul, Kabul, Saudi Arabia, or right here in Orlando, or San Bernardino, these attacks just reinforce the fact that radical Islamic terrorism must be defeated.

The NDAA is also important because it is a great opportunity to put reforms in place at the Pentagon. Whether it is reducing bureaucratic obstacles, improving military health care, or updating the command structure, the NDAA is the perfect tool to ensure efficiency and effectiveness from the Pentagon.

So I hope my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will join me in voting to get us to conference so we can keep the streak alive of passing a strong NDAA each year.

The other portion of this rule provides for consideration of the conference report dealing with the opioid crisis.

I recently heard a story of a young man from southwest Alabama who suffered an injury playing sports. He was prescribed opioid-based pain medication by his doctor, but, unfortunately, he became addicted. Next thing he knew, his addiction had spiraled out of control and he found himself using heroin. Ultimately, he became seriously ill.

Thankfully, this young man was able to enter a treatment program and receive help, but not everyone who suffers from opioid addiction is so fortunate.

Studies show that approximately 46,000 Americans die because of a drug overdose each year. That number adds up to over 130 deaths a day. Tragically, young Americans are disproportionately impacted.

One of the worst things about opioid abuse is that it can start so innocently. Whether it is a high school athlete who suffers an injury or an individual who undergoes a medical procedure as simple as dental work, no American is immune from this tragedy.

That is why this legislation is so very important. It authorizes new programs and reforms others to ensure that those struggling with opioid addition can get the help that they need.

The bill includes new grants to States to carry out comprehensive opioid abuse responses with education, treatment, and recovery efforts, and prescription drug monitoring programs.

The bill also has multiple provisions dealing with prevention, including a new intergovernmental task force to identify, review, and, as appropriate, determine whether there are gaps or inconsistencies between best practices for chronic and acute pain management.

Treatment and recovery are also a priority, with reforms to multiple existing grant programs and a new grant program to provide grants to community organizations to develop, expand, and enhance recovery services and build connections between recovery networks, including physicians, the criminal justice system, and employers.

□ 1245

The bill also helps women, families, and veterans. This includes reauthorization of a grant program for residential treatment for pregnant and postpartum women who have an opioid abuse disorder and a new pilot program to enhance the flexibility of funds so States can more broadly support family-based services for pregnant and postpartum women and their children.

Moreover, this bill contains other commonsense reforms such as clarifying that pharmacists coordinating with a doctor and patient may not fill the entire amount of a prescription for a Schedule II substance, such as opioids.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the numerous and important pieces of this legislation. I am pleased to report that 200 different organizations from every corner of our country have already come out in support of this conference report.

Now, this bill probably doesn't do everything that every Member would like for it to do. In my time up here, I have yet to see a perfect bill. But this is a good bill, and I honestly doubt there is anything in this bill that my colleagues disagree with.

I understand some of my colleagues have concerns over funding, but let me remind my colleagues about the important distinction between appropriations and authorizing. This bill authorizes programs to address the opioid crisis. The Appropriations Committee has made clear that they are going to do everything that they can to provide funding for these programs, and I take them at their word. But putting funding in an authorization bill is not the proper way to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I worry we are seeing a larger issue here that started with the Zika virus legislation a few weeks ago. My colleagues on the other side demand action on issues, the process plays out, the House and Senate work together on legislation, and then my colleagues on the other side announce their opposition to very similar bills to the ones they previously supported.

Let's not forget that the House passed our opioid legislation by a vote of 400–5, and the Senate passed their bill by a vote of 94–1. Neither of those bills included funding. So it is stunning that now many of my colleagues on the other side say that they are going to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I worry that this is about politics instead of policy. I fear that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want an issue to debate on the campaign trail instead of actual solutions to the problems facing our country.

I sincerely hope that that is not the case because the American people deserve better than that. They can turn on their TVs every night and get enough political theater. But here in this body we should rise above that temptation and actually work on solutions.

The minority will not get everything they want. That is the nature of compromise, and that is the realty of being in the minority. But this has been a truly bipartisan process, and I hope it will not fall victim to political grandstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 809 and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today providing for consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017, a bill that the President has said he would veto, and the conference report to accompany S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016. Many of us support the underlying bill, but, unfortunately, it doesn't allow for—despite nine times having funding being waived—any funding to deal with defeating the cycle of addiction or the health issues around opioid abuse. So while it is an innocuous bill and might help a little bit, it is in no way commensurate with the challenge that families across our country face in dealing with opioid addiction.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would require the House to consider the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation which would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

My amendment would not prevent the House from considering either of the underlying measures of this rule. It would simply give the House an opportunity to finally vote on keeping terrorists from assembling arsenals of weapons legally in our country.

Mr. Speaker, we can't wait any longer for Congress to take meaningful action.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Without question, the NDAA is a very important and serious bill. However, the bill before us today is one that the President has said he would veto. I have argued on this floor in an amendment that I supported a 1 percent cut to the authorization levels. By spending more on the military than we can afford as a country and plunging ourselves deeper into debt, we make ourselves less secure, not more secure. By making ourselves economically beholden to countries like China and Saudi Arabia, we are less secure rather than more secure. Frankly, this bill is more of the same, and if it passes and were to become law—which it won't because the President would veto it—it would also make it less secure.

But this rule and this day it is notable for what we are not doing rather than what we are doing. We are not under this rule considering two simple, plain, commonsense pieces of legislation that everybody knows will help protect American lives and prevent terrorist attacks in our Nation. One is simply to require a background check when a person obtains a gun. Another would prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals of weapons.

In my home State of Colorado, we already have universal background checks, and they have led to law enforcement arresting 114 fugitives since the beginning of the year.

It is our duty to simply vote on these bills that strengthen and enhance our Second Amendment rights by ensuring that law-abiding gun owners will continue to be able to purchase guns and keeping guns out of the hands of violent criminals and those who don't have the legal right to own them. Both of these bills do this, and each has over 100 cosponsors, including Members on both sides of the aisle.

As we stand here today, we are still reeling from the deadliest mass shooting in our country's history nearly 1 month ago. Pulse nightclub in Orlando was a targeted act of terror against the gay community, our allies, and the entire Nation.

In my home State of Colorado, we have been hard hit with mass shootings: Columbine, Aurora, and the Planned Parenthood center in Colorado Springs to name a few. It is time for action, and the simple, commonsense measures before us offer a good first step to ensure that we get that done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Xavier Arnold, a victim of gun violence who never ever received a moment of silence on the House floor.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend for one moment.

The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Kelly Russler; Jayden, her son, and Laing, her son; victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. She is a leader on the issue of reducing gun violence.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background check legislation to honor the memory of Serge Pierre Dumas, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. I ask the gentleman from Alabama: How many of us have to come down requesting this until you grant it?

Well, your silence speaks words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation in honor of the memory of my friend, Michele Love, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. She is a leader on the issue of reducing gun violence.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation in honor of Elizabeth Janie Woods, a victim of gun violence who never received a single moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Trooper Chad P. Dermyer, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Jamie Wilson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Mr. Rayland ''Ray Ray'' Maryland, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many people we need to have more come down here until our request is granted?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BYRNE. May I ask the Chair if I am on the time of the gentleman from Colorado in answering his question?

Mr. POLIS. You are. It is my time. I am yielding for an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is speaking on his time.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, the parliamentary inquiry in his asking about the time should not be detracted from my time, so that, as well as this, need to be subtracted.

Now, we go back to my time, and I yield to the gentleman to ask him how many people we need to come down here so we can have our vote?

Mr. BYRNE. We are here today to consider——

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, that is not an answer. It is a simple question with a number.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Davon Jones, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Dajae Coleman from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Keiwuan Murray, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Dana Rhoden, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (MICHAEL F. DOYLE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Gino Nicholas, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I just received devastating news in a story that was just broken by Politico: House Republicans indefinitely delay gun control votes. They have indefinitely postponed a vote on the antiterrorism package leaving Congress with no legislative response to last month's massacre in Orlando.

□ 1300

I would hope that this new information will lead the gentleman from Alabama to consider this very important request from my colleague, Mr. HUFFMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Tanya Skeen, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, given the new information that I entered, with regard to what has just broke a the Politico article, I think it would be important to hear from Mr. BYRNE again about whether he would entertain a unanimous consent request at this time, understanding his previous answer was no.

So I would like, Mr. Speaker, if you will, you to pose that question to him for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Colorado yielding to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. POLIS. I am not yielding. I am asking the Chair to confirm that, in fact, his stated preference is still valid, and if he would ask the gentleman from Alabama if that is still the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is still the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Alabama will not yield for such a request.

Therefore, the previous unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Delhaun Jackson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Damond Dawson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Hanna Rhoden and Christopher Roden, Sr., victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many people we need to have come down until the gentleman from Alabama would be willing to simply entertain a unanimous consent request to have the vote?

I understand that the gentleman from Alabama is opposed to the underlying measures. If a majority of the House is, so be it. But at least I would like to know how many requests we need to make until we can simply have this vote.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama for an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair continues to understand that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for the purpose of these unanimous consent requests.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the gentleman from Alabama from my time to ask how many more unanimous consent requests we need to have until we can have this vote.

Reclaiming my time, his silence continues to speak volumes, as does the silence of the Republican majority and the Speaker in the wake of an unprecedented wave of violence and terrorism in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Anpha Nguyen, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Andres Camacho, III, the son of a dear friend of mine and a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Chris Rhoden, Jr., a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Natalie, Sienna, and MJ Srinivasan with the shooter Jeremy Srinivasan, three victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Rheba Mae Dent, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Angelo Barboza, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of AJ Boik, the nephew of a friend of mine, Police Sergeant Dave Hoover, who was killed at the Aurora movie theater during the premier of the Batman movie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Kenneth Rhoden, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Roosevelt Burns, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor. God bless Mr. Burns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Lizzy Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation. I do so, Mr. Speaker, in honor of Shelly Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire again of the gentleman from Alabama how many more requests we need to make until this very simple request is granted to allow us a vote on these bills.

I am happy to yield for an answer as to how many more people we need to request a vote on these bills.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here today on House Resolution 809——

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I am in control of the time. I yielded for an answer. The gentleman from Alabama didn't give it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorism.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Roderick Nelms, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for a unanimous consent request to prevent terrorist attacks in our country.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Recco Cobb, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Carolyn Ann Sanders, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, now that, in addition to so many rank-and-file Members having made this request, the Democratic leader and the Democratic whip have joined in this request personally and have come down here, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he would be willing to consider the unanimous consent request at this point.

I am happy to yield for an answer.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 809 is on the National Defense Authorization Act——

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, again, I think no matter how the gentleman from Alabama says it, the simple translation of that is: no, we won't consider that request.

So at this point, we have a very important request that would save lives and help prevent terrorist attacks in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Devin Hamb, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Billie Jo, Courtney, and Collin Hettinger, victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader, for a unanimous consent request to fight terrorism.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3051, a bill that would close the Charleston loophole that allowed the assassination of Reverend Clementa C. Pinckney and eight of his parishioners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to save lives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. First, the Chair will make an announcement.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, and March 26, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such a request constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that the various speakers have not embellished to this point; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not deducted time to this point.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Laquan McDonald, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Gladys Tordil, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for a unanimous consent request to fight against terrorism and save lives.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Mike Dawid, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Cora Wilson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, that strikes close to home, I would say to Mrs. DAVIS. That is the name of my daughter as well, Cora; so that is particularly emotional to me as a father.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Alicia Norman, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up

H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Reid Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received his moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request to combat the terrorist threat to our country.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Zanyrah Taylor, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more motions for unanimous consent we need to make until it is granted and we, simply, allow an up-or-down vote on this issue?

Again, the silence speaks volumes not only from the gentleman from Alabama but from the Republican majority that continues to prevent a vote on these commonsense measures to reduce deaths and violence and terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Malcolm Winffel, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. He is the chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—because it is more than just time for a moment of silence—that we bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Shannon Johnson, a victim of gun violence, who died during the mass shooting in San Bernardino, California, who never received a moment of silence on this House floor, to dignify the passing and the need to do something for him and his family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, which is the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation. I do so to honor the memory of Welland ''Buddy'' Short, a victim of gun violence who, himself, never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Gerardo Hernandez of Chatsworth, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Justin Michael Murray, from my district—a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Councilman James E. Davis, who was assassinated at the New York City Council on July 23, 2003, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor his memory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorist attacks in our country.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jerome Wright, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jadarrion Spinks, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, given that not only have we had so many Members from across the country make this unanimous consent request but that they have been joined by every member of the Democratic leadership, I inquire of the gentleman from Alabama if he would be willing to entertain the next unanimous consent request that will be made shortly by the gentlewoman from California.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here to speak on House Resolution 809, the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. POLIS. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), who has a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorist attacks.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Kiara Kinard, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Mercy Cordova, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence here on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

I point out, on my own time, that granting this request does not take away from considering the other two underlying bills. They, too, will be considered, but it simply means that these additional two bills to reduce gun violence, preventing terrorists from assembling arsenals legally in our own country, and making sure that convicted felons can't legally acquire firearms, are common sense. I think they

would pass this House fairly overwhelmingly.

We are simply saying, in addition to the bills that are already being considered—which some of us may personally be opposed to in the case of NDAA, but we are not standing in the way of those. We are simply allowing for the consideration of these additional bills.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request only, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Gary Rhoden, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for a unanimous consent request that would prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals that they would use to cause harm to our fellow Americans.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Jones Pidcock, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was truly hoping that the motion by Ms. TITUS would be accepted because, frankly, Ms. TITUS' unanimous consent request would have saved lives, prevented convicted felons from acquiring firearms and would have prevented people on the terrorist watch list from silently assembling arsenals for them to commit terrorist acts in our country.

While I am disappointed that Ms. TITUS' unanimous consent request was rejected out of hand, I yield to—and I am hopeful that the gentleman from Alabama will accept—the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Christopher Houston, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BYRNE. I do not.

Mr. Speaker, I note far the record——

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to bring the House to order.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized on his own time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I note for the record that the Member who just spoke has made the same unanimous consent request three times. I would also note that other Members have made the same unanimous consent requests multiple times, and the Chair has indicated that he cannot entertain that request.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, at some point, this ceases to be an effort to debate the issue before the House and, rather, becomes an effort to obstruct the House from completing its work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how is the gentleman from Alabama able to seize my time before I have even made my opening statement and simply speak on his own time while I control the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was alternating recognition between the minority manager and the majority manager. The gentleman from Alabama was recognized using his own time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have a gentleman with us here today from the great State of Missouri, who has a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorists from doing harm to our fellow countrymen.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Michael Brown, one of my constituents and a victim of gun violence at the hands of a trigger happy policeman. Michael Brown never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from Missouri will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

□ 1330

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out on my own time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Alabama mentioned the word ''obstruction.'' And, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to consider—and, Mr. Speaker, I would like the American people to consider—who and which party is obstructing here when there is a very simple request for a vote that so many Members of this body feel fervently about.

Those who stand in the way of that vote are those who are obstructing, not those who simply seek a vote to prevent terrorists from acquiring explosives and firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jordan Croft, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Lana Carlson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how long he plans to continue obstructing this body and preventing this body from going about its business to vote on these underlying bills by objecting to these very simple, commonsense, unanimous consent requests to prevent terrorists from acquiring explosives and firearms.

Again, the silence speaks volumes. It sounds like the Republicans and the gentleman from Alabama plan on continuing to obstruct this body from going about their business.

However, luckily, thanks to the gentlewoman from New Jersey, there is another chance for this body to accept a very important unanimous consent request.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Tre Lane, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request to prevent terrorists from silently acquiring arsenals that they would kill our fellow Americans with.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation.

Here is Zina Daniel, who was murdered when her ex-husband bought a weapon from the Internet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are joined by the ranking member of the Rules Committee, and I hope that my colleague from Alabama will be willing to grant her very important request that she is about to make that will prevent convicted felons from acquiring guns legally and also help keep explosives and weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Valerie Short, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for the purpose of a critical and timely unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, a bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Kendrick Forrest, a victim of gun violence from my district who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the face of Republican obstructionism on this important issue, I am joined by a colleague from the great State of California. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request in an attempt to break through this gridlock.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jerry Nguyen, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Simon Carrillo, a victim of gun violence who never received his moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, would that we run out of victims. Mr. Speaker, would that we run out of victims, but, tragically, that is not the case.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Davon Barrett, a victim of gun violence who never received his moment of silence here on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of two of my constituents: former Deputy Sheriff Rick Del Fiorentino and former Fort Bragg Councilman Jere Melo. They are both victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) who has a very important and timely unanimous consent request to prevent terrorists from acquiring arsenals to attack our fellow Americans.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Kenneth Cornelious Loggins, a victim of gun violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) who has a very important and timely unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Joanne Woods, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) how many more Members need to make this very simple request until it is a simple courtesy they agree to simply hold these votes.

I would be happy to yield for an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado yields to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I hear nothing but silence.

Mr. BYRNE. Well, I thought he yielded to me for——

Mr. POLIS. Not to yield for an answer—absolutely. How many more——

Mr. BYRNE. Do you yield or not?

Mr. POLIS. I did. You were standing——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. BYRNE. You didn't allow me to say a word.

Mr. POLIS. How many more requests——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. Do we need to make?

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here to talk about House Resolution 809 that deals with the National Defense Authorization Act——

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BYRNE. And an opioid bill and not anything else. And I——

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BYRNE. I can yield——

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman is out of order. I reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. Yes. And yet the gentleman from Alabama continues to obstruct the consideration of those very underlying measures by not granting this simple request, this very simple request to consider these two bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, a bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Tony and Quinn Carlson, victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) who has a unanimous consent to break through this Republican obstruction and allow these bills to come forward.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of my constituent, Essence Christal, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House Floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Cory James Connell, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Reginald Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to prevent terrorists from acquiring explosives and firearms.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jean Carlos Nieves Rodriguez, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for the purpose of a timely, important, and critical unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Claudina Molina, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) for a unanimous consent request to prevent convicted felons from legally acquiring firearms.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Officer Steven Todd Dooley, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know: What are you afraid of? Why won't you give Officer Dooley his time? What are you afraid of, Mr. Speaker? Bring the bill to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman will be subtracted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, would that we ran out of victims. Sadly, that is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Laseam Hogan from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama: When will the Republican obstructionism end?

I am happy to yield for an answer.

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

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Elton Wayne Madison, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1345

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent that would save lives and prevent convicted felons from acquiring weapons.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Mr. Tevin Eugene Crosby, who was a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor, unlike other victims in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Rigoberto Jose Castillo, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to please bring up H.R. 1217. It is a bipartisan bill, the expanded background checks legislation, and I am doing this today in honor of this beautiful young mother of 2 from Chicago, a victim of gun violence. She never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request only.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, hoping you will change your misinformed judgment, again, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Enedia Branch, a victim of gun violence who never received one moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jamar Small; Tamara, or Tammy, Wilson-Seidle; and both Cristina LoBrutto and Bryan Breen. These are Cristina and Bryan. They are four victims of gun violence from my district who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Alison Parker, a victim of gun violence whose family wants more than a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of 5-year-old Aaron Shannon, Jr., a victim of gun violence shot down in his backyard, who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as someone with a background in law enforcement and someone who lives with the damaging effects of what guns can cause every day, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, also to honor the memory of Doris Dooley, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish that we had the time to adequately remember all of these victims like Doris Dooley and so many others, but given the limited time we have, I think our priority at this point is breaking through the Republican obstruction and achieving a simple up-or-down vote on these commonsense, bipartisan bills.

To that end, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Betty Mungin; her daughter, Alexis Mungin; her daughter, 8-year-old Armani Mungin, victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor. Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Javier Jorge-Reyes, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor. In his memory, we beg the Republican leadership, please, let us have a vote on a bill that has been awaiting passage for years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have been eagerly awaiting the arrival of Mr. KILDEE, and I am glad to say that he is not only here, but he has an excellent idea to break through this Republican obstruction and save lives.

I am honored to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Cederrius Hastings, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the local hometown representative, the esteemed representative from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) who has a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Brishell Jones, who at 16, with her friends, was gunned down in a drive-by shooting, but who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more unanimous consent requests we need to make until the Republicans stop this obstruction and allow the bill to come forward. I am happy to yield for an answer.

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

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, I think it is clear that we will not allow the Republicans to continue to obstruct these commonsense, bipartisan bills to prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals to kill our fellow Americans and to prevent convicted felons from legally acquiring firearms.

We are joined by a leader from New York, and I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan—that means Democrats and Republicans—expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jonathon Edwards, 22 years old, from Georgia. He was a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action here in the House of Representatives. He is deserving of that action, Mr. Speaker. Twenty-two years. No action. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to act. The American people need for us to act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from New York will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, which would fall under the Committee on the Judiciary on which I serve as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, to honor the memory of Ronald McPhatter, a child of some mother and some father, and honor the memory of Ronald McPhatter, a victim of gun violence, who never received a moment of silence or action on this House floor. Ronald McPhatter needs justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from Texas will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to the floor to honor the memory of David Washington. David Washington is a victim of gun violence. He can't speak for himself anymore, and he never received a moment of silence or a moment of action on this House floor, but he deserves one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from New York will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request only that would save lives.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Trayvon Martin from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of

silence on this House floor. And to all the mothers of murdered children in Miami-Dade County and Broward County, I extend to them a moment of silence now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from Florida will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Leatrick Benjamin, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor, let alone a moment of action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of 14-year-old Richard Newton from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor, let alone a moment of action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who has a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Pomona Police Officer Shaun Diamond, murdered at the hands of a Mongol gang member. The silence has to stop. We need action. To honor his memory, I would like the House to take up this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, and this is to honor the memory of Carl Batie, a former Mercer County corrections officer who was an innocent bystander killed in a hail of gunfire in a gang-related fight in the city of Trenton in my district. I do this to honor Mr. Batie, who was that victim, and I do this because he never received a moment of silence and he has never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

□ 1400

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the definition of obstruction in the dictionary is ''a thing that impedes or prevents passage or progress; an obstacle or blockage.''

The only obstruction here is the failure of the Republicans to simply remove that blockage or that thing that prevents passage of this commonsense measure to keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons and prevent terrorists from quietly assembling arsenals to conduct their terrorist acts.

I hope that, now that my colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has joined us and he will be making a very important unanimous consent request in just moments, that will finally allow this body an opportunity to break through this obstruction, move to consideration of both bills under this rule, and move to consideration of the bipartisan bill that will prevent convicted felons from acquiring weapons.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of this brave soldier, Captain Antonio Davon Brown.

I also want to honor the memory of people in my district who were victims of gun violence: Brandon Lawrence, New Rochelle, New York; Charles Smith, Mount Vernon, New York; Wilbert Francis, Mount Vernon, New York; Kevin Shaw, Mount Vernon, New York; Allashun Clay, Mount Vernon, New York.

We want to honor their memories. They are all victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor. We ought to be passing sensible gun control legislation in a bipartisan fashion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from New York will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. DELBENE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Amanda Alvear, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for the purpose of an important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, bipartisan expanded background checks legislation. It is really to honor the memory of Paul Terrell Henry. He was a victim of gun violence in Orlando, who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY), who has a request that will break through this Republican obstruction and save lives, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Landon Dooley, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

Enough is enough. Put this commonsense legislation forward today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). As previously announced the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. It is a new Speaker pro tempore, and I was wondering if the new Speaker pro tempore would be willing to pose a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been informed that the gentleman from Alabama will not yield for the purpose of the gentleman's request.

Mr. POLIS. Very well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) who has a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Elbert L. Merrick, III, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more unanimous consent requests we need to make until he agrees to allow for consideration of this bill.

I am happy to yield for an answer.

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

Mr. POLIS. Sadly, the gentleman from Alabama is unable to reserve or stop criminals from legally acquiring weapons or terrorists from silently assembling arsenals to conduct terrorist acts in our country. The only way the gentleman from Alabama can prevent those acts is to prevent the obstruction of this body by granting this very simple unanimous consent request that is about to be made by the gentleman from Florida.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Stanley Almodovar, III, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Lori Dooley and Brooke Dooley, a mother and daughter, victims of gun violence who never received legislative action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the purpose of an important unanimous consent request to save lives.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Eugene Liscomb, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence and never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Eric Ivan Ortiz Rivera, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence or who never received any action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Luis Vielma, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Brenda Lee Marquez McCool, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more requests we need to make until the Republicans stop their obstructionism and allow a simple vote on the bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Daniel Mauser. He is a young man who was a victim of gun violence at Columbine High School and was the son of a friend of mine, Tom Mauser.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, in a just-breaking Politico article, it says that House leader infighting has forced GOP leaders to indefinitely postpone a vote on an antiterrorism package.

You know, I don't know who is going to tell the terrorists that we are postponing a vote on an antiterrorism package. I would hope that the Republicans would join us Democrats in trying to prevent terrorists from quietly assembling arsenals of explosives and guns and weapons to conduct coordinated attacks on the people of our country—that is what we are hoping to do—and break through this Republican obstructionism on this issue.

Hopefully, there will be a new, breaking story based on the acceptance of a unanimous consent request that is forthcoming from my colleague from Ohio.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan King-Thompson expanded backgrounds checks legislation, to honor the memory of Juan Ramon Guerrero, a victim of gun violence who never received either a moment of silence or a moment of action on this House floor. We ask Speaker RYAN to allow the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Darryl R. Burt, II, yet another Black man who lost his life to senseless violence. He never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. The Chair has stated the last several times that the unanimous consent requests cannot be received. Is it that it cannot be accepted or that it is willfully not accepted by the gentleman from Alabama?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has been yielded for the purpose of debate.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. When a unanimous consent request is made, is it not at the discretion of the gentleman controlling the time, the gentleman from Alabama, to agree to that request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has yielded time for debate only.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Can the gentleman from Alabama accept a unanimous consent request to yield for the purpose of a bill being brought forth?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does the gentleman from Alabama have the ability to yield for that purpose?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has control of the time on his side.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, again, the gentleman from Alabama can agree to these unanimous consent requests. The way that the answer has been framed, he has not agreed to them.

The gentleman from Alabama and the Republicans are obstructing this body and preventing us from going about our business and getting to these bills, but it is certainly well within the authority under this rule for a unanimous consent request to be accepted.

With that, I am actually glad to say we have a unanimous consent.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

□ 1415

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation called the expanded background checks bill, and I do so today in honor of a particular person who was a victim in the Orlando massacre. Her name is Mercedez Marisol Flores, a young woman who has never received her own moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, they could be entertained, if the gentleman from Alabama would simply agree to them.

We actually have a forthcoming unanimous consent request. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you are willing to pose it to the gentleman from Alabama to see if he would, in fact, agree to what I think is a very reasonable request, to bring forward a bipartisan bill.

I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of just such a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Edward Sotomayor, Jr., a victim of gun violence in Orlando at the Pulse Nightclub who never, ever has received a moment of action on this floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be willing to pose the question as to whether that unanimous consent request is accepted to the gentleman controlling the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama will not yield for any such request.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again, I know that the previous Speaker pro tempore had posed that question some time ago; but I was hoping, by this point, the gentleman from Alabama would have been moved to change his position.

I am not going to ask every single time, but I would appreciate if the Chair would pose that question to the gentleman from Alabama about whether he would be willing to accept the most recent unanimous consent request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) to save lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado may yield to the gentleman from Alabama for a response.

Mr. POLIS. I would be happy to yield if the gentleman from Alabama would be willing to accept the unanimous consent request from Mrs. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

Mr. BYRNE. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I will take that as no. And, sadly, we are not about to run out of victims, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background check legislation, to honor, once again, the memory of Carolyn Ann Sanders, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Eddie Jamoldroy Justice, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, so many of us have made unanimous consent requests.

I have asked the gentleman from Alabama how many times we have to make this motion until the Republicans end their obstructionism. I have not received an adequate answer.

I was hopeful that the gentleman from Alabama would have accepted this unanimous consent request by now.

I was hopeful that the Chair would have posed a question to him multiple times, rather than accept his very first answer, now that the Democratic leaders and rank-and-file Members have all come forward in support of bringing forward this bill and breaking through the Republican obstructionism.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying all day to convince the Republican leadership to bring up H.R. 1217. The reason being is that, for the last 3½ years, we have been trying to get a vote on this bipartisan, pro-Second Amendment bill. And in the course of those 3½ years, 34,000 people have been killed in our country by someone using a gun; 34,000. That is someone's child, someone's brother, someone's loved one, someone's wife, someone's husband, someone's partner; and it is absolutely shameful.

Now we heard yesterday on the steps of the Capitol a terrifying story from a woman whose 10-year-old daughter was murdered by someone with a gun, someone who couldn't legally buy a gun because he couldn't pass a background check. He was a felon. But he got around that law because he went online. He found the same gun that you could buy in a gun store online but without the requirement to pass a background check. He bought that gun. He shot that brave woman, and he murdered her daughter.

We can take a step today to do something about that. We can bring up the background check bill. It is bipartisan, pro-Second Amendment. It has 186 coauthors in this House. We can bring it up for a vote, and we can pass it. That will provide the first line of defense against people who shouldn't be able to buy guns from buying guns.

Who are these people? Criminals, domestic abusers, terrorists, those who are dangerously mentally ill. They should not be able to get their hands on a gun.

Now, can we stop it in every instance? No. But we know that background checks work. We know that we can make a real difference.

Every day, every day in the United States of America, 170 felons are stopped from buying guns because of the background check program. Every day in the United States of America, 50 domestic abusers are stopped from buying a gun because of the background check system. It works. We know it works.

Why won't we bring that bill up for a vote?

That woman stood on the steps of the Capitol yesterday. That was a courageous stand she took. She lost her daughter. She watched her daughter be murdered right in front of her eyes. She, herself, was shot. But she is out advocating for sensible, pro-Second Amendment, reasonable gun laws that will protect people. That is brave.

What is brave about avoiding a vote on this bill, a bipartisan bill, a bill that

supports the Second Amendment, a bill that has both Democrats and Republicans as coauthors: 186 coauthors, a background check bill, perfectly constitutional, perfectly reasonable, supported by gun owners, both Democrats and Republicans, supported by 90 percent of the American people.

Ninety percent of the people that we collectively represent are asking us: Do something about this tragedy that is taking place over 30 times a day in the streets of America. Ninety percent. That is unbelievable support.

And what has the Republican leadership done? Nothing.

Thirty-four thousand deaths in the last 3½ years that we have been trying to take up this bill; 1,182 mass shootings since we have tried to take up this bill; 30 moments of silence on the floor of this House; zero, zero votes to protect the people that we represent; zero votes to do anything regarding responsible, Second Amendment gun laws that will protect the people that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, we are not asking for a lot. We are asking for a vote. We know that background checks work. Your side knows it, and our side know it.

One of the previous speakers on the underlying bill today said: It is time to put politics aside and look at the policy.

What in the world is going on with background checks? The policy is solid. They work. One hundred and seventy felons a day are stopped from getting a gun because of background checks. Fifty domestic abusers a day are stopped from getting a gun because of background checks.

It sounds like pretty solid policy to me, Mr. Speaker. It must be the politics on the other side that are getting in the way. And the American people do not want that to continue.

Ninety percent of the people who we represent are with us. They say that criminals, terrorists, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill should not be able to get guns and that the men and women who they send to the Congress of the United States of America should take responsible action to stop that from happening.

Please, give us a vote on the background check bill. Help keep our constituents safe.

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

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

We are here on House Resolution 809. House Resolution 809 deals with two underlying bills. The first one is a conference report related to efforts to combat the opioid crisis that is wreaking havoc in communities across the United States. 46,000 people die——

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BYRNE. I do not.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I am not asking the gentleman to yield.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking you for a point of parliamentary procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is under recognition. The gentleman from California may not make a parliamentary inquiry unless yielded to for that purpose.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. BYRNE. As I was saying, 46,000 people die every year of drug overdose. That is one of the things that is covered in the bills that are underlying in this resolution, and we just had over 2 hours of obstruction to try to keep us from considering that bill.

The resolution also contains the effort to get us to a conference on the National Defense Authorization Act, which is the policy that defends the United States of America. If we want to keep terrorists from murdering people in the United States, we need to defeat them over there so that they don't come over here.

I would ask everybody in this House to get back focused on what this resolution is about: trying to save people who are tragically dying from drug overdose and protecting the people of the United States of America, the number one thing that we in this Congress are here to do.

So I am glad that we are back to that because that is important business for this House.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 809 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 809 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. 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.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5485, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5485.

Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1439

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. RIBBLE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 7, 2016, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 25, printed in House Report 114–639, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a new regulatory action for which the aggregate costs of State, local, and tribal government compliance or private sector compliance, as estimated under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532), will be $100,000,000 or more.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that deals with an issue that quite often comes up on this floor. It is an issue about regulation and overregulation. What this amendment would do is prohibit the administration from using any of these funds to implement a rule that would cost the economy $100 million more. This is kind of like the REINS Act, but the rule doesn't come back for a vote; it is just prohibited.

The reason is there have been so many new rules and regulations that our economy is having a hard time keeping up. Just last year alone, there were 3,400 new rules—administrative rules, not from Congress, but these are from agencies. There were 80,000-plus pages of rules and regulations last year alone, and over half a million regulation pages over this President's administration.

This is having a real impact on the American economy. We have businesses that are having a more difficult time accessing loans to expand their businesses, to grow their innovation, to invest in innovation and create good-paying jobs within our communities. We have an increased cost of financing business expansions and home financing because of the compliance cost of our whole financial sector.

The costs have increased so much because the rules are now so complex and so many that it is trickling down to the business community and to our families. It is impacting our economy.

So I think it is time. At least right now, for a year, in this funding bill, let's take a pause. Let's just take a break on all the regulation. Let's stop, let's review, and then we can have a discussion about how we move forward. But this is a pause on the big regulation.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

It is a surprise to the gentleman that we still have 6 months to go in this Congress and in this administration.

This amendment would limit the administration's ability to propose or finalize important rules or regulations.

The administration issues rules because Congress has conveyed a specific responsibility to them. Rather than enact every contingency into law, we rely on public comment and technical advice to make sure the laws are implemented efficiently.

Taking a myopic view of our Nation's regulatory practices is nothing new for the majority. Time and time again we have seen appropriations riders and authorizing legislation that only looks at the costs associated with agency rules and completely ignores the associated benefits. This amendment is no different.

These proposals overlook the extensive review process that already exists for rules. For example, every new rule is already scrutinized up and down by numerous Federal agencies as well as key stakeholders and the public. For economically significant rules, an agency must provide the Office of Management and Budget with an assessment and, to the extent possible, a quantification of the benefits and costs of the proposed rule.

In accordance with Executive Order 12866, the agency has to justify the costs associated with the rule, and these costs are justified with benefits—something this amendment appears to think don't exist. But that is just false. For example, in its 2015 analysis of the estimated cost and benefits of significant Federal regulations, OMB estimated that, over the last decade, the benefits of these rules outweighed the economic costs by up to 9 to 1.

This amendment would upend years of precedent and could prohibit agencies from revising rules and regulations in response to changes in technology, the economy, or public demand.

Republicans should stop trying to undermine the rulemaking process and should stop ignoring the real-world benefits of these rules to society.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment very strongly, and I urge a ''nay'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), our chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this, and thank the gentleman for bringing this before the House.

We have an administration that just loves to regulate. They love to regulate. They have rules for everything. They have no regard for the cost of the regulations. Small businesses, governments, and States are all hard pressed to do all this stuff. The administration tries to sidestep us by going through executive orders and Presidential memorandums.

All this amendment does is force the administration to seek congressional approval on the most significant of the new regulations.

It is a great amendment, and I urge all the Members to support it.

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that my good friend across the aisle talks about the great review process that we have by Federal agencies. These are the faceless, nameless

bureaucrats who make rules that have huge impacts on our families, on our businesses, and on our economy.

I don't know about you, but people come to me and say: There is a horrible rule. Could you help me out, my Member of Congress? What I do is I write a letter.

We have disenfranchised the American people because we don't make the laws anymore. We have outsourced that to the regulators. Let's take that power back.

When we empower the Congress, we empower the American people to have a say in their government on the rules that have a huge impact on their lives. Let's have the backbone to take tough votes, to say ''yes'' or ''no'' to these kind of rules. But let's not outsource it to an agency that has no relationship with the American people and no accountability to the American people.

This is saying ''no.'' Let's take a stop and let's reempower the Congress to have a say, which, again, empowers the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing. I think it could be December 31 of this year and we would still be trying to find a way to make the President look bad. That is what this is about. It is about this President having an administration.

If it was up to some on the other side, there would be no Federal agencies, there would be no Federal employees, they might invent a new computer that would run the whole government, and the rest of us would just sit around. But be careful, because then somebody would suggest that there should not be a Congress.

This should be left alone. We have agencies. We have secretaries. These agencies carry out. And when they don't carry out to our understanding, believe me, just look at the appropriations bills. There are riders upon riders upon riders to try to undo what is being done, which, in many cases, is excellent work. This is just more of the same.

It may come as a shock to you, but the President is still around for 6 more months and we are around for 6 more months and those administrators are around for 6 more months, so we better learn to get along for those 6 months.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. CRENSHAW OF FLORIDA

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 794, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 27, 48, 53, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 69, printed in House Report 114–639, offered by Mr. CRENSHAW of Florida:

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY OF WISCONSIN

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to the case *Rainey v. Merit Systems Protection Board* (United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; No. 2015-3234, decided on June 7, 2016).

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to enforce section 540 of Public Law 110–329 (122 Stat. 3688) or section 538 of Public Law 112–74 (125 Stat. 976; 6 U.S.C. 190 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the relocation of the Office of Disability Adjudication and Review of the Social Security Administration located at 111 Livingston Street in Brooklyn, New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 11, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,250,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 46, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 90, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES OF CONNECTICUT

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,784,000)''.

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,784,000)''.

Page 114, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,784,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $800,000)''.

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $800,000)''.

Page 113, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $800,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 6, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,300,000)''.

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,300,000)''.

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,300,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 117, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for—

(A) commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract;

(B) violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or

(C) commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property;

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments en bloc. They are noncontroversial amendments that affect a variety of topics, such as whistleblower protection, property disposal, and reducing drug trafficking.

Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to the consideration of these amendments en bloc.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a historic moment, so let's pay attention.

I rise in support of the en bloc amendments. I appreciate the chairman's inclusion of amendments for Democratic Members.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the en bloc amendment. I think it is a fine example of what we can do every so often.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

I rise to support a bipartisan amendment that I have offered with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), which helps communities combat the opioid and heroin epidemic by increasing funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program by $2 million.

Across the country, HIDTA officials are doing important work to curb drug trafficking and bring law enforcement and community stakeholders together to stem the tide of drugs like heroin and fentanyl. Providing these additional resources will allow for even more local partnerships to fight drug trafficking.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

I rise to offer my amendment to the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act to improve the FTC enforcement of the Do Not Call Registry list, and to improve public education about FTC–supported solutions that can block these malicious and annoying robocalls.

Mr. Chair, all of us have suffered the repeated ringing from calls from unknown numbers from robocalls.

It only takes one day sitting at home to realize how invasive robocalls have become. This is what our elderly and retired citizens have to deal with every single day.

Robocall scammers steal over $350 million every year from those who fall prey to incessant calls. Without proper enforcement and support from the FTC, these calls will continue and all of our constituents will continue to suffer. This amendment I offer today would increase funding for the FTC for the purpose of additional enforcement of the Do Not Call Registry and for educating for consumers about their options.

The relatively small increase in this amendment would result in 6.5 percent more funds for enforcement. Since 2004, the FTC has brought in $41 million in penalties. That's a paltry $3.4 million each year. Considering scammers owe the FTC an estimated $1.2 billion in penalties, there's a lot more that can be done.

For the past several years, the FTC has held contests to support the development of robocall blocking apps such as Nomorobo and Robokiller. However, many people don't know that they are free and are effective solutions for some consumers. By allowing the FTC to conduct more education and outreach, this amendment would further leverage existing FTC investment in this area.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. This amendment would provide a significant increase to the FTC's ability to crack down on illegal robocalls and provide our constituents some peace for the constant robocall ringing.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment which would transfer $7 million to the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, also known as HIDTA.

HIDTA coordinates federal, state, and local drug task forces to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking operations.

So many individuals—and by extension, their families and friends—are suffering the effects of drug abuse.

The heroin and opioid epidemic is affecting all of northern Virginia.

But currently, only part of my district is HIDTA-designated.

Two counties—Clarke and Frederick—have not yet received a HIDTA designation.

But I will not rest until my constituents in the Shenandoah Valley are afforded the same resources to combat this scourge.

The funding increase proposed by my amendment will ultimately save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, those of us in this institution talk a lot about how America is a nation of laws.

But unfortunately, a recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that, while we are a nation of laws, we are not a nation of rules. At least not if you are a Federal worker.

My amendment would prohibit the use of funds made available in the underlying bill with respect to Rainey v. Merit System Protection Board.

Allow me to explain the case and why it's relevant to the bill before us today.

Dr. Timothy Rainey is a State Department employee who, while serving as a contracting officer in 2013, was ordered by his supervisor to violate the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Dr. Rainey refused, and in doing so he was removed from his duties.

When Dr. Rainey invoked the ''right–to–disobey'' provision of the Whistleblower Protection Act, the Merit Systems Protection Board ruled that the law only protects him from refusing to violate Federal laws, but not rules or regulations.

On June 7th, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit upheld this ruling.

So what does this mean, Mr. Speaker?

I chair the Financial Services Oversight Subcommittee where we frequently get valuable tips from Federal whistleblowers about questionable and illegal activities at Federal agencies.

This ruling will have the effect of taking away their protections to stand up to bad actors in the Federal workforce.

Let's not forget that our rules and regulations are supposed to be derived from law.

In effect, this ruling will give permission to political appointees and other supervisors in positions of authority to force Federal works to violate the rules and regulations that Congress, through law, directs the agencies to implement.

At the Treasury Department, one of the many agencies funded by this bill, this would mean that Federal workers could be forced to violate sanctions against Russia for its violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity.

Many of those sanctions are enforced through the Code of Federal Regulations pursuant to laws enacted by Congress.

Ultimately, Congress will need to fix the Whistleblower Protection Act.

I intend to work in a bipartisan fashion and with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to fix the Whistleblower Protection Act to address this ruling.

In the meantime, I ask adoption of my amendment to put the House on record that Federal workers should follows laws and rules and regulations.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO for including my amendment into the en bloc amendment to H.R. 5485, the FY2017 Financial Services Appropriations Act.

I offered this amendment to increase the funding provided to the Treasury Department's Office of Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) by $3,300,000. By sharing financial intelligence with law enforcement, private industry, and its foreign counterparts, FinCEN supports financial crime investigations throughout the world. Terrorists' proven ability to move money through innovative means necessitates continued progress in this critical counterterrorism area. The $3,300,000 is needed to enhance FinCEN's supervisory strategy of Money Services Businesses and to meet the growing demand for FinCEN's expanded national security response efforts.

The amendment would offset this necessary increase through corresponding decreases in the funding provided for the ''Rental of Space'' account within the General Services Administration.

Through my work as Ranking Member of the Financial Services Committee's Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing and the Co-Chair of the bipartisan Task Force on Anti-Terrorism & Proliferation Financing, I witnessed the vital work that FinCEN engages in to safeguard our financial system from evolving money laundering and national security threats. By analyzing financial intelligence and sharing it with law enforcement, private industry, and its foreign counterparts, FinCEN supports financial crime investigations throughout the world.

At this time, FinCEN needs additional funding to enhance its supervisory strategy of Money Services Businesses (MSBs) and to establish a specialized response team to focus on high priority threats. This is important because banks are increasingly derisking by exiting the MSB market due to the high risks associated with MSB customers. For example, this is making it nearly impossible for families, charities, and businesses to send remittances to people in Somalia. A specialized response team will encourage banks to more consistently service the financial needs of the MSB market that is seen as higher risk.

In addition, FinCEN could use these additional funds to meet the growing demand for its expanded national security response efforts. FinCEN continues to support the broader Department of Treasury efforts by identifying sources of revenue for organizations such as Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and their attempts to access the international financial system. However, without adequate funding FinCEN will be unable to meet the demand for expanded intelligence reporting and increased investigations into terrorism finance.

As evidenced by recent support to the Paris and Belgium terrorists attack investigations, FinCEN's expertise assisted in quickly identifying links between the two attacks. FinCEN

published 51 reports related to the Paris attacks and 2 reports related to the Brussels attack Many of these reports were generated through engagement with financial institutions by FinCEN, which resulted in increased reports from U.S. financial institutions. Moreover, FinCEN's financial intelligence has played an important role in identifying potential foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs).

With today's increasingly complex and rapidly evolving terrorist networks, we cannot risk our national security by not adequately funding this important Department.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to propose, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any requirement that a solicitation of a proxy, consent, or authorization to vote a security of an issuer in an election of members of the board of directors of the issuer be made using a single ballot or card that lists both individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) the issuer and individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) other proponents and permits the person granting the proxy, consent, or authorization to select from among individuals in both groups.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on an amendment that would prohibit special interests from having their agendas advanced by Washington bureaucrats, and to refocus the Securities and Exchange Commission on its important threefold policy mission: to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and to facilitate capital formation.

Strong and efficient communication between the boards and management of public companies and their shareholders is foundational to healthy capital markets and to maintaining the ability of companies to innovate and to create jobs for everyone.

Fortunately, recent studies have shown that communication between the investors and the companies has actually improved over recent years, and shareholders are now increasingly able to effectuate change without all of the drastic measures, such as launching a proxy fight.

In fact, according to a 2015 report from Ernst & Young, the number of companies disclosing engagement on government topics rose from a mere 6 percent of the S&P 500 companies all the way up to 50 percent in 2015. In many ways, this is a private market at work as investors demand that boards and management be more responsive to their request for how to improve the company and their long-term performance.

A number of regulatory hurdles still need to be overcome to improve the U.S. proxy system, which remains one of the primary ways in which public companies communicate between the two. Back in 2010, the SEC put forth a number of ideas, the so-called ''Proxy Plumbing'' concept release, which explored various ways to improve the transparency, if you will, of corporate government systems here in the United States.

Importantly, the Proxy Plumbing concept release also discussed at length the importance of getting retail investors more involved in the process. For a variety of reasons, retail investors have for years been disenfranchised by the current proxy system, and they rarely exercise the rights of shareholders to engage in improving the way that the companies work.

Unfortunately, for nearly 6 years, the SEC has, and maybe not surprisingly, allowed this Proxy Plumbing concept release to languish and has chosen not to act on it, even on some of the most basic and noncontroversial parts of it.

But then last year, out of the blue, SEC Chair Mary Jo White had directed the SEC staff to develop a rulemaking for what is known as ''universal proxy ballots.''

You ask: What are universal proxy ballots? Good question. Put simply, while they sound quite benign, actually, universal proxy ballots are a means for special interest groups to easily then nominate their preferred candidates to a company's board, and that would fundamentally change things. It would fundamentally change the way in which public company directors are elected here in the U.S.

This is an initiative that has been pushed for years by insiders and special interests. It has also been pushed by a number of activist pension funds, many of which have been horribly managed themselves and now find themselves with unfunded liabilities that threaten the retirement security of the public sector workers over which they were responsible.

The adoption of the universal proxy rule would only increase the likelihood of high profile proxy fights at public companies, which would then serve to distract the employees and management of these companies from carrying out their core mission.

More importantly, it would make the vast majority of public company shareholders, including the smaller retail investor, pay the price for the costs associated with these big fights.

Finally, it is unfair to those investors who do not wish to carry the water for these special interests.

Aside from these specific policy concerns, there are also issues of how the SEC has been prioritizing its finite resources. The SEC recently missed the rulemaking deadline for yet again another congressional mandate to simplify and modernize our current corporate disclosure regime.

This is an initiative that has bipartisan support and would help boost confidence by making quarterly and annual reports more effective for the small investor by reducing some of the unnecessary and the not material disclosures within them.

Unfortunately, once again, the SEC chose to ignore what Congress mandated and, instead, prioritized rulemakings over such things as that universal proxy I mentioned, which, again, would benefit simply a minority of insider special interests over the vast majority of public company shareholders.

This rulemaking should be nowhere on the SEC's agenda. My amendment would simply disallow the SEC from using its finite resources.

I urge all of my colleagues' support.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing the amendment before us. This is a very good amendment. It keeps the SEC on track, it gets them focused on their core dual mission—investor protection and capital formation.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said it more succinctly than I did in the last 4 minutes, and I thank him.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to hear the other side protecting the right of the SEC to do its work when the budget and the bill show just the opposite.

This amendment is yet another attack on the independence and efficacy of the Securities and Exchange Commission. It also represents an attack on shareholders.

When special interests cannot win ballot questions put to their shareholders, they seek protection from Congress to change the rules of the game.

Specifically, this amendment would prohibit the SEC from proposing, implementing, or enforcing any regulatory action on the issue of universal proxy ballots. These universal proxy ballots would let shareholders vote for whomever they wish to represent them on the corporate boards. This is a vital consideration in proxy contests since

board seats and, in some cases, board control are at stake. It would also make for a fairer, less cumbersome voting process.

Right now, there is a two-tiered system governing shareholder elections. Shareholders in attendance at meetings, particularly in proxy contests, have the ability to receive a legal ballot that allows them to pick and choose among all of the candidates who are duly nominated.

□ 1500

Shareholders who are not in attendance do not have that ability and, typically, can only choose from among nominees who appear on management's or a dissident's ballot, but not both. This limits shareholders' choice.

Many advocates and investors, including the Council of Institutional Investors, have written to the SEC and have asked them to address this issue. Indeed, the CII filed a rulemaking petition to this effect. Likewise, the SEC Investor Advisory Committee, which is the group of outside experts tasked with the responsibility under Dodd-Frank to advise the SEC on issues of investor protection, called upon the SEC to take action on this issue.

Corporate governance is only effective when boards are elected in a free and fair manner. The SEC should take steps to eliminate disenfranchisement in proxy contests in cases where shareholders have no ability to ''split their ticket'' and vote for a combination of shareholder and management nominees.

This amendment would curtail the SEC's existing authority in this regard, to the detriment of shareholders and corporate accountability.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) designate any nonbank financial company as ''too big to fail'';

(2) designate any nonbank financial company as a ''systemically important financial institution''; or

(3) make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of such company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I rise to prevent government regulators from expanding the corrupt doctrine of ''too big to fail'' into even greater parts of our economy.

Under Dodd-Frank, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC, has the power now to designate companies as systemically important financial institutions, SIFIs. I have heard it said that the SIFI status does not necessarily mean ''too big to fail,'' but that is a ridiculous claim that is on par with the reassurances that there was no implicit guarantee with Fannie and Freddie. In the real world, the Federal Government will never allow a SIFI to fail. The SIFI designation is nothing less than the government's stamp of approval and the enshrining of taxpayer bailouts. Simply put, a SIFI designation is the guarantee that the taxpayers will, once again, be on the hook for the bailouts of Wall Street.

First, megabanks were designated as ''too big to fail.'' Now FSOC is claiming that nonbank firms, such as insurance companies and asset managers, should also be designated as SIFIs. FSOC's words and actions belie its true purpose, which is to grow its regulation of the economy so that every sector of the financial industry is propped up on the backs of taxpayers.

I am offering this amendment to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the SEC, who are both voting members of FSOC, from designating any additional nonbank companies as SIFIs. When companies become SIFIs, they cease to operate in the free market. Instead, they operate under a new system—a system that protects entities by sparing them from the costs and the consequences that other regular companies face in a competitive market. So, over time, the combination of this protected status and the Fed's risk-averse regulation will zap the energy and competitiveness of this company. Simply put, the government will corrupt the private sector, which, in turn, will corrupt the government.

''Too big to fail'' must not take root in the nonbank financial sector. These companies serve as an important counterbalance to the megabanks. You see, Dodd-Frank was built on a foundation of sand—a foundation that mistakenly views the financial crisis as having been caused exclusively by the greed of large financial institutions and that intrusive government regulation would have prevented the crisis by keeping them from making risky investments. So it should come as no surprise that, instead of solving the problem, Dodd-Frank gave ''too big to fail'' the force of the law. FSOC is not working as intended because it is unworkable.

Finally, even with its absolute and unaccountable powers, its faulty premise dooms FSOC to failure. We must prevent FSOC from continuing to dig a deeper hole in free market capitalism and get Wall Street off the backs and out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment before us, and I urge everyone to support it.

Mr. Chair, FSOC is there to mitigate risk, not to just go around looking for people to designate. In our underlying bill, we say that, before you can designate a nonbank, you have to give it the right to cure whatever the problem is. This takes it one step further in asking: Why do we designate nonbanks as significantly important financial institutions?

We ought to focus on where the focus ought to be and just leave the nonbanks out of this.

I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Once again, the chairman said it more succinctly than I. I urge all Members to support the legislation.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, we finally found something we agree on again. This is becoming a habit. We want to keep Wall Street in its place. I wish the gentleman would help us with empowering the SEC to do so.

Dodd-Frank does not designate any entity as ''too big to fail,'' as the Garrett amendment suggests. Instead, Dodd-Frank provides regulators with the tools to address the risks posed by large, complex, and interconnected financial institutions—both banks and nonbanks alike. This is crucial in addressing one of the main regulatory gaps we witnessed leading up to the 2008 crisis. Too many nonbanks were in the shadows, having had escaped critical regulation that could have prevented the crisis.

For example, regulators have already designed AIG as a nonbank systemically important financial institution, a SIFI. Recall that the London arm of AIG's was speculating in derivative products, such as credit default swaps, leading up to the 2008 crisis. By the fall of 2007, AIG Financial Products had already begun a tailspin that helped

spark the worst financial crisis in the U.S. since the Great Depression. By May 2009, various programs of support from the Federal Reserve and the Treasury amounted to more than $180 billion in bailouts to the company.

Other nonbank broker dealers, like Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers, were at the center of the creation of toxic assets, which were central to the crisis and necessitated the need for a Wall Street bailout. The Garrett amendment would stop our banking regulators from subjecting the next Lehman Brothers from heightened regulation. Hedge funds were also key intermediaries in the distribution and structuring of toxic assets. Again, the Garrett amendment would stop our banking regulators from providing the heightened regulation of their operations.

The Garrett amendment is an attempt to roll back the critical rules of the road we have passed in the wake of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression. Large financial institutions are fighting the SIFI designation because they know that being identified as one means being subjected to regulation that is above and beyond current requirements, including ''living wills,'' which will help regulators plan how to wind down the firms in an orderly fashion in the event they become insolvent. The heightened regulation also includes the ability for regulators to ''stress test'' the entity to see if it can withstand financial distress, demand more capital, or to demand more stringent reporting.

Former FDIC Chairman Sheila Bair, a Republican appointee, noted in congressional testimony after the passage of Dodd-Frank: ''Many institutions are vigorously lobbying against such a designation,'' and ''being designated a SIFI will in no way confer a competitive advantage by anointing an institution as 'too big to fail.' ''

The capacity to designate nonbanks as SIFIs is critical to the U.S. financial system for appropriate regulatory oversight. The designation process already has in place multiple procedural safeguards and opportunities for appeal via a lengthy process. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Garrett amendment as it does much more harm than we would think.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, the harm that has occurred is from the Dodd-Frank legislation, and the harm that has occurred by the FSOC designations is twofold.

One, the large one, is the fact that it has given a regulator the ability to put financial institutions and non-financial institutions and their problems on the backs of the American taxpayers, meaning that you and I and everybody who is listening to us may someday have to reach into their pockets and bail out, once again, Wall Street for its bad decisions. That should end now.

Two, the even larger issue, is the failure of Dodd-Frank. In the legislation here, we are trying to fix the fact that it has had a debilitating effect on the overall economy. It has created disincentives in the marketplace, which is bad for the economy, and it is why we are having such a slow growth in the GDP, which translates into less job growth, fewer jobs for the American public, and fewer jobs for your neighbor and my neighbor as well. We need this legislation to fix it.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, the other side doesn't like ObamaCare; it doesn't like Dodd-Frank; it doesn't like the SEC. Maybe I am going to try an amendment on the bailout of the automobile industry to see if they like that one, because that helped a lot of folks.

This amendment is misguided. The gentleman is a good man who honestly believes in what he is saying and in what he is doing, but it is only going to hamper the SEC's ability to do its work. We do that enough in this bill, so it should be left alone. I urge a vote against the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any career appointee within the Senior Executive Service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment with the intent of prohibiting the use of funds in this act to pay a performance award to any senior executive employee within the IRS.

Under the direction of Commissioner John Koskinen, IRS officials have led a coordinated effort to hide the truth about this IRS' targeting of innocent Americans based on their political beliefs. Rather than cleaning up this rogue agency, Koskinen has doubled down on the agency's lawlessness and political culture.

On Koskinen's watch, the IRS intentionally destroyed nearly 24,000 emails from Lois Lerner and failed to comply with a congressional subpoena. To make matters worse, Commissioner Koskinen made a series of false and misleading statements under oath to Congress at multiple committee hearings on this matter.

Koskinen said in March of 2014 that the IRS had turned over all of Lerner's emails and all requested information; yet the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration uncovered more than 1,000 emails that the IRS tried to hide.

□ 1515

The recent transgressions perpetrated by this agency are not only disgraceful, they border on corrupt. The trust Americans once had has been utterly destroyed.

In July 2013, Danny Werfel, Acting Commissioner of the IRS, sought to eliminate bonuses for union employees and senior executives within the agency, sending an email to employees which stated: ''I do not believe there should be performance awards this year for IRS employees, managers, or executives.''

Unfortunately, Koskinen chose to ignore Werfel's attempts to restore trust within the agency. In February of 2014, Koskinen announced his decision to pay out bonuses to senior IRS bureaucrats in order to improve ''employee morale.''

In April 2014, the Treasury inspector general reported that more than 1,100 IRS employees with delinquent tax returns received bonuses of more than a million dollars. That same investigation found: ''2,800 IRS employees facing disciplinary actions received more than $2.8 million in monetary bonuses.''

The Office of Personnel Management reported that in fiscal year 2014 alone, 61.5 percent of all senior executives within the Treasury Department received performance awards.

Lawlessness within this agency should not be rewarded. This amendment seeks to effectuate a policy of accountability and change the corrupt culture of this agency by prohibiting bonuses and performance awards for Senior Executives Service employees within the IRS.

It is unconscionable that Lois Lerner and other dishonest senior officials

within the IRS have received more than $100,000 in bonuses in recent years. Committing perjury, purposely disposing of hard drives and more than 2,400 emails in order to stymie an investigation, and providing an extremely poor level of service to taxpayers doesn't warrant a bonus of even a penny, in my mind.

Fifty-seven Democrats joined every single Republican in seeking to prevent senior bureaucrats within the IRS from collecting these lavish bonuses in the fiscal year 2015 by voting in favor of my amendment that passed the House with strong bipartisan support.

The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste supports this amendment and FreedomWorks is key voting in favor of this amendment.

Once the IRS can prove that it will hold rogue employees accountable for their ineptitude, I will cease my efforts to prohibit these awards.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am going to start backwards here.

We are not going to call for a vote on this, and the reason for it is, when people read your amendment, they are going to realize someone didn't write it correctly. It doesn't speak to the IRS. It actually allows for this cut to be across the board on the whole bill, which should make our chairman not very happy, and I am interested in my chairman's happiness.

I rise to oppose the amendment. This amendment would prevent agencies under this bill from giving employees in the Senior Executive Service bonuses. This seems to be aimed at the IRS since the summary on the Rules Committee Web site emphasizes the IRS, but it would have the same effect across the board.

No one is saying that poor performance should be rewarded, but this takes one class of employees and punishes all of them regardless of their individual merits. It will cause us to lose good employees, which is not what we need.

I realize Members on the other side of the aisle are eager to get their kicks in against the IRS—they even put them in bills when they are not the only ones in the bill—but I argue that this amendment would have unintended consequences.

Rather than somehow making the IRS or any other agency better, this is likely to make it worse. This amendment is going to simply ensure that we have less accomplished employees at the IRS and at other government agencies. It would have a negative effect on recruitment and retention of highly talented senior executives necessary to ensure tax administration and other agency duties. It may also conflict with statutory requirements for SES bonuses that are designed to award strong performance.

I oppose the amendment. It is not well targeted or well thought out.

I think we also should know that this is the one agency that has been reduced in its employee number by the largest in the last few years, so I really don't understand what this is trying to accomplish.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, let me now ask the gentleman from New York a question.

I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to respond.

If you disagree with my amendment and feel that it will have unintended consequences, name the agencies in the bill that you think should be allowed to dole out lavish bonuses to their senior executives.

Mr. SERRANO. I think that if an—

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I am asking the gentleman: Name me an agency here that should not be doling out—

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, with all due respect, and I am not answering the gentleman's question, my role is not to tell you what you should have put in the bill.

Mr. GOSAR. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman from New York can't give an answer—

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I am telling the gentleman from Arizona what he didn't write.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, I think most hardworking Americans would agree that the senior bureaucrats with the Customer Financial Protection Bureau, the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and the Federal Communications Commission should not be receiving lavish bonuses when we are $19 trillion in the hole.

As I mentioned at the outset, the intent of this amendment is to prohibit the use of funds in this act to pay a performance award to any senior executive employee within the IRS. When the staff realized the actual language in the amendment could be more far reaching than intended, we attempted to work with the committee to correct this occurrence.

One thing that this House agrees on is that senior executives within IRS should not be collecting bonuses, and this amendment prohibits exactly that occurrence.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I will be brief.

I don't want to read into the gentleman from Arizona's statement, sir, that you were trying to get the chairman not to notice that you were writing the amendment that he dislikes the most across the board—that we both dislike the most. I just think, you know, what you are talking about is something that, in many cases, has to be looked at. Also, in order to keep good employees, you have to find ways to reward them.

This agency, through the hits it takes, has lost—the one you intend, according to your comments, the IRS—has lost 18,000 employees in a couple of years since 2010, I believe, 18,000 employees. Now we go further here.

Secondly, I am glad to see that you spoke about other agencies, which means you must have read the amendment a little closer. But I still think it is not a good amendment. I still think it should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Members on both sides are reminded to direct their remarks directly to the Chair and not to each other.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment. The Gosar-Bridenstine-Duncan-Gohmert-Huelskamp-Jones-Barletta-Brat-Brooks-Black amendment prohibits funds within this act from being used in contravention of Federal immigration law for sanctuary city policies.

The concept of sanctuary city policies is in direct opposition to the rule of law and our Constitution. Article I, section 8, clause 4 gives Congress clear jurisdiction on immigration matters.

A nation of laws must enforce established law, not seek ways to skirt around it. Sanctuary cities defy Federal immigration statutes by harboring untold numbers of illegal immigrants and providing safe havens for criminals, many of whom are violent offenders.

Our amendment prohibits the use of funds which are appropriated by this act from being used in contravention of

section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. This Federal law prohibits sanctuary policies that prevent or obstruct government and law enforcement officials from sharing information regarding a person's immigration status with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Despite being the law of the land, more than 200 State and municipal jurisdictions across the country have established policies that directly violate the law and shield criminal illegal aliens from enforcement. The shocking case of Kate Steinle in San Francisco in 2015 revealed the danger sanctuary cities pose to our Republic.

Just over a year ago, on July 1, 2015, Steinle was shot and killed by Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez, an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times. San Francisco authorities were asked to detain Sanchez until he could be turned over to Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials. The city declined and held Sanchez in jail for less than a month on a 20-year-old drug charge before releasing him on April 15, 2015, less that 2 months before he killed Steinle.

Sadly, Kate's tragic murder is not alone. Between 2010 and 2014, criminal aliens who were released by DHS went on to commit 124 homicide-related offenses across the country.

Let's not forget the many others who have been killed by criminal aliens: Jerry Braswell, Sr., and Jerry Braswell, Jr., of North Carolina; Dani Countryman of Oregon; Chandra Levy of Washington, D.C.; the Gonzalez family of Texas; Kevin Will of Texas; Christopher ''Buddy'' Rowe of California; Jamiel Shaw of California; Alvert John Mike of Utah; and Grant Ronnebeck of Arizona and countless others.

These brutal murders have called attention to the dangers sanctuary city policies pose to the safety and security of the American people. The Federation for American Immigration Reform supports this amendment stating: ''Gosar amendment 31 addresses a critical public safety problem and sends a clear message to sanctuary city jurisdictions that their dangerous policies are unacceptable.''

NumbersUSA is key voting in support of this amendment and has stated: ''The Gosar Amendment is a targeted approach to sanctuary policies.''

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Gosar amendment to cut off the funding to sanctuary cities through the financial appropriations bill.

When I came to Congress in 2011, I quickly cosponsored the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act, and I have worked to hold these governments accountable ever since. Here is why.

We all know that, for years now, Congress has ceded more and more power to the executive branch. But less talked about is the fact that, for just as long, Congress has allowed more than 200 State and municipal jurisdictions to do the same exact thing. And this is just plain wrong. Sanctuary cities thumb their nose at Congress; they ignore Federal law; and they endanger the lives of their citizens.

While I urge passage of this amendment, I also believe that we must act by passing my bill, the Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act, which takes a broad-based approach to defunding sanctuary city policies once and for all.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for his leadership on this issue. I support his amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, this is one of those moments where you realize that an amendment is put forth not to deal with an issue but, rather, to put it on the floor so you can discuss it.

First of all, this is not the place to discuss immigration policy. And I can tell you that we would both agree that our immigration policy, our program, is broken and it has to be fixed.

Here is the problem, one that I have been arguing for years, and a lot of other people have been doing the same thing for years and lately, and that is that law enforcement officials, for the most part, will tell you that, regardless of whether we deal with the immigration issue or not, they need to speak to the local people and get information so they can do their job.

If they are seen as agents of the immigration department, if you will, the people won't speak to them who are here undocumented. They won't speak to them. So they are faced with a very difficult situation. They are saying: You guys and ladies are supposed to handle immigration reform. Do it. Take care of it. Do it in the way you want. Take care of that. But in the meantime, let me do my job.

So a guy steals a car, and three people in the neighborhood know who stole it. They go up. If they think that that police officer is also enforcing immigration policy, they are not going to talk to him. That is just a fact of life.

So you may think you are doing a great thing, but you are actually hurting law enforcement in the job that it has to do. What we need to do is have an immigration policy that speaks about all the issues that are covered by immigration policy.

Secondly, we hear from the other side about local control, local control, local control. Well, some cities have decided that they are sanctuary cities, that they are going to deal with the immigration issue differently than other people deal in other places—less mean, less aggressive and being nasty, more understanding of a problem rather than just saying that people come here to rip us off.

We have to keep all those things in mind as we look at this amendment, and this amendment should be defeated.

□ 1530

Lastly, your amendment talks about cutting funds, and the gentlewoman talked about cutting funds. To our knowledge, there is nothing in here that funds anything having to do with sanctuary cities or, for that matter, having to do with immigration. So wrong bill, wrong place, wrong time, wrong idea.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to implement, administer, or enforce any guidance with respect to indirect auto lending.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. Chairman, in March of 2013, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau issued flawed and inaccurate guidance that would threaten to eliminate auto dealers' flexibility to discount the interest rate offered to consumers financing vehicle purchases.

Whether a person seeks to buy an automobile, an RV, or a motorcycle, consumers rely heavily on their neighborhood auto dealer to provide them the best possible rate. However, this faulty and unstudied guidance could increase the cost for consumers, ultimately making it more difficult to obtain an automobile.

Roughly 6 months ago, my good friend across the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and I, introduced H.R. 1737, which passed the House with an overwhelming bipartisan and veto-proof vote, 332–96. My bill, along with 13 bipartisan letters sent by Congress over

the last 3 years, gave the CFPB a chance to fix the faulty guidance and reissue it, but, unfortunately, they still insist on an anticonsumer policy and chose to keep their faulty bulletin in place.

In fact, the CFPB has refused to change course even with a solution modeled on the Department of Justice consent order that is supported by auto dealers and lenders and do not resort to eliminating dealer discounts. Congress has given the CFPB an opportunity to correct and reissue their guidance, and that would take into account consumers and bring clarity to the market.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will leave no doubt that either the CFPB will fix this problem they created or Congress will, and if we do it, we will do it in a bipartisan way.

I would like to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Chairman HENSARLING of the Committee on Financial Services for their support. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for bringing this before the body.

Here is another example of the CFPB overregulating, trying to find a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. I support this amendment, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the CFPB from implementing, administering, or enforcing any guidance related to indirect auto lending. This is meant as a shot across the bow to the CFPB, telling them not to bring fair lending cases against indirect automobile finance companies. But on a practical level, the amendment will only invite confusion into the industry.

After all, this amendment does nothing to address lenders' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. Instead, the amendment only strikes guidance the CFPB has provided to those lenders, providing clarity on how they can meet their obligations under the law.

Discrimination in any finance market is unacceptable, and we know that discrimination is still alive and well in the indirect auto lending marketplace. In the three settlements to date against Ally Financial, Fifth Third Bank, Honda and Toyota Motor Credit, the CFPB secured nearly $162 million in borrower relief and penalties, finding that minority borrowers paid more than $200 over the life of a car loan than White borrowers, even when controlling for borrowers' creditworthiness.

Discretionary markups are the source of discrimination in auto lending, and the guidance that this amendment nullifies helps lenders monitor and respond to potentially discriminatory auto lending practices. It is something that we should not be allowing, and this amendment tries to undo a lot of work that we are doing and a lot of work that should be done in the future.

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that there is no place for discrimination. Based on information from the CFPB, CBO expects that the agency would not prepare a replacement bulletin if H.R. 1737 were enacted. That is because the bill would not affect the underlying statute or regulations to implement it. The Bureau can continue to enforce the Equal Credit Opportunity Act without the bulletin. I also remind the gentleman that the minority report also stated that this would not negatively impact the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank Mr. SERRANO for yielding.

You just described this as a shot across the bow to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and you are absolutely right. They are attempting to tell them not to bring fair lending cases against indirect automobile finance companies.

This amendment is about protecting wrongdoers who gouge racial and ethnic minorities with high markups on car loans even when their income, their credit scores, and their financial backgrounds are the same as Whites. The amendment is about protecting companies like Ally Financial, Fifth Third Bank, Honda and Toyota Motor Credit, all of whom have had to enter into settlements with the Bureau over their indirect auto loan practices.

All told, the CFPB, again, has secured nearly $162 million in borrower relief and penalties to help these borrowers. In their investigations, the Bureau found that minority borrowers paid more than $200 over the life of a car loan than White borrowers, even when controlling for borrowers' creditworthiness.

Studies have shown that minority borrowers are less likely to be aware of interest rate markups. According to the Center for Responsible Lending, 68 percent of all borrowers were unaware that dealers have the ability to mark up an interest rate above what a lender offers based on their creditworthiness and the car being sold, but nearly 75 percent of African American and Hispanic borrowers are unaware that the practice of dealer markups even exists.

The guidance that this amendment seeks to nullify clearly outlines steps that lenders can take to protect borrowers from potentially discriminatory lending practices that often occur without the borrower even being aware of it occurring. So we know what the intent of this amendment is, but on a practical level, the amendment will only invite confusion into the industry.

After all, this amendment does nothing to address lenders' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. Instead, the amendment only strikes guidance the CFPB has provided to those lenders providing clarity on how they can meet their obligations under the law. The issue has come up before in this Congress, but no matter where you stood on H.R. 1737, a bill we considered last year, you should be against this amendment.

To the Members on the opposite side of the aisle, you are supposed to have a poverty agenda, and you claim that you are taking on a new direction, that you want to have reduced poverty and deal with the problems of minorities and people in rural communities, et cetera.

This is what keeps poverty in these communities. We have these blue suede, slick dealers of all kinds—whether they are automobile lenders or payday loans or auto loans, all of this stuff—coming into these communities, taking advantage of the most vulnerable people who want to get out of poverty.

You say you want to help, but then you come in and you attack the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You hate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You want to do everything to undermine their authority.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members on both sides are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not each other.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau's guidance was issued without public notice or comment and without any study of its impact on consumers or small businesses.

I want to thank the ranking member for authoring the minority report that states: ''H.R. 1737 does not alter regulated entities' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act or the CFPB's examination or enforcement activity pursuant to ECOA.'' This is nothing more than a continuation of H.R. 1737.

I also want to repeat my thanks to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for helping me with a successful 332–96 vote in favor of that bill. This amendment is almost identical to it, and I would appreciate the ongoing support on behalf of consumers not just in New Hampshire, but all across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would again thank the chair, Mr. CRENSHAW, as well as Mr. HENSARLING, those Members who voted in favor, 332–96, on H.R. 1737. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to propose or finalize a regulatory action until January 21, 2017.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment that prohibits future regulations from the Obama administration. This is a commonsense step to rein in our regulatory system and make it work for the American people and not the other way around.

Since my first days in office, one message I continue to hear is people are tired of an unaccountable government that oversteps its bounds. In April, I was successful in pushing the EPA to withdraw a harmful regulation that would have devastated the motorsports industry. I recently had the opportunity to visit a national leader in custom auto-racing parts in my hometown of Concord, North Carolina. I spoke with one worker who told me that if this one regulation would have gone through, he would have lost his entire livelihood. That, Mr. Chairman, is unacceptable.

The problem is, agencies have moved beyond their constitutional authority, and Washington bureaucrats are accountable to no one. They show little regard for the real world damage of their new rules on working families, on people looking for jobs, on our economy in general.

From regulatory gut punches like ObamaCare and ever-expanding EPA rules, stacking one on top of the other often before the previous rule is even enacted, regulations under this President have woven a web so complex and large, it risks ensnaring every American. This means fewer job opportunities, it means lower wages, and more families struggling.

At its core, overregulation is a form of stealth taxation. Working families, working people are paying the price for every new rule that comes out of Washington.

Now, I recognize some regulations are necessary, but we need a regulatory system that is transparent, one that balances the needs of our environment and public safety with economic strength and jobs, one that benefits hardworking Americans, not big government, big labor, and big business. It is time for us to chart a new pro-growth course away from this administration's burdensome regulations so that Americans can get back to work, and this amendment is one solution.

□ 1545

It will prevent the President from unleashing a new hailstorm of regulations in an attempt to cement his legacy in the last months of his administration. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that there is a new bipartisanship here. I notice that this bill takes effect from now until January 21. So that means we will wait for Mrs. Clinton to become President before any new regulation would take effect.

Secondly, the other side is always complaining about regulations. But every so often, we should step back and, instead of knocking our country so much, kind of pay attention to what some of those regulations have done.

Sure, we have regulations. We have regulations about conditions in coal mines. Is that bad? We have regulations about the water we drink. Is that bad? We have regulations about the air we breathe.

Those regulations make us different from other countries where there is no respect for the population and no protection. There is a regulation that says you have to go to school up to a certain age. That is great. There is a regulation that says no children can be working in factories or in the garment industry in New York. That is wonderful.

So I am not afraid of regulations. Overregulating, okay, we can discuss that. But that side wants no regulation. It wants a computer to run the country. I keep claiming I want to see who is going to invent that computer. Here we go again, just talking about overregulating.

There are questions. This provision, for instance, would also be in direct conflict with other statutory requirements. For example, EPA is required to finalize annual renewal fuel standards regulations by November 30 of each year. I am sure there are others.

This is widely overbroad and can prevent significant regulatory actions in emergency situations, like disaster relief, where required by a court order, or when required by statute.

For another example, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Trade Bureau, or TTB, in Treasury would not be able to publish implementing regulations relating to taxation of cider and removal of bond requirements for small beverage alcohol producers, and numerous other rules, such as a final rule reducing formula burdens on industry for specially denatured spirits and completely denatured alcohol, and the modernization of beverage alcohol.

It is easy to say: no more regulations from October 1 to January 21. Let the next President deal with it. You are rolling the dice, assuming you think you know who is going to be President. But that is okay, I can roll along with you.

The problem is that this is not the way to go. The dislike of the Obama administration by the other side is so evident, especially in amendments like this, where it is directed. At least, to your credit, you had the honesty in you to say the Obama administration. You called it by name, and I respect for you that. Other than that, I don't have a lot of respect for your amendment.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank my colleague for his comments. I do agree that we don't need to eliminate all regulations. That is certainly not what we are saying here. We are saying that, from October 1 until January 21, we don't need new regulations.

With all due respect, I think we have had plenty. The amount of regulations that have come out of the Obama administration has been astounding. If you compare the amount of regulations to all other administrations combined, it is astounding, and they affect every aspect of people's lives.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned regulations in the past have been good. For example, regulating coal mines. I am sure that there were good regulations on coal mines, but we are at the point now where this administration is going to make coal mines illegal.

The gentleman also mentioned, Mr. Chairman, regulating water and air. We certainly all agree that we want clean air and clean water. But this administration issues a clean air regulation, or a new rule, and even before it goes into effect, they issue the next one to reduce the levels even lower—to levels that even experts agree aren't necessary.

In fact, members of the other party, in our hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, testified to the fact that the air today is so much cleaner

than it was before. And science proves that.

In North Carolina, we have got a 20 percent reduction in the coarse particulate matter in our air. We have made great progress, but to say we are going to continue to lower that level even before the science is to determine what the effect of the last regulation was is simply going too far.

What that means is, in places like Montgomery County, North Carolina, where we desperately need jobs, you can't have a new job. You can't have a new road. You can't have a new water-sewer line. You have can't add any new manufacturing jobs. That is ridiculous.

This administration has had 7½ years, and they have used that time wisely if their goal was to overregulate the American people. All I am saying is, in the last few months of this administration, let's put the brakes on.

As my colleague mentioned, we don't know who the next President is going to be. It may be someone from the other party. But that new President will have won a mandate, and that new President can then address the regulatory scheme. I look forward to having that debate. But as far as this administration, the votes are in. We have gotten our results. This administration has gone way too far with regulation.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to put on the brakes and say: 7½ years; enough is enough.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, you know, it is amazing. Many of us—and I am not suggesting you—get elected to Congress, and we are in awe of the fact that we come from where we come when we get to Congress. I am in that category. I am very blessed. There are others who come to Congress, and it seems that they come to Congress to undo Congress and undo the government.

We are the greatest nation on Earth.

How did we get that?

Obviously, the fighting and the working spirit of the American people. But it was also the protections placed on the American people; the fact that children were told you have to go to school, the fact that we try to get the best water.

We spoke before about an immigration issue. I don't call it a problem.

Why does it exist?

Because people still know that we are the greatest country on Earth, and they want to come here.

So a lot of what you see as government intrusion, a lot of what you see as government being a pain could actually be some of the reasons that we became the great country we are. We just didn't let people go on their own and hurt each other, and so on.

We had people elected by the people to say: Hey, hold on. Why don't we do this? Why don't we do that? Why don't we curtail this? Why don't we grow that?

And we continue to do that. So we disagree. I think we are great because we have certain rules to follow. And we follow them well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a rule issued pursuant to section 13(p) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue a rule mandating that public companies disclose whether the minerals they use benefit armed groups in the Democratic Republic of Congo, also known as the DRC, and its nine neighboring countries.

''Conflict materials'' refer to tin, tungsten, tantalum, and gold, which have been used in a huge variety of products, from cell phones, cosmetics, jewelry, chemicals, footwear, and including auto parts made right in west Michigan.

Simply put, section 1502 produced a rule that has failed everyone, and my amendment would, therefore, suspend its implementation for 1 year. The people of central Africa don't want it. President Obama's own SEC chair doesn't want it. Parts of the rule have been judged by the courts to violate First Amendment rights, and businesses throughout America are burdened with a reporting task that even the Department of Commerce has admitted is impossible.

Recently, the European Union—apparently sobered by other own experience in the U.S.—rejected this approach to conflict minerals. It is easy to see why they did so.

As we debate this amendment, let's be clear on what this isn't about. It is not about who cares more about the plight of the Congolese more, a population that continues to suffer violence at the hands of rebel groups. The question is whether a window dressing disclosure rule at the SEC is the way to address this problem. If we truly care about peace in central Africa, then good intentions aren't enough. We have to demand results, Mr. Chairman.

Sadly, we have gotten the wrong kind of results from section 1502. Recently, I spoke with some missionaries from my own denomination who confirmed this. However, let's start by highlighting the voices of those who too often go unheard in this debate—the voices of the Africans themselves.

I include in the RECORD an open letter from 70 Congolese leaders and other regional experts who wrote:

''But in demanding that companies prove the origin of minerals sourced in the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries before systems able to provide such proof have been put in place, conflict mineral activists and resultant legislation—in particular Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act—inadvertently incentivize buyers on the international market to pull out of the region altogether and source their minerals elsewhere.

''As a result, the conflict minerals movement has yet to lead to meaningful improvement on the ground, and has a number of unintended and damaging consequences.''

According to a Washington Post article titled ''How a well-intentioned U.S. law left Congolese miners jobless,'' section 1502 ''set off a chain of events that has propelled millions of miners and their families deeper into poverty,'' with many miners forced to find other ways to survive, including by joining armed groups.

This article goes on to share the story of a Congolese teenager who actually joined a militia because mining could no longer put food on his table. ''If we were earning money more from mining, I would not have entered the militia,'' he said.

I ask my colleagues to remember the Congolese, who aren't alone in their suffering. The SEC rule applies to nine other African nations as if they were all a single country. Section 1502 treats over 230 million people living in 10 distinct nations as one undifferentiated group.

Little wonder that Africans themselves take issue with Washington's one-size-fits-all mentality. In testimony to the Financial Services Committee last November, Rwanda's Minister of State for Mining, Evode Imena, noted that—despite Rwanda's actions to strengthen due diligence in its mining sector, and despite the fact that Rwanda has no armed groups in the first place—''the region is now suffering from an 'Africa-free' and not a 'conflict-free' minerals situation. Section 1502 has caused a de facto boycott by companies in the U.S. and much of Europe on most of our valuable resources.'' This disaster ''has largely

impacted the livelihood of thousands of miners and their families . . .''

The words of Africans harmed by this rule should be enough for us to suspend it. But if we need more evidence of section 1502's failures, let's take a look at hard numbers.

A GAO study found last year that not a single company sampled could determine whether its minerals supported armed groups. Professor Jeff Schwartz of the University of Utah Law School has come to a similar conclusion, after reviewing 1,300 filings under section 1502.

Additionally, I wrote to SEC Chair White asking for a detailed description of the funds and hours expended to date on the SEC conflict minerals disclosure rule. In the SEC response letter, she stated that from July 2010 to March 16, 2015, the SEC spent over 21,000 hours and approximately $2.7 million on this particular provision which the SEC has little to no experience with.

Given the lack of benefits from this rule, it is no wonder SEC Chair Mary Jo White has said:

''Seeking to improve safety in mines for workers or to end horrible human rights atrocities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are compelling objectives, which, as a citizen, I wholeheartedly share. But, as the Chair of the SEC, I must question, as a policy matter, using the federal securities laws and the SEC's powers of mandatory disclosure to accomplish these goals.''

I agree with the SEC, and I appreciate support for this amendment.

AN OPEN LETTER

Dear governments, companies, non-governmental organisations, and other stakeholders implicated in efforts of various kinds related to the issue of 'conflict minerals': In early 2014, two international industry giants—Intel and Apple—issued refined corporate social responsibility policies for minerals sourced in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). The announcements followed an unprecedented wave of guidelines, law-making, and initiatives over the past few years to 'clean up' the eastern DRC's mining sector, and were met with widespread praise.

Perhaps the most widely publicised of these efforts is US legislation known as Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act, which asks all companies registered on the US stock market to reveal their supply chains to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) when sourcing minerals from the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries. Canada is in the advanced stages of developing similar legislation, and many other countries are looking closely at the issue. The European Union has introduced a voluntary conflict minerals regulation scheme for all member states, and the United Nations (UN) and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have developed guidelines on sourcing natural resources in high-risk areas such as the eastern DRC.

These efforts primarily target artisanal (or 'informal') mining in the eastern DRC, due to widespread international recognition that so-called conflict minerals (most notably tin, tantalum, tungsten, and gold) produced by artisanal mining in this part of the world have helped conflict actors generate revenue to finance their operations in the DRC over the past two decades.

THE SITUATION

Despite successes of activists in shaping policy, the conflict minerals campaign fundamentally misunderstands the relationship between minerals and conflict in the eastern DRC. First, while the minerals help perpetuate the conflict, they are not its cause. National and regional political struggles over power and influence as well as issues such as access to land and questions of citizenship and identity are just some of the more structural drivers of conflict. The ability to exploit and profit from minerals is often a means to finance military operations to address these issues, rather than an end in itself. Internal UN assessments, for instance, show that only 8% of the DRC's conflicts are linked to minerals, and specific motivations vary greatly across the vast array of different armed groups.

Second, armed groups are not dependent on mineral revenue for their existence. The eastern DRC is a fully militarised economy, in which minerals are just one resource among many that armed groups—and the national army FARDC—can levy financing from. The M23, until recently the most powerful non-state armed group in DRC, never sought physical control over mining activity.

Moreover, few local stakeholders have been included in on-going international policy-making, and as a result realities on the ground have not always been taken into account. Setting up the required systems and procedures to regularly access and audit thousands of artisanal mining sites in isolated and hard-to-reach locations spread across an area almost twice the size of France would be a challenge for any government. In the eastern DRC, where road infrastructure is poor to non-existent and state capacity desperately low, the enormity of the task is hard to overstate. But in demanding that companies prove the origin of minerals sourced in the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries before systems able to provide such proof have been put in place, conflict minerals activists and resultant legislation—in particular Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act—inadvertently incentivize buyers on the international market to pull out of the region altogether and source their minerals elsewhere.

THE RESULT

As a result, the conflict minerals movement has yet to lead to meaningful improvement on the ground, and has had a number of unintended and damaging consequences. Nearly four years after the passing of the Dodd-Frank Act, only a small fraction of the hundreds of mining sites in the eastern DRC have been reached by traceability or certification efforts. The rest remain beyond the pale, forced into either illegality or collapse as certain international buyers have responded to the legislation by going 'Congo-free'.

This in turn has driven many miners into the margins of legality (for instance, feeding into smuggling rackets), where armed actors return through the loopholes of transnational regulation. Others have simply lost their jobs, and in areas where mining has ceased, local economies have suffered. To put this in context, an estimated eight to ten million people across the country are dependent on artisanal mining for their livelihood. Some former miners have returned to subsistence agriculture, but persisting insecurity levels leave them in abject poverty facing dire living conditions, in fear of missing harvests due to displacement. Others have been prompted to join militias as a means to quick cash in the absence of other opportunities; a particularly perverse impact, when one considers the intentions of the movement.

Alongside the impact on mining communities and local economies, several armed groups have responded by turning to different businesses such as trading in charcoal, marijuana, palm oil, soap, or consumer goods. Those remaining in the mining sector have largely traded mineral exploitation on site for mineral taxation a few steps down the supply chain, operating numerous roadblocks that can bring in millions of dollars a year. Others are reported to have sent in family members or civilian allies to run business for them on site, while they remain safely at a distance.

For the few mining sites fortunate enough to be reached by Joint Assessment Teams responsible for determining their 'conflict-free' status, these teams have been unable to provide the regular, three-month validation visits envisaged in legislation. There is an additional delay of several months following these visits before the Congolese Ministry of Mines reviews and approves the assessment at the national level. Given the speed at which situations can change in volatile environments, infrequent assessments and lengthy delays raise concerns over the accuracy of certification and the credibility of the system.

More worrying still, multinational corporations such as Apple and Intel are auditing smelters to determine the conflict-free status of the minerals they source, and not the mines themselves. As smelters are located outside of the DRC and audits are not always conducted by third parties, these processes raise further concerns over whether conflict-free certifications reflect production realities.

By far the most advanced site in terms of producing 'conflict-free' minerals for sale to the international market is Kalimbi, a tin mining area home to externally-financed initiatives running an industry-led bagging-and-tagging scheme called iTSCi. Yet even here, despite the establishment of a 'closed pipeline' from mine to exportation, the mine still suffers from the sporadic influence of armed actors, and miners are made to bear the additional costs of 'conflict-free' schemes. This raises further concerns over the credibility of the system in place, and its suitability for the scale-up and expansion to other, more remote mine sites currently underway. Coupled with slow progress in implementation, the trend towards the monopolisation of 'conflict-free' supply chain initiatives, in particular traceability by iTSCi, is economically damaging to local populations since it currently excludes and isolates the overwhelming majority of mining communities from legal access to international markets.

THE ALTERNATIVE

There is broad consensus for the need to clean up the eastern Congo's minerals sector, yet much disagreement about the international community's current model for achieving this goal. As such, efforts to improve transparency in the eastern DRC's mineral supply chains should continue. Yet a more nuanced and holistic approach that takes into account the realities of the eastern DRC's mining sector and the complexity of the conflict is needed. To this end, we make the following five recommendations:

Improve consultation with government and communities: Congolese government and civil society were poorly consulted on Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act prior to its passing, and as a result many were unaware of its implications. The few who were consulted were unanimously pro-Dodd-Frank, creating additional conflicts on local levels where endorsement and dissent compete. More Congolese voices must be listened to, and the local context and power structures

taken into account. This would ensure greater understanding of the local context and better harmonisation with existing national and regional initiatives, such as the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region's (ICGLR) Regional Initiative against the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources.

Work towards meaningful reform: The audit process should be designed to improve policies and practices rather than to just provide window-dressing. The dominant belief that static oversight and validation processes ensure 'conflict-free' mineral trade is misplaced given the volatile security situation in most of the eastern DRC. Both mines and smelters should be regularly inspected and the time period between inspection and certification minimized. Where this is not feasible, additional waivers or similar measures should not be ruled out.

Create incentives towards better practice: Legal frameworks must be supported by real projects on the ground that can meet their requirements. If this is not possible—which is clearly still the case today, nearly four years after the passing of Dodd-Frank—then transition periods must be extended and the lowering of excessively high standards for 'conflict-free' minerals should be considered. Similarly, former conflict actors should be incentivised where appropriate to join new 'conflict-free' schemes. This may help avoid the eventual subversion or infiltration of the 'clean' system put in place, as has been seen to date.

Promote fair competition: Regulation must be based on competition that allows not only international businesses but also Congolese producers to influence (i.e. increase) local price schemes. This in turn would encourage a regime that ensures minimum wages which mining cooperatives can guarantee to their members based on their increased leverage on the price fluctuation.

Widen the lens: Root causes of conflict such as land, identity, and political contest in the context of a militarized economy, rather than a single focus on minerals, must be considered by advocates seeking to reduce conflict violence. Furthermore, efforts to eradicate conflict minerals should not overlook the fact that artisanal mining is a key livelihood in the eastern DRC that holds as much potential to help steer the region away from conflict as it does to contribute towards it. More supportive measures are needed—such as those found in the earlier 2009 draft of the US Conflict Minerals Act—that can help capture the economic potential of artisanal mining. Finally, other critical challenges such as access to credit, technical knowledge, hazardous working conditions, and environmental degradation should not be ignored by multinational corporations if they seek to improve business practices and increase transparency in their supply chains.

So far, progress has been made in producing more ethical products for consumers, but stakeholders have not yet proceeded to improve the lives of Congolese people, nor address the negative impact current 'conflict-free' initiatives are having. If the conflict minerals agenda is to lead to positive change on the ground, legislation passed by national governments and steps such as those outlined by Apple or Intel need to be grounded in a more holistic approach that is better tailored to local realities. Failure to do so will continue to seriously limit the ability of conflict minerals initiatives to improve the daily lives of the eastern Congolese and their neighbours. Worse, these initiatives will risk contributing to, rather than alleviating, the very conflicts they set out to address.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

1. Aloys Tegera (Director, POLE Institute Goma)
2. Ann Laudati (Lecturer at the School for Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol)
3. Ashley Leinweber (Assistant Professor of Political Science, Missouri State University)
4. Ben Radley (Researcher, International Institute of Social Studies & 'Obama's Law' Producer)
5. Bonnie Campbell (Professor of Political Science, Université du Québec à Montréal)
6. Christiane Kayser (Independent Analyst & Civil Peace Service-Bread for the World mobile team)
7. Christoph Vogel (Researcher, University of Zurich & Independent analyst/writer)
8. Cyprien Birhingingwa (Executive Secretary, COSOC-GL & Coordinator of CENADEP Kivu)
9. Daniel Rothenberg (Professor of Practice, School of Politics and Global Studies, Arizona State University)
10. David Rieff (Independent Author and Commentator)
11. Deo Buuma (Executive Secretary, Action pour la Paix et la Concorde—APC, Bukavu)
12. Didier de Failly s.j., (Directeur, Maison de Mines du Kivu, Bukavu)
13. Dominic Johnson (Africa Editor and Deputy Foreign Editor, die tageszeitung)
14. Dorothea Hilhorst (Professor of Humanitarian Aid and Reconstruction, Wageningen University)
15. Emmanuel Shamavu (Director, APRODEPED, Bukavu)
16. Eric Kajemba (Coordinator, Observatoire Gouvernance et Paix, Bukavu)
17. Esther Marijnen (Researcher, Institute for European Studies/Vrije Universiteit Brussel)
18. Evariste Mfaume (Executive Director, ''Solidarité des Volontaires pour l'Humanité'')
19. Gabriel Kamundala (Researcher, CEGEMI & Universite Catholique de Bukavu)
20. Ganza Buroko (Cultural Operator & Coordinator of Yolé!Africa, Goma)
21. Godefroid Kä Mana (Professor, ULPGL Goma & UEA Bukavu & Université Kasavubu Boma)
22. Godefroid Muzalia (Professor, Institut Supérieur Pédagogique de Bukavu)
23. Henning Tamm (Postdoctoral Prize Research Fellow, Nuffield College, University of Oxford)
24. Herbert Weiss (Emeritus Professor of Political Science, City University of New York)
25. James Smith (Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of California/Davis)
26. Jean Ziegler (Former UN Special Rapporteur for the Right to Food and Professor at University of Geneva)
27. Jeroen Cuvelier (Postdoctoral Researcher, Wageningen University and Ghent University)
28. John Kanyoni (Independent Consultant and Vice-President of the Congolese Chamber of Mines)
29. Josaphat Musamba (Assistant Professor, Université Simon Kimbangu of Bukavu)
30. Joschka Havenith (Independent Researcher and Consultant, Cologne)
31. Jose Diemel (Researcher, Special Chair for Humanitarian Aid & Reconstruction, Wageningen University)
32. Joshua Walker (Postdoctoral Research Fellow, University of the Witwatersrand)
33. Josue Mukulumanya (President of the South Kivu mining cooperatives board GECOMISKI)
34. Justine Brabant (Independent Researcher and Journalist)
35. Juvénal Munubo (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)
36. Juvénal Twaibu (Director, Centre Indépendant de Recherches et d'Etudes Stratégiques au Kivu)
37. Ken Matthysen (Researcher on artisanal mining in eastern Congo, Antwerp)
38. Kizito Mushizi (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)
39. Koen Vlassenroot (Director, Conflict Research Group & Professor, Ghent University)
40. Kris Berwouts (Independent Consultant and Author)
41. Kristof Titeca (Assistant Professor, University of Antwerp)
42. Laura Seay (Assistant Professor of Government, Colby College)
43. Ley Uwera (Independent Journalist and Author, Goma)
44. Loochi Muzaliwa (Programme Coordinator, Life and Peace Institute DRC)
45. Micheline Mwendike (Activist, on behalf of LUCHA—Lutte pour le Changement/Struggle for Change)
46. Manuel Wollschläger (Conseiller Technique, ZFD-AGEH in Bukavu)
47. Milli Lake (Assistant Professor, Arizona State University)
48. Nicole Eggers (Assistant Professor of African History, Loyola University New Orleans)
49. Odile Bulabula (Deputy Coordinator, RIO—Network for Organisational Innovation, Bukavu)
50. Pádraic MacOireachtaigh (Regional Advocacy and Communications Officer, Jesuit Refugee Service)
51. Pamela Faber (Researcher, St. Catherine's College, University of Oxford)
52. Passy Mubalama (Independent Journalist and Author, Goma)
53. Paul Muhindo Mulemberi (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)
54. Paul-Romain Namegabe (Professor of Law, Director of CEGEMI, Universite Catholique de Bukavu)
55. Paulin Bishakabalya (Director of Humanitarian Assistance and Development Committee, Bukavu)
56. Peer Schouten (Postdoctoral Researcher, University of Gothenburg)
57. Phil Clark (Reader in Comparative and International Politics, SOAS/University of London)
58. Rachel Niehuus (Postdoctoral Researcher at University of California, San Francisco)
59. Rachel Strohm (Researcher in Political Science, University of Berkeley)
60. Raf Custers (Independent Journalist and Author on Mining)
61. Rémy Kasindi (Director, Centre for Research and Strategic Studies in Central Africa, Bukavu)
62. Rodrigue Rukumbuzi (Coordinator, AGAPE-Hauts Plateaux, Uvira)
63. Rosebell Kagumire (Independent Consultant and Blogger, Kampala/Addis Ababa)
64. Salammbo Mulonda Bulambo (Director, PIAP, Bukavu)
65. Sara Geenen (Postdoctoral Researcher, Institute of Development Policy, Antwerp University)
66. Sekombi Katondolo (Director, Radio Mutaani, Goma)
67. Severine Autesserre (Assistant Professor, Barnard College, Columbia University)
68. Thomas Idolwa Tchomba (Consultant and Mining Expert, Goma)
69. Timothy Makori (Researcher, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto)
70. Timothy Raeymaekers (Lecturer in Political Geography, University of Zurich)
71. Yvette Mwanza (President of the Mining Committee, Fédération des Entreprises Congolaises North Kivu)
72. Zacharie Bulakali (Independent Researcher on mining in eastern Congo)

All the signatories listed express their support to the open letter in its above form but

not necessarily approve of accompanying opinion pieces and/or explanatory notes, which remain their respective authors' views.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

□ 1600

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is just another devious Republican attempt to undermine efforts to end the decade-long scourge of rape and murder in Congo.

I have been in Congo many times. I served in the State Department in Kinshasa. I know the area. And the gentleman's statement that there is no company that is able to do this is absolutely incorrect. There is a company in Coral Gables, Florida, Kemet Corporation. They certify every bit of their metal is conflict-free. It is possible to do.

Now, why is this important? Well, all the 5 million people that have died in eastern Congo since Rwanda in 1992–93 have been from armed militias that are getting their money by taking minerals out of the ground and selling them abroad using slave labor.

The way you enslave a man is to rape his wife in front of him, and then bring him down and chain him and make him dig up the minerals. That is what has been going on there, and it has been going on for a long time, and everyone in this room is benefiting from that.

Everybody who has a cell phone has tin, tungsten, tantalum in it. And what this amendment is about is companies that will not go through the process. They do not want to do it. They want to get it from wherever it comes from. They don't care who it is.

Now, you can't tell me, and I know enough about Boeing and a lot of other companies, that they know their supply chain right down to where it starts in the ground somewhere. Everything that is in a plane, they know where it came from. And for them to say they don't know where it comes from or I can't know is simply that they want to get it on the cheap and don't care about human value in central Africa.

Now, the gentleman has given me the opening, which I didn't know if I would have, but his own church, the Christian Reformed Church in North America, their coordinator of office of social justice says defunding section 1502 and amendment No. 34 is immoral. It will result in violations and will undo work to our conflict-free mining in Africa.

This is a long-time battle, and we have had no one come up with any other way to deal with this except to cut off the money to the militias. To say there is not armed conflict in eastern Congo is somebody who has got their head buried in the sand; because if you go over there, you know that there is conflict from Rwanda and Uganda and all the countries in that area, because this stuff is valuable and people want it, and they want it on the cheap.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I maybe, possibly like yourself, have occasional differences with my own church denomination. I have challenged them to talk to their own missionaries that are in the surrounding areas, whom I have talked to, who are also out on the coast, who are now seeing minerals exported.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Reclaiming my time, I get your point. You are saying that your church in wherever they are located, in Michigan or wherever, they are out of touch with what is going on on the ground.

I am in touch with the people on the ground. There are groups like HEAL Africa, which have been operating a hospital in Goma, which has been filled with people that come from this whole process. And when you go over there and talk to them, they say the only way you are ever going to do it here is cut off the money, and that means saying to people you have got to know where that tin or tungsten or tantalum came from and was it gotten by using slave labor.

If you are unwilling to do that, as a company, in the United States, you have no moral fiber. If you are not willing to say you will not use slave labor for the material that is in your product, in your cell phone—and believe me, it wouldn't be hard to get a boycott going in this country against some folks who want to, but nobody wants to come out in the open.

This amendment gets slid in at the last minute every year. Senator DURBIN, Senator COONS, Barney Frank, all of us worked on this. We have heard it all.

And of course the SEC doesn't want to do it. They don't want to do anything that doesn't have to do with paper shuffling and letting the derivatives run through the economy. They simply have been given this because they handle the money.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce pay ratio disclosure rules, including the final rule titled ''Pay Ratio Disclosure'', published Aug. 18, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 50103).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit any funds from being used by the SEC to implement, administer, or enforce the ineffective pay ratio disclosure mandate in section 953(b) of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Under Dodd-Frank, section 953(b) requires all publicly traded companies to calculate and disclose, for each filing with the SEC, the median annual total compensation of all employees of the company, excluding the CEO, disclose the annual total compensation of the CEO, and calculate and disclose a ratio comparing those two numbers.

In adopting the final rule, the SEC admitted that the pay ratio disclosure provides ''no quantifiable benefit to public shareholders, yet it will cost public companies billions of dollars in initial and ongoing compliance expenses that could otherwise be used for investment in equipment and in job creation.''

While the SEC provided modest flexibility in the final rule as compared to its initial proposal, the final rule did not mitigate the most significant burdens that the public companies will face as they collect and calculate the compensation information necessary to comply.

Companies must still all include all employees—including temporary, part-time, seasonal employees—and non-U.S. employees into their pay ratio calculation. The rule's 5 percent exclusion for non-U.S. employees, which includes any foreign employee whose salary data is protected by their home country privacy laws, will not defray the significant compliance costs, which the SEC estimates at $1.3 billion in initial compliance costs and $526 million on an ongoing annual cost basis.

Even the former Financial Services chairman, Barney Frank, acknowledged that burden before a September 24, 2010, hearing, stating: ''I would note, again, that it was a Senate provision, and I think our inclination is to see to what extent it can be lessened as a burden, and, if not, we would be able to work and try to change that next year.''

That was almost 6 years ago, Mr. Chairman. During that same hearing, the Democratic witness, Mr. Martin Baily of the Squam Lake Group, stated: ''I am quite concerned about the level of poverty in the United States. I am quite concerned about the fact that ordinary workers have not done very well in the last few years. I don't see how publishing that ratio helps anybody very much, so I am not a big fan of that.''

Amen. I could not agree more, Mr. Baily.

In his dissent, SEC Commissioner Gallagher stated: ''Addressing perceived income inequality is not the province of the securities laws or the Commission.''

Additionally, SEC Chair Mary Jo White has expressed similar concerns about the provision of the Dodd-Frank Act, noting that several provisions ''appear more directed at exerting societal pressure on companies to change behavior rather than to disclose financial information that primarily informs investments decisions.''

Again, I could not agree more, Mr. Chairman.

This useless disclosure requirement creates a number of lengthy and burdensome reporting obligations whose costs far outweighs any perceived benefits. This includes failing to provide shareholders with useful information or facilitate a better understanding of pay practices, which some falsely trumpet this provision would do.

Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about creating more jobs in our various congressional districts, and instead of companies being forced to spend millions of dollars trying to comply with a regulatory mandate for which the SEC has been unable to quantify any benefits to the public, shouldn't these burdensome costs, instead, be converted and used by manufacturers, retailers, and other public companies for much-needed investment and job creation? I think so. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would repeal a requirement that companies show just how much more the CEO is paid compared to the company's median worker.

Why are Republicans so scared about reporting this number?

I imagine my Republicans colleagues will describe the alleged costs to industry. Indeed, industry has offered wildly exaggerated estimates of the SEC's initial proposal, 10 times what the SEC economists estimated. However, none of these estimates are credible. There is no indication that industry has yet to come up with any credible estimate for the cost of the final rule. In fact, no one has, as the House Financial Services Committee has failed to convene a hearing on the final rule and the flexibility provided by the SEC. Worse, the committee has failed to hold a hearing on the bill, itself, this Congress. Rather, the Republicans are rushing this bill through the House and once again seek to repeal outright this provision in Dodd-Frank.

In the past, and before the SEC finalized its flexible rule, Democrats offered amendments to ease burdens on businesses, but Republicans weren't interested then and are apparently worried that the American public and investors will finally see that not all public companies pay their employees the same. In fact, some companies pay their CEO 400 times the median employee.

My Republican colleagues aren't concerned that CEOs and the rest of the 1 percent continue to take most of the income and wealth of this country. My colleagues aren't concerned that minorities and low-income Americans haven't seen a raise in decades.

The SEC has provided industry with as much flexibility as it could while still being consistent with the congressional mandate. I will also note that the requirement doesn't affect small businesses or emerging growth companies, but it is targeted to companies that retail investors overwhelmingly choose to invest in.

I know that industry, especially the global manufacturers, oppose the SEC rule, but I think that the information provided by this number matters. It will go a long way to identify the disparity between the top 1 percent and the everyday worker. It will go a long way towards enabling everyday investors to fund companies that properly compensate their employees, or punish those that inappropriately compensate their CEO.

I urge my colleagues to think seriously about this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the remaining time on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. And I believe I have the right to close; correct?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to point out to my colleague from New York that he is actually wrong. We marked this bill up in committee in April of this year.

And the interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is they want it both ways. We have to follow the SEC until they don't want to do it, and then they disagree with it. They disagree with the statement that the SEC apparently has come up with that this is going to cost $1.7 billion in this initial year.

They want to say that the Obama economy is great—until it isn't and it doesn't work in their favor.

I, too, am very concerned and join my colleagues of all stripes to say that this economy has not responded the way it needs to and we need to have those wages up. And here we are robbing Peter to pay Paul, because we are going to take that money that could go into investing in equipment and productivity and actual workers, and we are going to do meaningless reports to this that tell us nothing. And the words of the SEC Chair—not my words, the SEC Chair—says that this brings no meaningful information to people in the economy.

□ 1615

So I don't understand why, other than window dressing, once again, and trying to set up a straw man argument, for why the businesses are doing what they are doing, why they would move ahead.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a corporation tell you that studying their business practices is well-spent money. Everybody wants to keep everybody in the dark as to what is going on.

The American people have a sense of what is going on. We have heard enough, especially during this last campaign, about the 1 percent and the 99 percent. We have heard enough about how on Wall Street, in my city of New York, part of the problem was the lack of supervision by the FCC and by the SEC. And part of the problem—a large part—was the bonuses that these folks were getting. A $50 million bonus in some cases and a $25 million bonus in some cases was not something unheard of.

So I think that every so often the American people need to know and get information that may seem like a waste of money to some people, but actually can get at a problem.

We need to know in this capitalist society that we have—and we are not about to change that. We all like it. I like it. I want to keep it. But I think we have to try to look for ways to balance so that 99 percent of the people are not in danger of hurting while 1 percent of the folks are in great shape.

To find out that CEOs sometimes get 400 times the salary of one of their workers is totally outrageous, and the American people should know that and

should know—especially in the cases of stockholders too, there are a lot of stockholders who are small stockholders—and they want to know what company they are investing in.

So I think that this rule or this approach is good, and I think your amendment just tries to—I am not saying you do—but your amendment, the final result will be to try to cover up the truth, and that is not a good thing.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that Amendment No. 36 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by the Act may be used in contravention of, or to implement changes to, section 560.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on June 22, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to eliminate the potential of Iran's gaining access to the U.S. dollar.

As Iran continues to violate international law with illicit ballistic missile tests, as it undermines U.S. foreign policy, and as it destabilizes the Middle East, the Obama administration may be willing to ease restrictions on Iran's access to the dollar and potentially reward Iran's international provocations with coveted access to world financial markets.

We cannot allow this to happen.

Since agreeing to the Iranian deal last year, the Obama administration has seemingly gone out of its way to appease Iran. Sanctions were lifted with little to show in the way of nuclear disarmament. The rogue regime is now selling oil on the international market, and Iran has received access to tens of billions of dollars held abroad and has signed deals worth over $100 billion in foreign investment.

Allowing Iran to have access to the dollar would mark an unprecedented additional concession to the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Access to the dollar would be an undeserved reward to a country that tortures its own people, denies human rights to women, and has the blood of Americans and our allies on its hands.

But in an effort to advance the nuclear agreement, I worry that the President may act unilaterally—as he has done so often in the past—and permit the Treasury Department and other Federal entities to proceed with granting Iran the access to the dollar it so desperately wants. A vote for this amendment will eliminate that possibility.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that this does not change what is currently the situation in this country. Last summer, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew testified that Iranian banks will not be able to clear U.S. dollars through New York, hold correspondent account relationships with U.S. financial institutions, or enter into financing agreements with U.S. banks.

As the Secretary made clear, Iran, in other words, will continue to be denied access to the world's largest financial and commercial market.

This amendment simply puts that promise into statutory law, and that is why I have proposed it. The Lance amendment will eliminate any possibility that we might move in the other direction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

I don't, as you can see, have much to say on this because it is really an interesting situation. It is an amendment looking for a problem that doesn't exist. It is an amendment looking for the possibility that the President—there we go again, the gentleman in the White House—that the President may do something he hasn't said anything about doing.

The Treasury Department says that there are no current plans to amend the regulation and that flexibility is not at issue at this point because no one is discussing this.

The second part to this amendment is the underlying feeling by some Members still that the deal with Iran was a bad deal, that that deal won't work, and that somehow we will be left holding the bag. Well, giving peace a chance, as the song says, is never a bad thing to do.

I would hope that in the future we deal only with amendments that speak to an existing problem and not to an amendment that simply speaks about: What if? We have too many what-ifs in amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and would hope that our colleagues would vote against it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that this is not designed against any one President. This would be put into statutory law, and it would proceed after this President leaves office.

I believe that it is important that this fundamental principle—that Iran not have access to the U.S. dollar—should be in statutory law and not merely a matter of executive action. That is why I have proposed the amendment.

I hope that all Members will consider the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to note that we speak about it, and it is not directed at any one President. But we have a unique system. We only have one President at a time. So it is directed at one President.

I suspect that if we were going to stay in session—which we are not—for every week from now until the end of the year, we would see more and more and more bills—up to December 31—bills that would try to limit the power of the office of the Presidency because of who occupies it right now and the disdain that the other side, so many Members, have for our President.

I see it differently. I see the Iran deal as a possibility for peace. Maybe history will say that I was naive. But I know the alternative, and the alternative is war. So any time that I can take a chance on evading and not having war, let's go for it.

Secondly, to legislate by suggesting that something could happen and therefore we have to head it off at the pass is not the way to legislate.

I would hope that we could vote against this amendment. I urge opposition to it.

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that the Iranian agreement is, of course, extremely controversial. It was voted down by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, there was never any vote in the other House because cloture was not achieved.

The President submitted the Iranian agreement as an agreement, not as a treaty, based upon the fact that legislation has been passed to make it an agreement. I think it is important that as a matter of statutory law we make sure that Iran not have access to the U.S. dollar, and that is why I propose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Number 38.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce Executive Order 13166 (August 16, 2000; 65 Fed. Reg. 50121).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is an amendment that I offered before in the past. It simply says: ''None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce Executive Order 13166.''

That is an executive order that was filed by then-President Clinton on August 16 in the year 2000, in the last months of his Presidency, that directs all Federal fund recipients—and that would include Federal contractors, State and local governments, as well as the Federal Government—to facilitate language interpretation with anyone who seeks to engage with them.

That has been an executive order that has been highly costly not only to the taxpayers, but to the consumers in this country, in time and in money. It was one of the initial things that began to slow down this process of assimilation in America.

We know that a common language is the most powerful unifying force known throughout all of history, whether it is English or whether it is some other language in some other country, and that we have a strong effort to establish English as the official language of the United States.

I happen to be the author of that accomplishment in the State of Iowa. Thirty other States have English as the official language, and some 83 percent of Americans support this policy. Yet President Clinton's executive order subverts this and works to fracture us rather than unify us.

So it will save us billions of dollars. I didn't bring that figure to the floor with me, but we know it has been very expensive over time. We are 16 years into this. It has been destructive to the unity of the American people. I want to see us united as a people, and this is one of the steps that we can take.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I won't speak in Spanish. I will only speak in English. The gentleman is a person that we all know well. He can't pass up the opportunity to say something about immigrants and say something about English as the official language.

Let me start off by saying this: I don't speak for any community, and I certainly don't know what other communities go through. But I can tell you that in the Hispanic/Latino community, when people sit around the dinner table and the issue of language comes up, it is not a plot against the English language. It is usually a conversation about how the children and the grandchildren no longer speak Spanish; they speak only English. That is just a fact.

Number two, this assimilation issue, do you really think that someone would leave all their small belongings behind, leave in many cases their wife and their children to come into this country undocumented—assuming we are talking about undocumented people—before they can find a way to bring the rest of the family, to not learn English, to purposely keep themselves away from immigrating into the American society?

On the contrary, some of the jokes are that some of the better—not better, but stronger-feeling Americans, the ones who want to vote, the ones who want to wave the flag strongly and proudly, are people who came from other countries.

□ 1630

Just about everybody has somebody that came from another country, either now or a long time ago.

The reason that President Clinton and so many of us have supported the issue—and I am speaking about the first President Clinton, not the next one—the fact that we support the issue of giving service is because in many ways this could be a constitutional question.

I will give you an example. I am not a lawyer, but it says life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that is what we are promised. Well, life could be a paramedic being able to speak to you in a language that you understand. Liberty could be you in a trial getting an interpreter so what you have to say to that judge and to that jury can be understood. And the pursuit of happiness, of course, is a separate issue, but it allows you to grow two cultures at the same time.

I speak Spanish, I speak English, and I am a Member of the U.S. Congress. I don't think the fact that I speak Spanish has made me a worse Congressman or a worse American. I was born in an American territory that speaks a lot of Spanish. I grew up speaking Spanish and English at the same time. I am still working on both to be better at them every day, but I am a living example that there is nothing wrong with speaking more than one language.

We in this country have a couple of fears that set us apart from the rest of the world and make us less than the rest of the world, and that is the fear of languages. In some other countries, in Europe and so on, children at the age of 10 speak two, three, or four languages; grownups speak a couple of languages. It doesn't hurt them in any way.

What is wrong if you speak another language?

But here we are talking about services, going to the Department of Motor Vehicles and getting someone who can understand what you are saying until you learn to speak English. But trust me, the big line here is ''until you speak English,'' because no one wants to come here and remain only speaking Spanish or their own country's language and forgetting English.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say first in response to the gentleman, and I respect his position and his background, but I would say if he had a development in the Greek language, he might think of that pursuit of happiness as what our Founding Fathers did. They called it eudaimonia, E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A, the Greek word. That means developing the whole human being—the body, the mind, the spirit, and the soul—all together.

That pursuit of happiness wasn't about a tailgate party. It was about becoming the best human being that you could. That is a little difference in the translation of the language that got lost. It is an example of how we are divided by language rather than unified by a common language.

Another example would be Israel. It became a country in 1948. In 1954, they adopted Hebrew as their official language. I asked them why, and they said: Because we saw the example of the United States, that you have embraced English as your common language. It has unified the people. We needed to have a language to unify the Israelis.

And it has been successful, and I could give you examples. One day I got in a taxicab and there was a gentleman there. He spoke perfect English and he didn't seem to fit what a normal taxicab driver was. I said: Where were you raised?

He said: Bosnia.

How long have you been here?

Seven years.

Did you learn English before you came?

Not a word.

How can you speak perfect English in 7 years?

He said: It helps when you have to.

So I am not about discouraging the utilization of other languages, and this amendment does not do that. What it says is I am dispatched by the taxpayer dollars that are contributing to the division of America rather than let us have an encouragement to pull together in the same language. That is what this is about. It is a fiscally responsible amendment that addresses an

83 percent majority in 31 States that have already taken this act.

I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that the gentleman picked the wrong example—Israel—because they have more than one official language, but that is okay. The more the merrier.

The fact of life is that the gentleman picked the example of someone who learned English. Well, everybody wants to learn to speak English. If you go to my community in the South Bronx, you see small-business owners. Those are the best examples. Some of them speak what we would call broken English. Some of them speak perfect English. Their children, half of them no longer speak Spanish; they speak English. Their children are attending Fordham University or a university down South. They are not going to be bodega owners when they grow up, or cab drivers. They most likely will go work on Wall Street or somewhere else or teach.

In other words, we have a pattern in this country that hasn't been broken. What made us great is the fact that people come here, they adapt, they become part of this country, and then they defend this country with everything they have got, including their blood. That happens all the time, it happens all the time, and it is not going to stop happening.

So if you have a worry—and I have heard you for years—that somehow speaking Spanish is going to wreck this country, on the contrary. Just learn to speak Spanish and you will feel much better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say in response to the gentleman, I give some thought to the story of the Tower of Babel. We know that the construction manager there was Nimrod. He was building a tower to the heavens. They had the arrogance to believe that they could bypass God and get to heaven without Him. The Lord looked down on the Tower of Babel and He said:

Behold, they are one people, they speak all one language, and nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them.

He scrambled their languages and scattered them to the four winds. Humanity on the planet has been at each other's throats ever since. That is the message of the Tower of Babel.

My message is unify us as one people. It is not discouraging the utilization of other languages, but it is discouraging the idea that we should establish ethic enclaves in America, that we should isolate ourselves somehow in these neighborhoods and not be assimilating into a broader neighborhood.

I will give an example to the gentleman. When Bush was President and we had a representative from the Department of Labor who came to testify before the Small Business Committee, she said: We have a problem. We don't have enough workers in the factories to run our punch presses and our lathes. Simple industrial work.

Why is that?

She said: Well, the applicants are not literate in the English language, and we have great difficulty in teaching them how to operate these machines.

I said: I can understand that if they are first-generation immigrants. In fact, I can understand it if some of them are second generation.

She cut me off and said: Even third generation.

So the pick-up of the language and the transition into the next generation is not happening at the speed it did because our enclaves are getting larger and more populated and people are more isolated into that.

I want to encourage people to be successful, to go out and get an education and to assimilate more broadly. I want to be able to look across this country and know that I can walk into a city council meeting anywhere and know that it is being conducted in English. I want people to be able to talk and communicate with each other. When I go to a foreign country and they speak their language, I get the sense of that, too.

We gravitate towards common kind, and the more common we can be, the more things we can have in common with each other, the more likely we are to be bonded together. That is what this amendment is about.

I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out Operation Choke Point.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, how does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it doesn't like?

Simple. It cuts that industry off from the financial services sector—the lifeblood of every business in this country.

It sounds impossible, doesn't it?

However, that is exactly what the FDIC is doing in conjunction with the Department of Justice. By this point, we are all familiar with Operation Choke Point. It is the program designed to force legally operating and licensed entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need.

What started with nondepository lenders has spread to many other industries. Reports indicate that the FDIC and DOJ continue to pressure financial institutions that service the gun, ammunition, and tobacco industries. These are legal industries, and it is my belief that no joint FDIC and DOJ operation should broadly target lawful commerce.

I want to be very clear. I strongly support the FDIC and other Federal banking regulators' authority to monitor financial institutions and identify risky behavior. But what cannot be tolerated is the Federal Government abusing its authority to target entire industries, including those that obey the laws and live within the rules.

This isn't a Republican issue; this isn't a Democratic issue; it isn't a liberal or a conservative issue. This is an issue of the DOJ, FDIC, and potentially other banking regulators stepping outside the law.

We worked on a bipartisan basis to inform the DOJ, FDIC, and others of the consequences of Operation Choke Point, but those concerns have fallen on deaf ears. Operation Choke Point is still happening. In the last few months, I have heard from a debt buyer in California, a tobacco shop in Florida, and, just this week, a veteran-owned shooting sports company in Virginia.

I am now concerned that Operation Choke Point-like tactics have spread beyond the FDIC to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Despite Comptroller Curry's remarks on the dangers of de-risking, we continue to hear from financial institutions that OCC examiners are applying pressure in an effort to force banks to drop longstanding customers and correspondent banking relationships for no valid reason.

I would like to remind my colleagues that similar amendments to prohibit the use of funds for Operation Choke Point were attached without opposition to appropriations bills in fiscal years 2015 and 2016. In February, the House passed a bipartisan vote of 250–169 H.R. 766, the Financial Institution

Customer Protection Act. That legislation included measures that would prohibit Operation Choke Point through increased transparency and responsible governance.

This amendment is an important step in ensuring that the FDIC and other Federal banking regulators continue their job, but do so without abuse of power.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this amendment which, again, has generated no opposition and has been adopted by voice vote in previous years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, at the behest of the House Republicans' inquiry, the Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility investigated whether there was misconduct or targeting of legal businesses by Operation Choke Point. The DOJ's OPR, in their report from last year, found that absolutely no wrongdoing had occurred.

The DOJ's Office of Professional Responsibility ''concluded that the Department of Justice attorneys involved in Operation Choke Point did not engage in professional misconduct,'' and that, ''OPR's inquiry further determined that Civil Division employees did not improperly target lawful participants.''

Moreover, a follow-on report from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation inspector general found that the FDIC's involvement in Operation Choke Point was inconsequential to the direction and outcome of the initiative.

Operation Choke Point is an enforcement action by the Department of Justice, whose funding is not addressed by this particular appropriations bill. In fact, that is part of the large problem with this amendment—that it really speaks to issues that belong in another bill.

What this provision really does is tell the banking regulators not to cooperate with law enforcement when the Department of Justice has identified mass market fraud and other abuses of the payments system.

The Department of Justice has made it a priority to hold the perpetrators of consumer fraud accountable. Recently, for example, they prosecuted the operators of lottery scams, the promoters of fake business opportunities, and the criminals behind a telemarketing fraud targeting Spanish-speaking customers.

Preventing banking regulators from cooperating with legitimate law enforcement requests would restrict the ability of the Civil Division's Consumer Protection Branch in enforcing consumer protection statutes throughout the United States.

Operation Choke Point is just one of the Consumer Protection Branch's efforts that require cooperation with banking regulators and which have produced significant results.

□ 1645

For example, the Branch, together with U.S. Attorneys across the country, obtained over 150 criminal convictions and more than $7 billion in criminal fines, forfeitures, and restitution ordered to victims. Limiting the funding it receives would be a serious blow to consumers who need the protection of the government from the financial predators.

This is something that we should not be doing at this point. We, certainly, shouldn't be doing it in this bill, but we shouldn't be doing it at all. I urge its opposition.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, as somebody who has been on both sides of the table with regard to financial services—as a regulator and on the other side of the table as a businessperson—I think I have a unique perspective on what is going on here.

We also have a couple of reports from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee that took the emails of both of these agencies—their own emails—and showed them to be engaged in Operation Choke Point activities with the intent not to go after somebody who is doing something illegal, but to go after people who are doing something legal. That is the difference.

I support, as the gentleman indicated a minute ago, some of the activities of the regulators in going after bad actors. I support that 110 percent. As a former regulator, I am with the gentleman all the way. My problem is what is going on with Operation Choke Point as we are going after legal businesses that are doing legal business. That is a big difference because their own emails indicate their own, internal attorneys—the legal authorities in their own agencies—questioned their own ability to be doing what they are doing.

This should send a chill down the spine of every single American when you have the Department of Justice's own attorneys telling them we shouldn't be doing this because this is not legal. Yet this is the legal entity that is supposed to be leading our country and providing us protection with the law, itself.

It is interesting because the FDIC has already implemented a lot of these changes that we requested in our bill. In committee—and to me, personally—they admitted what was going on and said: We are going to fix our problems. They admitted Operation Choke Point was going on and that they were targeting legal businesses that were doing legal business. They said: We can't have that. We are going to stop it. The problem is it is continuing to go on, as I indicated in my testimony.

Just this week, there was another one. I have an email address that takes information from individuals who have been wronged by Operation Choke Point activities. They are in legal businesses, doing legal business. And we got another hit just this week. Over the last several months, we have had numerous hits from different businesses across the country. Yet we have continued to see this happen.

I ask for the support of the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–639 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 22 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. BUCK of Colorado.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GUINTA of New Hampshire.

Amendment No. 34 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—182

Abraham	Barton	Blackburn
Allen	Bilirakis	Blum
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Boustany
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Barr	Black	Brat

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

□ 1711

Messrs. WOMACK, HIMES, MEEKS, Ms. BASS, Messrs. REED, ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MULLIN, TROTT, and ROYCE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 224, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—197

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—224

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda

Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Guinta
Hastings
Lieu, Ted
Marchant
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1715

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

AYES—217

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
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
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—203

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Lieu, Ted
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Nugent
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner
Williams

Announcement by the Acting Chair

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

□ 1718

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 379, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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
LaHood
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—180

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Lieu, Ted
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1721

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
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
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
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
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
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna

Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
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
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
DeSaulnier
Duncan (SC)
Hastings
Jordan
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1724

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
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
LaHood
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
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
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
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—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
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)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bost
Brat
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Eshoo
Farr
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Sinema
Takai
Turner
Walz
Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1727

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 162, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—260

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw

Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
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)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
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—162

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Buchanan

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Sinema
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1730

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 188, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
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—188

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

Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1734

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
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
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—185

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
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
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (GA)
Bost
Brown (FL)
Curbelo (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Mica
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1737

Ms. FOXX changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOES—232

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

□ 1741

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 809; and

Adoption of House Resolution 809, if ordered.

All electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 524, COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 809) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 524) to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin abuse; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 179, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
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)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
McDermott
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1749

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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 243, noes 177, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
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)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
LaHood
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
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—177

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
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
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bost
Brown (FL)
Castor (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Johnson, E. B.
McDermott
Nadler
Nugent
Pingree
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1755

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 809, S. 2943, as amended, is considered as passed.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5485.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1756

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 38 printed in House report 114–639, offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to commence any administrative adjudication or civil action under section 1053 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 more than 3 years after the date of discovery of the violation to which the adjudication or action relates.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), for his great work on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is a simple and modest proposal. It ensures that the CFPB follows the statute of limitations established by Dodd-Frank during agency administrative proceedings.

This amendment is a response to the CFPB blatantly ignoring the express statute of limitations in Dodd-Frank and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, otherwise known as RESPA.

□ 1800

In January of 2014, CFPB launched an administrative proceeding against the PHH Corporation alleging a violation of RESPA. In the case, CFPB Director Richard Cordray claimed the express 3-year statute of limitations within Dodd-Frank did not apply to the CFPB's administrative proceedings process—deliberately ignoring the law.

Using this unprecedented rationale, the CFPB retroactively imposed fines of $109 million against PHH Corporation for alleged violations dating back to 1995, meaning that the CFPB imposed fines for alleged violations that occurred 19 years after the statute of limitations had expired—again, 19 years past the express statute of limitations.

These fines are illegal under Dodd-Frank, and they deny businessowners basic liability protections guaranteed to them under the statute of limitations. Without those protections, the CFPB could threaten litigation forever, handcuffing businesses' ability to create jobs in perpetuity.

You can't just make it up. This is lawless behavior and it is dangerous for the rule of law.

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits the CFPB from using any funds to take administrative actions past the express 3-year statute of limitations in Dodd-Frank.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits funds from the CFPB to commence any administrative adjudication or civil action beyond the 3-year statute of limitation in Dodd-Frank.

In doing so, it would limit the board's ability to bring enforcement action against wrongdoers. This represents a free pass for bad actors who have swindled borrowers on a host of practices and products under the Bureau's jurisdiction—credit cards, student loans, mortgages, auto loans, debt collection practices, and payday loans, just to name a few.

Title X of Dodd-Frank does provide a 3-year statute of limitations for claims being brought by the Bureau under that title. However, the Bureau has argued in court that the statute of limitations does not govern claims brought under the enumerated consumer protection laws transferred to the Bureau—laws like the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Truth in Lending Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.

While some of these enumerated statutes have their own statutes of limitations, others do not. The board has argued in court that, even under those laws that do have statutes of limitation, they do not apply to the Bureau, but instead only apply to private litigation.

Of the enumerated laws that do not have statutes of limitation, the Bureau has argued in court that no statute of limitation applies.

When it comes to administrative law judge proceedings, rather than those brought in court, the Bureau also contends the statute of limitation does not apply.

In the final analysis, this is currently being adjudicated by the Bureau and defendants in the courts. It would be premature and disruptive for Congress to step in with this amendment, which tilts the playing field in court toward the side of special interests.

Moreover, both the House and Senate authorizing committees of jurisdiction have not even considered this issue during hearings or markups. At the very least, it would be premature to adopt this amendment, which significantly alters existing law and throws into flux cases pending before the courts, without any regard for regular order.

Finally, this amendment creates uncertainty and complications as to how our regulatory agencies can enforce the law.

The Wall Street Reform Act transferred enforcement authority to the Bureau for a host of consumer protection statutes. Yet banking and other market regulators have retained authority on a number of those laws, thereby creating two sets of standards: one for banking and market regulators, where the statute of limitations would still be being interpreted by the courts, and one for our lead consumer regulator, the Bureau. This will only serve to confuse the industry.

That is the main reason why I oppose the amendment and urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. It is common sense. We all believe in regulation, but we believe in reasonable regulation. What the gentleman is trying to do is just kind of curtail some of this regulatory overreach.

When this agency was set up, it was outside the appropriations process. They get a check from the Federal Reserve for $600 million with no strings attached. Nobody asks anything. In our underlying bill, we put them under the appropriations process. We say: You ought not just have a single director. Have a five-member commission like a lot of these regulatory agencies. So it is a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, what I would ask the gentleman to do is to consider the fact that this is being still dealt with in the courts, and this is not the right time for us—or any time—to get involved before the court has decided. That is one of the problems that we have on many of these issues, that we get involved and we try to get our will, our

way on an issue, before the courts have decided what to do with it.

This is a big issue for them to decide, and I would hope that we can see our way to letting those decisions be made before we set a tone that kind of sways what the final outcome might be, and that is not the right thing to do.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's position. I would just submit that the express language of Dodd-Frank says what we should do here. It creates a 3-year statute of limitations for the CFPB, and the CFPB is ignoring the rule of law and ignoring that express language. All this amendment does is say that the CFPB cannot use dollars to violate the express letter of the law. I urge my colleagues for their support.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, there are other parts covered by the Bureau that have their own statute of limitations. That is why these questions are being asked. While the gentleman is correct that Dodd-Frank says 3 years, in other areas it is not 3 years. It is being settled, and we should stay out of it until then.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act (including title IV and title VIII) may be used to carry out the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Law 20-261) or to implement any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out such Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like, first of all, to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) for his work on this bill.

My amendment would prohibit funds from being used to implement the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, or RHNDA.

The Declaration of Independence declares that: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.''

These founding principles remain true today. The reason life was included by our Founders as the first principle is because without life there is no liberty; it is a prerequisite for liberty. Without life, there is no pursuit of happiness. In fact, it is self-evident, without life, there isn't even a discussion about any rights.

Liberty encompasses social and political freedoms, and the tenets associated with liberty were those used in drafting the First Amendment to the Constitution. With life and liberty, you can pursue happiness. Take away either and the pursuit becomes difficult or impossible.

My amendment protects all three, but I will focus my comments on liberty as it relates to the free exercise of religion clause in the First Amendment.

The First Amendment states in part that: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'' Without my amendment, some employers in the District of Columbia would not only be prohibited from exercising their religion, but would be forced to embrace the beliefs of the 13 members of the D.C. Council.

The District of Columbia allows abortions until the moment of birth, but a number of employers in the District of Columbia believe in the sanctity of life and protecting it. In fact, many organizations in D.C.—such as March for Life, Americans United for Life, and the National Right to Life Committee—exist solely to protect life. The Constitution provides them the right to exercise those beliefs, just like it does those who oppose it.

That is why when the District of Columbia passed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, former Mayor Vincent Gray expressed concerns about the law. In December 2014, Gray wrote a letter to the D.C. Council about RHNDA, describing it as ''legally problematic'' and saying: ''. . . the bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993. Religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them.''

Employers who oppose abortions and paying for them as part of a compensation package have every right to exercise their freedom not to do so, and those who want to receive abortions or have them paid for have every right to seek employment from someone willing to do so. That is how freedom works. It does not work with one group imposing its version of freedom on the other, which is what this District law currently provides for.

In its 2012 opinion in the case of Hosanna Tabor v. EEOC, the Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the right of religious organizations to hire employees that support the mission of the organization where their employees are responsible for carrying out its mission. The opinion says: ''The interest of society in the enforcement of employment discrimination statuses is undoubtedly important. But so too is the interest of religious groups in choosing who will preach their beliefs, teach their faith, and carry out their mission.''

Would you require PETA to hire someone that comes to an interview in a fur coat? Would you require Planned Parenthood to hire a nun or anyone adamantly opposed to abortion? Neither of these situations makes sense, nor does requiring a pro-life organization to hire someone who explicitly contradicts their moral conscience or religious beliefs. The Supreme Court agrees.

My amendment would restore religious freedom to employers inside the District of Columbia. Those who want to have abortions do not have to work for employers who oppose them. They have life and the liberty to pursue their own interests with another employer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. This amendment would, once again, overreach into the District of Columbia's local affairs by prohibiting funds for D.C.'s local law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.

The D.C. law this amendment would vacate prohibits discrimination based on reproductive health decisions. This amendment would allow workplace discrimination if the employer disagrees with the employee's use of contraception, in vitro fertilization, and even perhaps a medically necessary abortion.

D.C. is attempting to protect workers from losing their jobs because their supervisors may or may not agree with their personal decisions. This amendment offered today would strip those protections from D.C. workers.

In addition to being bad policy, this amendment goes around the law which states that Congress has 30 days to review bills passed by the D.C. Council. The 30 days are up, and the Republican-controlled Congress did not legally stop these laws from going into effect. The House passed a resolution disapproving the D.C. bill on reproductive health, and the Republican-controlled Senate did not.

The Congress had time to act on these issues, and it failed to do so. D.C. residents should not be subject to endless efforts to overturn its laws. It continues to be part of what I always complain about, this desire that we have on the other side to tell the District of Columbia what to do.

□ 1815

In this case, there was actually protection for the Congress if the Congress had acted within 30 days. But it didn't, and now we want to, in this bill, get around that lack of action by putting in new action to overturn their law.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, obviously, Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power ''to exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District.''

Moving aside the jurisdictional issue, I take exception to my colleague's point that it is acceptable to infringe on the religious liberties of certain people, those who actually believe in protecting life. If those who don't believe in protecting life want to find employment, let them find employment at like-minded organizations.

The D.C. government should not be able to compel pro-life organizations to hire pro-abortion employees. That is exactly what the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was in place to protect, as Mayor Gray pointed out in his letter to the D.C. Council. I can't say that I always agree with the Mayor, but his serious concerns were, and remain to be, completely valid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, very carefully let me say that there are many instances where people have disagreements, but the law prevails. Not every employer agrees with everything that the employee does and vice versa, but if there is a law in place, then the law prevails. Here there is a law in place, number one.

Number two, we should continue to try not to meddle in the District of Columbia's issues.

Number three, I repeat, we had a period, a legal period for us to act—some would say a constitutional period for us to act—and we didn't act. Now we want to get around that by using this bill improperly to undo what the people in the District of Columbia, through their representatives, found to be correct for them, just like other States, other communities throughout this country, maybe communities even in the gentleman's and many of the gentlemen and gentlewomen on the other side's districts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. The amendment prohibits the District of Columbia from using its local funds, consisting of local taxes and fees, to enforce a local nondiscrimination law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act, giving employers license, in the name of religion, to discriminate against employees, their spouses and their dependents based on their private, constitutionally protected reproductive health decisions. Contrary to the sponsor's claim, the D.C. law does not require employers to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions. The law states expressly: "This section shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision."

The amendment permits employers to fire a woman for having an abortion due to rape, or to decline to hire a woman for using in vitro fertilization, or to fire a man for using condoms, or to reduce the salary of a parent for buying birth control for his or her child.

The D.C. law is valid under both the U.S. Constitution and federal law. Indeed, the law has been in effect for more than a year, and there appear to have been no lawsuits challenging it.

Under the U.S. Constitution, laws may limit religious exercise if they are neutral, generally applicable and rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest. The D.C. law applies to all employers, does not target religion and promotes workplace equality. Under the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which applies to D.C., laws may substantially burden religious exercise if they further a compelling governmental interest in the least restrictive means. D.C. has a compelling interest in eliminating discrimination, and the D.C. law is the least restrictive means to do so.

The D.C. law protects religious liberty. The law is subject to constitutional and statutory exceptions to non-discrimination laws. The Constitution's narrow ministerial exception allows religious organizations to make employment decisions for ministers and ministerial employees for any reason whatsoever. D.C. law permits religious and political organizations to make employment decisions based on religion and political views. Under the D.C. law, employees must be willing to carry out employers' missions and directives.

I urge Members to vote NO on this amendment in order to protect employees' reproductive health decisions, workplace equality and D.C.'s right to self-government.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 42 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), I offer amendment No. 43.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices'' published by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in the Federal Register on November 21, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 69793).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds for the voluntary recall proposed rule at the Consumer Product Safety Commission and prevent them from moving forward with a rule that would cripple the highly successful voluntary recall program currently in place.

Congress has expressed significant concerns over this proposed rule. Two years ago, the House approved this amendment, and Congress has repeatedly made it clear to the CPSC that it would cease in its quest to make unnecessary changes to a recall system that has worked well over the past 40 years. This system—one based on a successful partnership between businesses and the Commission—has helped ensure that consumer products sold in the U.S. are the safest in the world.

Congressional intent has been expressed in House-passed legislation, report language, letters from lawmakers, and oversight hearings. However, the Commission has failed to withdraw the proposed rule and has continued to indicate in its operating plan that it will move forward.

The CPSC does not even have the statutory authority to issue the rule. The CPSC has presented absolutely no evidence supporting its proposal, and all but one comment submitted expressed serious concerns over how the proposed rule would actually delay recalls and harm the effectiveness of our recall program.

The Commission unilaterally seeks to transform the voluntary recall process into a legal negotiation equivalent to a settlement agreement. The proposed changes would require companies seeking to implement a recall to hire an attorney, dragging out the process and creating a financial burden for small businesses.

The CPSC's proposed rule on voluntary recalls would slow down a process meant to be conducted with speed

and without red tape. Consumers would ultimately be more at risk as recalls are delayed. This proposed rule would make it more difficult to remove defective products from the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this amendment would remind the Commission that its mission is to protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products in an efficient and reasonable manner. The proposed rule to significantly alter the voluntary recall process is contrary to that mission.

I urge Members to adopt this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would prohibit the CPSC from taking action on the proposed rule on voluntary recall actions and voluntary recall notices.

The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was published in 2013. There has been no further official rulemaking action taken on it since then, so this amendment is not necessary.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or codify into regulation, the guidance relating to ''Commission Guidance Regarding Disclosure Related to Climate Change'', affecting parts 211, 231, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (as described in Commission Release Nos. 33-9106; 34-61469; FR-82).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from using funds under this act to pursue a political agenda on climate change and, instead, return its focus to their three-part mission: to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation.

My amendment relates to the SEC's 2010 interpretive guidance for companies to disclose the impact that global climate change may have on their businesses.

My amendment is necessary and timely, given the SEC's recent regulation S-K Concept Release that suggests the SEC is moving toward further action on this issue. It is even more important, in light of a campaign by several States' attorneys general, to impede the First Amendment rights of those who dare question the accuracy of climate change science.

More and more, we have seen the Federal securities laws and disclosure system abused for political purposes—from the median pay ratio disclosure requirement of Dodd-Frank to conflict minerals, to climate change. These politically motivated and mandated disclosures are not about protecting investors, they are about shaming companies, or at least attempting to shame companies, into adopting their agenda.

It is a waste of resources for the companies, for their shareholders, and for the SEC. Publicly traded companies are already required to disclose all material information. Having companies disclose information on immaterial issues, like the climate, is highly speculative and dubious at best.

Regardless of how you feel about climate change policy, securities law is not the place for it. We already have agencies in place to help protect our environment. The SEC's job is to protect investors, and that means making sure they have material information to make sound investments.

The SEC's guidance is also at odds with the FAST Act of 2015—legislation the President signed—and that requires the SEC to simplify, not make more complex, the current disclosure regime by June 1, a deadline which the SEC has already missed. Clearly, there are better, more pressing, uses for the SEC's finite resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and refocus the SEC on their core mission.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to be funny here, but I am trying to figure out what political climate issues are. Maybe it is Democrats manipulate the weather so it only hurts certain people. I don't know what it means.

Mr. Chairman, indeed, this amendment would prevent the SEC from enforcing or codifying into law its 2010 interpretive guidance to public companies intended to provide greater transparency to investors on the material risks—and opportunities—of those companies to climate change.

This guidance was put forth after nearly 100 investors, representing $7 trillion in wealth management, specifically petitioned the SEC for this clarity.

Additionally, the guidance doesn't create new climate change regulatory frameworks or mandates. Instead, it simply provides clarity on what companies should view as a ''material'' risk or opportunity that ought to be disclosed to investors.

Given that Hurricane Sandy caused $70 billion in damage, it is difficult to say that climate change doesn't have an impact on business, unless you deny the existence of climate change in the first place.

Democrats support efforts by the SEC to modernize public company disclosures so that investors are appropriately apprised of the material risks, including the risks of climate change.

H.R. 4792, for example, represents a bicameral effort by Democrats to encourage the SEC to do more, not less, to ensure investors are aware of climate change risks like the effect of carbon costs on oil and gas companies.

This amendment always runs counter to a recent decision by the SEC to require ExxonMobil to allow a shareholder proposal from the New York State Common Fund and the Church of England to come up for a vote on this issue. That proposal would require ExxonMobil to disclose to shareholders how climate change may impact their profits.

Indeed, shareholders are increasingly craving this information. Since the beginning of 2016, eight shareholder proposals have gone to a vote at oil and gas and utility companies requesting increased disclosure of their plans to mitigate the impact from climate change on their operations. Average support for the proposal was 31 percent, but at Occidental Petroleum, nearly a majority of shareholders voted in favor. In comparison, in 2015, climate change-related proposals received an average of 17.5 percent support, with the highest support of 36.3 percent at Marathon Oil Corporation.

If the SEC guidance on this was stronger, and if the SEC enforced this mandate, these shareholder proposals, which go further than voluntary disclosures, would not be necessary.

As the impacts of climate change continue to be felt by individuals and businesses alike, shareholders will demand more information about the risks associated with their investments. The SEC should do more, not less, to clarify to companies the material risks they must disclose to their shareholders and owners.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, I apologize if I wasn't clear.

This amendment does not stop companies from mentioning bona fide weather and environmental risks in their disclosures. If a company wants to weigh in on climate change, nothing in this amendment would prevent it from volunteering that information; but the reality is that companies are already required to disclose all material information.

We shouldn't allow the disclosure system to continue to be used as a tool for special interests. Instead of forcing agendas on companies, the SEC should be focused on protecting investors, maintaining fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitating capital formation. The SEC let Bernard Madoff run free for 10 years—a decade—while he evaporated $70 billion worth of people's life savings and hard-earned money. They were asleep at the switch. They were busy doing something else like this. Their job is to protect investors, and that is the intent of this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I have been in public office for 42 years, 43 years, and only once in those years in the New York State Assembly and in Congress did an agency come before me and say: ''We don't want any more money. We have enough.'' That was the SEC in the old days, under another administration. They didn't want any more money, and I was shocked. No agency ever does that. Then, when Wall Street fell apart, we found out why. They didn't want any more money because they didn't want to enforce anything.

The gentleman is right in that Madoff got away with a lot of stuff; but now, when we have an SEC that looks at things differently—that says that we should ask questions, that we should, for instance, tell shareholders what they are doing to mitigate the problems that they may face as shareholders—we want to stop them. We can't have it both ways.

I agree with the gentleman in that Madoff and people like him got away with things, but not because this SEC, in these modern times, was looking the other way. It was because it was during a period of time when they didn't care, when they didn't enforce anything. A lot of people didn't enforce anything. I will give you an example which is related.

To my understanding, not a single person from Wall Street went to prison. I don't know if that is possible anywhere else.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, with regard to the new SEC and the old SEC, I have been here a little less than 8 years, but I heard the new SEC Secretary say, well, there is really nothing to worry about and that half of the 38 employees who were culpable in allowing Madoff to run free are no longer with the agency. She couldn't tell us what happened to them, if they were with another Federal agency or if they retired on the public dime. That is just like saying a pedophile changed neighborhoods—problem solved.

The fact is that we need to have the SEC focus on protecting investors. That is their main course. That is what they are supposed to do, and that is what the public expects them to do. That is what this amendment will allow them to do.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available to the Department of Treasury by this Act may be used to issue a license pursuant to any Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) memo regarding Section 5.1.1 of Annex II to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action of July 14, 2015 (JCPOA), including the January 16, 2016, OFAC memo titled, ''Statement of Licensing Policy For Activities Related to the Export Or Re-Export to Iran of Commercial Passenger Aircraft and Related Parts and Services'' and any other OFAC memo of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, we have an opportunity to do a good thing, and the good thing is this: to prohibit the Iranian regime from getting a product that is fungible militarily. One begins to ask oneself: What can that be, and how could the Congress be involved in that? It is very simple.

There is a large American company, which is the Boeing Company, that is now seeking to do a deal, and the deal that they are seeking to do is to sell billions of dollars' worth of planes to the Iranians.

Now, the Iranian regime—let's stipulate that everybody agrees—is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. When I say ''everybody,'' I mean everybody. Capitol Hill agrees; the administration agrees; the President says that is true; the Secretary of State says that is true. Yet they are on the verge of getting something that can be used for a military purpose. What is that? That is a Boeing plane.

This is a tweet from May of this year when the Boeing Company tweeted this: ''These airplanes don't retire. They're getting another 20 years of life. See how. #freighters.''

That is exactly it. Boeing, in a moment of candor, overdisclosed one of the interesting things—and they are really attractive things—about their products. Why? Their products can be used as freighters. Their products can be used to transfer things on behalf of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, whom everybody acknowledges has been complicit in terror.

This amendment is very simple, and it is very clear. It says that the Treasury Department cannot use money that is appropriated to license this deal.

I urge its passage.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, if you listen to the last comment by the gentleman, for whom I have a lot of respect, this is really not about this particular situation. It is about the Iran deal. Anything to make it look bad—to make the agreement look bad, to make any future work on it look bad, to make any future vote on it look bad—some folks will do.

What he says is not to allow any dollars to be appropriated by this committee to help in any way, shape, or form, or to get involved with the Iran deal. That is a situation we see a lot of on this committee, and it shouldn't be. It doesn't belong here. It belongs in another committee.

If you are opposed to what the President has proposed—with what the President is trying to do and with what many of us believe is correct—then we should work on that but not necessarily work on trying to cut funding and say that this particular part cannot be done and that that particular part cannot be done. It simply speaks to a larger issue, and I think we should be fair and honest with ourselves and say: I oppose this whole deal. I oppose this proposal. I oppose all of this, and I am simply trying to get at it in another way.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, the gentleman has conflated a number of issues, so let me explain and try to bring some clarity to this.

There is, really, a false notion and a false narrative, which is to collapse the JCPOA—that is the nuclear deal—and the activity around Iran and the ability to sell. So what am I saying? The Iranians, under the JCPOA, are entitled to civilian aircraft, but it is to use for civilian purposes.

Boeing, by their own admission, Mr. Chair, says this: ''Building on success: Boeing's commercial jetliners make an ideal platform for a variety of military derivative aircraft.'' Mr. Chair, this is Boeing's language from their own promotional materials.

How about this? This is according to Boeing: ''Good news. Modifications can take 3 months to 2 years. It all depends on how much militarization they want to do.''

Don't you see the point, Mr. Chair? Don't you see the point? To give these types of planes to the Iranian regime, which is still the world's largest state sponsor of terror, is to give them a product that can be used for a military purpose. We are not talking about baby formula. We are not talking about licorice. We are not talking about sandals, for crying out loud. We are talking about aircraft that can be used.

What can fit in a Boeing 747? This can fit in. It can fit 100 Shahab ballistic missiles or 15,000 rocket-propelled grenades or 25,000 AK–47 assault rifles.

Let's not do this. Adopt this amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, let me point out one other piece of literature. Again, this comes from the Boeing Company. This is from their Frontiers Magazine: ''Military derivatives front and center.'' This is a continuing problem.

Look, this is in stark contrast, Mr. Chair, for a company like Lockheed Martin. Lockheed Martin has said they are not going to do business with the Iranians. God bless Lockheed Martin. They could be assembling helicopters—they could be doing all kinds of things—but they recognize that they ought not to be complicit in this adventure.

It is also interesting to me to say that, a couple of minutes ago, my friend, the gentleman from New York, was echoing a criticism from the U.S. Chamber. The U.S. Chamber said this: ''Congress should avoid intervening in commercial contract agreements in instances such as these where national security matters are not involved.''

Okay. It is wrong on two counts. Number one, it is an assertion that this is a commercial deal. I am asserting that it is military, and that is true by definition. It is true by Boeing's own admission. Secondly, when do we defer to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for military and national security advice?

This is a good amendment. It is targeted. It is thoughtful. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, in closing, it is interesting that he singles out this particular situation, because, if we were to look at every place to which we send any kind of armament that, maybe, some people would disagree with sending it to, we may not be selling anything to anyone throughout the world because there are plenty of people who oppose just about everything. I mean, we probably would only be sending stuff to the British and to no one else, perhaps, and everybody else would be in trouble. So that is not such a strong argument.

The thing is that, if we start nitpicking—and I am not saying the gentleman is—this piece and that piece and that piece, then we could find so much that we can't send to Iran, and we will have no relationship at all. The whole purpose of what we are trying to do here is to establish some sort of understanding of who they are and an understanding of what their behavior is, but to still hope that, through conversation, though diplomacy, through other means, we can reach agreements that are good for us, good for them, and good for the world and world peace.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for acknowledging that we are not nitpicking.

Mr. Chair, let me just say this. Look, let's set aside every other country in the world. Let's come together, and let's agree on one thing. As for the world's largest state sponsor of terror that has been involved and complicit in killing thousands of Americans—the number one of the hit parade of evil regimes that are projecting terror and malevolence—let's agree not to give them more capacity.

I urge the passage of this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to authorize a transaction by a U.S. financial institution (as defined under section 561.309 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) that is ordinarily incident to the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1845

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, similar theme, this is a limitation amendment that would prohibit the administration from being involved in expediting the financing for the Boeing sale to Iran.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, the last amendment dealt with the actual sale of the planes. The Iran nuclear deal, the JCPOA, does provide that we should license those planes if we are sure they are going to be used for civilian purposes. So there is, at least, some argument about what Iran is supposed to get under the JCPOA.

This amendment deals with whether we finance airplanes, whether they are made by Boeing or Airbus or anybody else, and exactly what we are going to let our banks finance.

This amendment has nothing to do with the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal. Nothing in that agreement promises, hints, or even discusses the possibility that we would go so far as to lend money to one of the state sponsors of terrorism.

I know there is concern: Do we want to boycott everybody in the world? There are only three countries that are state sponsors of terrorism, and two of them—Syrian and Sudan—no bank would lend money to. So this is one country that we have to deal with that is a state sponsor of terrorism that might borrow money.

Why shouldn't we allow it?

First, because we shouldn't allow our banks to endanger their depositors' money with loans to Iran.

Second, because we don't want major banks lobbying this Congress and saying: ''Oh, my God, you have got to be nice to the Iranians or we won't get paid back and we might fail and then you will have to bail us out.'' We don't need Wall Street to become a lobbyist for Iran.

Finally, because when it comes to fairness under the Iran deal, some say the Iranians have violated it. Some say they are barely technically complying. But everyone agrees they are not overperforming, they are not erring in the direction of being consistent with the overall purposes of the deal. There is no reason we should massively overperform and provide financing we didn't even hint that we might do.

Finally, keep in mind what we would be financing if we finance these planes.

Hundreds of thousands of Syrians have been killed. Most of the country is either in an internal exile or is fleeing the country. Bodies wash up on the beaches of Greek islands from people who risk their lives to escape an Assad regime that is kept in power by the thugs, the money, and the weapons carried to Damascus by Iran.

We don't have to finance this terrorism. We're not obligated to do so, even if we are going to be in the strictest compliance with the JCPOA. We shouldn't expose our banks to that risk.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the same purpose as the amendment we just debated, that is, to undermine the Iran agreement and penalize American manufacturing companies.

We have already gone over this, but it is worth repeating. The JCPOA closed the four pathways through which Iran could get to a nuclear weapon in less than a year. We do not gain anything by putting limitations on the United States' ability to engage or monitor Iran's compliance with the agreement.

My objection to this amendment is the same objection I had to the last amendment: I see no need to proactively cut off domestic industry's access to a large market and, at the same time, undermine the commitment under the agreement regarding the exportation of commercial passenger aircraft and related parts and services to Iran.

The financial mechanism for any transaction regarding U.S.-manufactured commercial aircraft has not yet been determined. Once the contracts are completed, Iran Air will decide how it wants to finance its purchases. Like the discussion on the gentleman's last amendment, all payment matters will be done in full compliance with U.S. sanctions.

I understand that there is concern amongst some that the financing of any arrangement would be done through the Export-Import Bank of the United States. I would just note here that the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. is prohibited from providing financing to any Iranian airline. We should not be dictating the finance mechanisms for the purchase of American-made commercial aircraft, consistent with an international agreement and U.S. law and policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I have repeated myself. So let me just say this: The amendment harms U.S. manufacturing jobs and ensures that U.S. companies will be locked out of a large aerospace market which is expected to grow for decades to come.

Under this agreement, Iran is being subjected to the most comprehensive, intrusive inspection regime ever negotiated to monitor a nuclear program. If Iran tries to cheat, if they try to build a bomb covertly, we will catch them.

The President has repeatedly said that he will continue to take aggressive steps to counter any activities in violation of existing sanctions. There is no reason to believe that the next President will not do the same.

I strongly oppose this harmful amendment and encourage my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Quickly, there is the nuclear deal over here. There is Iran, the terrorism regime, over here. What we are focusing on is the latter, the terrorism regime.

This is a map. This is a map that was put together by the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies. It shows flights.

A few weeks ago, an Airbus A300 aircraft belonging to Iran Air, which historically has been on the terrorist watch list by the way, took off from an airfield in southwestern Iran. The commercial jet left Abadan, a logistical hub for the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and left for Syria. This is not a regularly scheduled flight. There is nobody with a straight face that can say these were tourists, this was commercial travel. Complete nonsense. This is illicit behavior.

Let me show you one other slide. This is from yesterday, Mr. Chair. Iran's air force flew a Boeing 747 from Tehran to Damascus yesterday, and this is the documentation of it. Iran systemically uses commercial aircraft to spread death, destruction, and mayhem; and we can do something about it.

So divorce in your mind, Mr. Chairman, the notion of the nuclear deal that the gentleman from New York was speaking about. It is completely separate. This is our ability to stop an iconic American company that has basically said: ''Well, look, somebody else is doing it.''

Let me ask you one question in closing, Mr. Chairman. When does history ever treat well the entity that said: ''I did this terrible thing because somebody else did it too''?

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

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

This is about the Iran deal, and you could paint it any way you want. Anyone can say what they want about it, but it is about a deal that people would like to destroy. And so any opportunity we find, we do it.

The charts that you showed are very good. The charts that the gentleman showed, Mr. Chair, are very good, are very strong, with a lot of information. But I am wondering, aren't those charts being shown to our military? Aren't those charts, in fact, being seen by our government? Isn't our President aware of whatever the gentleman claims?

He makes it sound like it is a secret that somehow folks on the other side found out. Whatever is happening, if something is happening, our government, our military will react to it.

He says to separate the Iran deal from what is going on. Well, separate the military from this President that the other side doesn't like. The military very carefully looks at this and advises the President. So, if something was going on that was out of order within the deal, they would tell him immediately. I know that, and I am confident of that.

This, I repeat, is just one of the many ways that we will see, not only tonight and have seen today, but on many other bills and for as long as we can, to see if we can undo the Iran deal, just the same way some people are trying to undo some other deals that were put together recently by this President.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer or enforce part 515 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (the Cuban Assets Control Regulations) or section 910(b) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7209(b)) with respect to any travel or travel-related transaction. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear that in just a few moments, I am going to be withdrawing my amendment.

Before I do so, I just want to say a couple of things because this amendment was a very simple and straightforward amendment that did nothing more than allow Americans to travel to Cuba, which is to say this amendment ultimately was about American liberty.

We just heard a long conversation about Iran, and yet, as an American,

you can travel to Iran. You could travel to Syria. You could travel to North Korea. There is no prohibition for any other place on the globe, except for one, and that is Cuba. And that may have made sense 50 years ago.

The reality of today is that it does not make sense today. And so this has ultimately been about American liberty. It has been about the bundle of rights that come with liberty. The Supreme Court has said that as real as the food that we eat or the clothes that we wear or the books that we read, the ability to choose where you come and go, where you travel to, is an American liberty.

So Jefferson said 200 years ago that the normal course of things was for government to gain ground and for liberty to yield. And I think it is very, very important wherein we run into policies that have outlived their usefulness, that may have made sense 50 years, that don't make sense today, that we push back against them. That is what this amendment was about and, again, affording people the true American way, which is to travel as they choose, not as government sees.

Two, it is about bringing change. I signed on to the original Helms-Burton language. The definition of insanity is continuing the same process and expecting a different result. We have tried this approach for 50 years. We have the longest-serving dictatorship in the world in the form of the Castro brothers in Cuba. And it would seem to me, if it hadn't worked in 50 years, might we not trying something different?

It was Ronald Reagan that encouraged engagement. In fact, that has been the policy of this country. So I don't like what goes on in Russia or in China or in Vietnam, but we allow Americans to travel there, believing that that personal diplomacy is part of changing those places.

Finally, this is about government regulation. It is interesting that we are at the eve of real connections, real flights going down to Cuba. But we will have to sign affidavits. We will have to store records for 5 years. We will be subject to 10 years in prison and $250,000 in penalties if we fill out a form wrong. And so this is also about easing government regulation.

So, in my closing, I would just like to say a couple of thoughts. I want to thank KEVIN CRAMER, TOM EMMER, RICK CRAWFORD, TED POE, JIM MCGOVERN, KATHY CASTOR, BARBARA LEE, and about 130 other Members of this House who signed on to this bill. I want to thank Senators JEFF FLAKE, JERRY MORAN, MIKE ENZI, and others over on the Senate side.

I want to thank the U.S. Chamber, who is going to key vote this vote tonight, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Washington Office of Latin America, Engage Cuba, the Farm Bureau, the Americans for Tax Reform, and a long list of others who said that this is something that makes sense.

Finally, I want to say, there is real momentum. As I just mentioned, just today U.S. transportation is outlining eight airlines that will be able to travel to Cuba. Last night, I think there was something of a deal struck between ag interests and the ability to export product or a deal that will be formed in exporting product to Cuba. I think that makes sense.

Given the fact that the Speaker is working against this amendment, I see the handwriting on the wall. I think it best to withdraw, so that is exactly what I am going to do.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 49 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), I offer amendment No. 50.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to remove any area from the list of areas considered to be HUBZones, until such area has been designated as a redesignated area by the Administrator for at least 7 years (as such terms are defined under section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise tonight to offer this amendment on behalf of my colleague and good friend, Congressman JOHN DELANEY of Maryland. Unfortunately, Mr. DELANEY couldn't be with us this evening. His father passed away a few days ago, and he is at the funeral in north Jersey tonight. He did ask me to make sure that this amendment was given consideration as a part of this legislation.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, the Delaney amendment is a simple reform to the Small Business Administration's HUBZone program to give affected communities additional time to respond to the potential loss of their HUBZone status. The Committee on Small Business has expressed a desire to reform the program more broadly, but there are more than 2,000 HUBZones that are affected by this right now, so we can't wait to see if such a provision is enacted as part of those reforms. Our communities and the economies in those areas need help now.

The SBA's HUBZone program was created in 1997. It was designed to encourage economic growth in historically underutilized areas, areas that have often struggled with poverty and a lack of opportunity. Small businesses in SBA HUBZones receive contracting assistance and a pricing preference for Federal contracts.

For the last two decades, this program has enjoyed bipartisan support. It benefits communities in both rural and urban areas. Right now the Census Bureau works with the SBA to update the locations of Federal HUBZones and, in some cases, to remove an area's HUBZone status. Many small businesses and communities that lose their HUBZone status, including in Mr. DELANEY's district in Garrett County, Maryland, believe that the process is just too abrupt, there is not enough time for these small businesses and the communities they support to adjust.

The short redesignation process also inhibits long-term investment in these communities, which is badly needed. This does not give local lawmakers in those areas enough time to adjust to potentially large job losses that would negatively impact those communities. The Delaney amendment extends the redesignation process, giving underserved areas additional time to respond to the loss of their HUBZone status. This is good for small businesses that are using the HUBZone program; this is good for the employees who work for those businesses; and it is good for the communities that are benefiting from these additional local jobs.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my friend and colleague, Congressman DELANEY, I urge support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Small Business, which I chair, has oversight responsibility of the HUBZone program. Our committee has not yet had the opportunity to hold hearings on the program to uncover ways it can properly be improved. It wouldn't be prudent to extend or expand the program until the committee has had the opportunity to perform its due diligence.

I am committed to working in a bipartisan manner with our ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and others to hold hearings and develop legislation to update and reform and improve the

HUBZone program. I would therefore urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, but I invite them all to share their ideas as we work through regular order in the committee process. That way we can be sure to take the action that best serves American small businesses and this country.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for his willingness to work in a bipartisan way with the Committee on Small Business—in particular, my colleague Ms. VELÁZQUEZ—on this issue and the reforms therein.

Mr. DELANEY, I know, would like to see an extension, which is why he has offered this amendment, so that the affected communities have some time to react to the phaseout, potential phaseout of the HUBZones in their areas. I would again urge support of Mr. DELANEY's amendment to extend the HUBZone redesignation period.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Over the years, the Committee on Small Business has seen the HUBZone program move further and further away from its goal, and this amendment would only amplify this problem. Allowing a massive expansion of the program, as has been proposed, would greatly reduce the efficacy of the program by steering contracts away from active economically distressed areas.

The amendment will also dilute the competition in HUBZone contracting opportunities as well as in the free and open marketplace. In some cases, agencies will even be required to pay up to 10 percent more for goods and services to companies that would otherwise not qualify for the program. The chairman and I are committed to working on the HUBZone program.

The committee plans on conducting a hearing in the fall, and I am working on a comprehensive reform bill. We will welcome Mr. DELANEY's participation as we look further into how we can improve this program, while ensuring that contracts are awarded to those areas that need them most.

However, I cannot, in good conscience, support the inclusion of this provision. It has not been vetted by the committee of jurisdiction, and there is not any evidence that this amendment will further the mission of the HUBZone program of supporting economically disadvantaged areas. I therefore ask my fellow Members to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying that we know there is some concern about redesignating the HUBZones, but we have listened, and I think it is best that we wait and let the authorizing committees of jurisdiction work through this issue; and so, therefore, I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

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

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), I offer amendment No. 51.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interest and costs specified in the judgments to Iran using amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or interest from amounts appropriated under such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, the Treasury Department transferred $1.7 billion to Iran's Central Bank to resolve a long-running financial dispute regarding Iran's arms purchases before the revolution of 1979.

The agreement involved the return of $400 million in Iranian funds that the United States seized after the revolution plus an additional $1.3 billion in interest. This financial transaction was carried out through the Department of the Treasury Judgment Fund, a permanent, indefinite appropriation that was created by Congress in 1956 to pay judgments entered against the United States.

While the U.S. Department of the Treasury claims that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, IRGC, remains sanctioned under our current sanctions regime, an associate fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, Saeed Ghasseminejad, recently noted that Iran's Guardian Council approved the government's 2017 budget that instructed Iran's Central Bank to transfer that $1.7 billion to Iran's military establishment, which includes the IRGC.

According to administration officials, outstanding legal claims against the United States by Iran remain, meaning that future payments could be made as a result of any resulting settlement.

It is unacceptable for additional U.S. taxpayer dollars to flow into the hands of the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and that is why this amendment is needed. It prohibits funds from being used to pay final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interests and costs specified in the judgments to Iran using amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or interest from amounts appropriated under such section.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would put the United States in breach of its international legal obligations. It would also lead other countries to question U.S. integrity and reliability in entering into settlements and dispute resolution clauses in a wide range of treaties that directly affect our international economic interests, including treaties designed to protect U.S. investors abroad.

Under the 1981 Algiers Accords, awards of the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal are final and binding and enforceable in the courts around the country. If the U.S. does not pay, Iran will attempt to enforce the awards against U.S. assets around the world, which are significant. Even if not successful, Iran could tie up U.S. assets in litigation for years.

In almost every administration, the United States has entered into settlements with Iran, including especially with respect to claims at the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal. Settling certain cases with Iran is key to the U.S. ability to avoiding far greater liability where we believe the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal is likely to award a far larger award against the United States.

The U.S. has settled certain cases or parts of cases in the past for this reason, including most recently the settlement in January involving the Iran FMS Trust Fund. In cases where the administration does not believe we have serious exposure, it litigates vigorously.

In sum, this amendment would put the United States in breach of its international obligation, expose U.S. assets abroad to needless attachment litigation, and remove our ability to assess U.S. litigation risk regarding claims against the United States and prevent the United States from making important settlement decisions that are in the U.S. taxpayers' interest.

For that reason, for trying not to expose our country to those problems, I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment offered by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida, which has been part of a very effective effort on behalf of Mr. DESANTIS advocating for a more effective foreign policy, especially in light of a deal entered into approximately 1 year ago with Iran that is not in our best interests.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentleman just proved to me what we already know, and that is that this is about feelings about the deal that we arranged some time ago. It is also an attempt to embarrass the people who put the deal together, embarrass our President, whatever the issue may be; but this one is a dangerous one, because this one exposes the United States to various situations throughout the world that we should not be caught up in.

We have a reputation about paying our debts, about keeping to our treaties, about keeping to our arrangements, even with people we may not be crazy about. If that is what the idea is and that is what the deal is, we should live up to it, and this amendment goes against that. I still oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), I offer amendment No. 52.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to modify regulations that prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in any activity described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 104(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–195; 22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment on behalf of Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

Section 401 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 requires the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations to prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in Iran's illicit activities.

□ 1915

Under section 401(f), the Secretary of the Treasury may waive these prohibitions or conditions if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is necessary to the national interest of the United States, and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the reasons for the determination.

However, as noted in a recent Congressional Research Service report, section 401 was not waived to implement the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, while many entities with which transactions would have triggered sanctions under section 401 were delisted in accordance with the deal.

This delisting is unacceptable, given that the U.S. Department of the Treasury claims to be more than aware of the ''concerns that remain'' regarding Iran, ''such as transparency issues, corruption, and regulatory obstacles,'' as reported in a recent Free Beacon article.

Given that the U.S. Department of the Treasury is circumventing the law, this amendment was introduced to prohibit funds from being used by the Secretary of the Treasury to modify regulations that prohibit or impose strict conditions on the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in any activity described in section 401(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010.

I would encourage my colleagues in this Chamber to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, it is the same thing. I am repeating myself over and over again. That is redundant. Anyway, it is just the same thing. It is that we are not happy with the Iran deal and want to try to find any way possible to undo it.

There is enough support all around to at least try to reach a new day with the Government of Iran and try to find a way to have a better understanding. You know, I am a big supporter of this situation, and people have asked: Why?

Simply because I have seen, I have been a Member of Congress during wartime, I have been alive during wartime, I have been alive during peacetime, both as a Member of Congress and out of Congress. I would rather give peace a chance. The Iran deal allows for that situation.

Secondly, the Iran deal closed many of the pathways that Iran had to building a bomb within a year. And those are still there.

The President, trust me—do I know this for a fact? Am I in the room there in the oval office? No—if there is one item the President does not want to fail, it is on this one. So there are people looking at this on a daily basis. Any chart we come up with, any photograph we come up with, they have it at the White House, I assure you, and they are dealing with this on a daily basis.

So I understand the gentleman from New York, my colleague, has this amendment representing someone else, but he believes in it, and I respect him for that, but I think we should give this an opportunity to work. And if it doesn't work, the very people who supported it, I assure you, will be the first ones criticizing it and making sure that it gets undone or is done away with. But this needs a chance to work, and it is the best we can do. It is the responsibility we have to bring peace to future generations.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. DESANTIS for bringing this important amendment as we strive to hold Iran accountable.

There are many other bad activities Iran has been involved in directly impacting the United States, our allies in the Middle East, and around the rest of the world. So I do commend the gentleman from Florida for bringing this amendment. I would ask all of my colleagues to vote for it this evening.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 317).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with Ms. ESHOO,

Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. WELCH that will make it easier for the American people to figure out who is trying to influence their votes through campaign ads.

In today's political reality of nonstop campaigning, our system continues to fail the American people by allowing special interests and shadow groups to flood our airwaves with anonymous ads, with no true disclosure whatsoever.

Section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 requires broadcasters to disclose the true identity of political ad sponsors on air during the ad. The FCC currently relies on an outdated 1979 staff interpretation of this law that does not account for the dramatic changes in our campaign system that have taken place over the last 6 years. This has resulted in a major loophole in which special interests and wealthy donors can anonymously spend limitless sums of money to influence the outcomes of our elections.

To be honest, when an ad disclaimer says, ''Paid for by Americans for Kittens and Puppies,'' or ''Paid for by Americans for a Brighter Tomorrow,'' that really doesn't help the American voter understand who may be behind those ads. This is not what Congress intended. Despite having the authority to do so, the FCC has yet to take action to close this loophole.

In January, 168 Members joined Ms. ESHOO and me in sending a letter to the FCC to unmask secret sponsors of political ads. They have yet to act. It is my hope that our amendment, which simply states that none of the funds may be used in contravention of section 317, will send a strong message to the FCC that it is time to uphold the original congressional intent.

But this is not just congressional intent; it is also the intent of the Supreme Court. In the widely discussed Citizens United decision—something that I certainly don't support—Justice Kennedy, writing for the majority, said:

> The First Amendment protects political speech; and disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages.

He also wrote:

> There was evidence in the record that independent groups were running election-related advertisements while hiding behind dubious and misleading names.

In the McCutcheon decision, which basically said that anybody can give unlimited sums to Federal elections, Chief Justice Roberts wrote:

> Disclosure of contributions minimizes the potential for abuse of the campaign finance system. Disclosure requirements are, in part, justified based on a governmental interest in providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending.

So what we are hearing here is not just congressional intent, but also the recognition by the Supreme Court that disclosure is an important part of guaranteeing transparency in our electoral process.

We all know that dark money has flooded our politics, weakened accountability in government, and made it harder for voters to develop a true opinion of the individuals to Congress to represent them. This amendment will help change that and, hopefully, restore a minimum level of honesty in our electoral system.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at this amendment and what it says is that none of the funds made available by this act may be used in contravention of section 317 of the Communications Act. This says that you can't do anything against what the law says. I guess that is another way of saying you have got to do what the law says. We call that a double negative.

It doesn't make a whole lot of sense, but I guess it is a good opportunity for my good friend to stand up and talk about Citizens United and make his points, which I find interesting, and I am willing to listen some more.

I want to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this somewhat superfluous amendment that maybe would prevent the FCC from actually doing its job. That is my observation. And I respect my good friend a great deal. I am just curious as to why he filed this amendment, other than to talk a little bit about what he has been talking about.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Florida. I understand that this amendment has no legal impact in terms of forcing the FCC to do what it is statutorily required to do. It is just a prod. It is a way to say to them: We expect you to do your job.

We are in the middle of a very, very contentious political season in which hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent anonymously to influence voters' opinions and their votes. And we think that it is time for the FCC to act.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which will help ensure that the public knows exactly who is trying to influence their vote during elections.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope the FCC got the urge.

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

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

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 55 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 57 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. JENKINS OF WEST VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.
>
> Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, one of the most effective tools in fighting the drug crisis is the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program. It is also known as HIDTA.

This program works at Federal, State, and local levels, bringing together law enforcement to stop drug trafficking in our communities. In my district, the funding is to provide necessary resources to local police departments and county sheriffs' offices to help facilitate efforts to stop drug trafficking. It teams up with local law enforcement, the FBI, and the DEA to get drugs off our streets and lock up traffickers.

The police chief in my hometown of Huntington, West Virginia, says HIDTA is critical to the success of their counterdrug mission. They rely on HIDTA funding to support training and operational activities.

The amendment I offer today is straightforward and completely offset. It will increase funding for the HIDTA program by $2 million. The increase will go a long way in ensuring our sheriff and police departments can continue making strides in combating the drug crisis.

I want to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and the committee for their tireless efforts to fund programs making a difference in our communities. His work on this bill and continued support of HIDTA are truly making a difference in combating the drug epidemic.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, while I have only served on the Appropriations Committee for 2 years, it has been a pleasure working with my colleague from Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW.

Again, thanks to the chairman, Chairman CRENSHAW, and I ask for support for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 114–639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to revise any policy or directive relating to hiring preferences for veterans.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank, first, my colleagues, Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK and Congressmen TAKANO and AGUILAR, for helping me with this amendment. We strongly believe that veterans who served our Nation in uniform deserve the chance to serve our Nation in the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, a provision slipped unseen into this 1,700-page document, the Senate defense authorization bill, severely undermines these policies that have been helping veterans get jobs with the Federal Government. Specifically, it will prevent veterans from benefiting from the preference system if they are already employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, this misguided provision was never the subject of a public hearing, it was never the subject of a public debate, it was never the subject of a roll call vote, and it was never voted on in the committee or on the Senate floor. I am willing to bet the vast majority of my colleagues in the Senate do not know that this provision is in the National Defense Authorization Act.

America's veterans deserve better. We deserve the chance to proudly and publicly make our case for veterans preference, a system which has done so much to help courageous Americans returning from war to find good jobs so they can provide for their families. That is why I am offering this amendment. I want to give the Members of this body the chance to go on record in support of our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is deeply personal to me. After I got back from Iraq, I saw my friends and fellow veterans struggle to find employment and to get on with their lives. I personally witnessed the physical and emotional toll that joblessness can take on a veteran's life and on their families.

Simply put, the Senate language is a step in the wrong direction. After years of painful progress in combating economic distress and homelessness among our veterans, now is not the time to dilute a system that is working, that has been proven highly successful in promoting veteran employment.

The American people recognize that we owe an immense debt of gratitude to the brave men and women that have served our country. Many of them left civilian jobs, left their lives behind for months, or even years, to risk their lives to defend our Nation.

The veterans preference system helps create a fair playing field for veterans by compensating them for the time they spent fighting overseas instead of working in government or the private sector.

Instead of getting master's degrees, veterans were going door to door looking for insurgents. While other civilians were building their résumé in civilian jobs, our men and women in uniform put in time away from their family, in dangerous situations, with little monetary compensation.

Veterans are not asking for a handout. We have earned this preference through the blood, sweat, and tears we have given this country.

Mr. Chairman, this provision sends the wrong message to our troops. It establishes the wrong policy for our government and for our country and sets the wrong precedent for our future.

On behalf of America's veterans, I urge every Member of this House to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. I did not have as illustrious a military career as he had, but in the sixties I was proud to serve our country.

There is something that troubles me a lot, and I have to say it. There is always so much talk about our veterans, our veterans, our veterans, and yet, at the same time, people cut the Veterans Health Administration. At the same time, they try to take away preferences that they have gotten and they have earned the hard way.

When we think of veterans, we shouldn't only think of that picture we always see of the person in uniform and so on. There is also the veteran in a wheelchair. There are the young kids that come here and greet us Monday nights sometimes, with a missing limb and so on.

So, to me, I am either a contradiction or I am the way a lot of people should be. I will have to be really forced into voting for Congress to declare war. Given a choice, I don't want any war.

But coming back from that war, I have become a big-spending liberal when it comes to veterans. Give them whatever they want. Give them whatever they need. Give them whatever they deserve. And I mean that sincerely.

So this, to me, is an important amendment that the gentleman brings up. This, to me, is one that sticks to our comments that we care about the veterans. If we start chipping away at the benefits that veterans get, the day will come when we treat veterans just like any other Federal agency and cut away all their benefits and all the support that they need from us.

So I strongly support this amendment, and I hope that everybody else will do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for a contract for consumer awareness and engagement tools and resources communication.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would limit the CFPB's ability to unilaterally enter into fiscally irresponsible contracts for the purpose of advertising.

The CFPB has shown itself to be irresponsible with their spending and politically motivated with their choice of advertising firms. In fiscal year 2016, the CFPB has so far spent $15.3 million on Internet ads which have achieved questionable results. The CFPB is devoting a greater portion of its budget to advertising than nearly every other Federal agency.

Moreover, nearly all the CFPB's advertising dollars, including a $12.5 million contract signed in February of this year, are going to a single advertising firm that just happened to be used by the Presidential campaigns of President Barack Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. This is reckless, out-of-control government spending at its worst, and it reeks of cronyism.

Congress must act to rein in this abusive waste of taxpayer funds and stop the agency from throwing away money. We need to end this misuse of tax dollars by passing my amendment. And I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to thank her for bringing this before the body tonight, and urge its adoption.

This underlying bill talks about the CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. We have talked about it a lot tonight. One of the things the underlying bill does is it puts it under the appropriations process, and this is a pretty good example of why they ought to be under the appropriations process.

Most other agencies in the Federal Government are. They come to Congress, and they say: This is what we plan our spending on and here is how much we would like. But they are not accountable to anybody. So we are just trying to bring some transparency.

But this is the classic example of why they ought to be under the appropriations process. If they would walk in and say, ''We just want to spend $15 million of hard-earned taxpayer dollars on advertising,'' we might ask them questions about that.

So it is a good amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the Chairman. I really appreciate his support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is an ambiguous and punitive amendment which could prevent the Bureau from making seniors, servicemembers, and students aware of predatory financial practices, interrupt the Bureau's ability to work with consumer advocates and the financial services industry on consumer education, and keep American consumers in the dark about the only agency designed specifically to protect their interests.

For every dollar spent on financial education, $25 is spent on financial marketing. You can see that for yourself by searching for a ''car loan'' or ''credit card offer'' on Google, or looking through the junk you get in your mailbox every week. In fact, marketing of these products has become so pervasive, Google recently banned advertising for payday loans on the basis they were harmful to Google's own customers.

The Bureau has developed a number of tools that we should all be helping to make Americans more aware of, including a great set of resources on home ownership and mortgages called ''Know Before You Owe,'' as well as an online tool that arms consumers with the information they need to identify the most competitively priced loans in the marketplace.

The Bureau has used Internet advertising, as well as TV advertising, through GSA-approved contractors that offer advertising management services to get the word out about these important resources that help consumers plan for their financial futures and save their hard-earned money.

While Republicans claim to support transparency and competition in markets, they want to shut down the Bureau's efforts to educate consumers on how to get the best deals on financial services and avoid debt traps.

At the same time, Republican allies have spent millions of dollars on Internet and television for a smear campaign cynically named ''Protect America's consumers,'' which has falsified quotes from Members of Congress and misrepresented Bureau activities to discourage taxpayers from taking advantage of the Bureau's services.

One Sunlight Foundation analysis found that this bogus group spent $58,000 just on television advertisements smearing the Bureau. What real consumer nonprofits have that kind of money to throw around? Not anyone that I know.

Fortunately, none of the Republican attacks have been able to keep the Bureau from returning $11.4 billion to consumers, or from providing financial advice to more than 12 million unique visitors to their Web site.

We would, however, like to thank the Republicans for giving the Bureau some free advertising for those who are watching the debate. Make sure you visit consumerfinance.gov for more information on mortgages, student loans, credit cards, and banking accounts. And that is consumerfinance.gov, just in case anyone missed it.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I would just thank the gentleman for giving some free advertising there to the agency and proving my point: that we don't need to spend over $15 million of taxpayer money on this. All these services are available already online. Consumers can find this information.

This is about fiscal responsibility and accountability. We weren't even aware that the CFPB was spending this amount of money. As the chairman mentioned, there is no accountability for the agency. So Congress didn't know until a newspaper article did an investigation on it. That is how we became aware that this agency has spent 2.5 percent of its budget this year on ads, the second-highest level among all Federal departments and comparable regulatory agencies for this year to date.

So this is egregious. There is no accountability. It is not needed. So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1945

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to save the taxpayer dollar and to curb irresponsible spending. More thorough oversight of the CFPB is necessary, and I believe this is a step in the right direction.

So I thank the chairman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) at 8 p.m.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5485.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 2001

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 114–624, offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–639 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 40 by Mr. MESSER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. POSEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. CARNEY of Delaware.

Amendment No. 54 by Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 68 by Mr. GALLEGO of Arizona.

Amendment No. 70 by Mrs. HARTZLER of Missouri.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 179, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—235

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
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)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
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
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Delaney
Diaz-Balart
Eshoo
Hastings
Hurt (VA)
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Nadler
Nugent
Pelosi
Poe (TX)
Ross
Takai
Turner
Yoho

□ 2023

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 192, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—223

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—192

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt
Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Crawford
Delaney
Diaz-Balart
Fitzpatrick
Hastings
Hurt (VA)
Moolenaar
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Takai
Turner
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2027

Mr. HUDSON changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 179, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
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)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—179

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

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Delaney
Franks (AZ)
Hastings
Hurt (VA)
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Stewart
Takai
Turner
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2031

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, on rollcall Nos. 389, 390, and 391, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on all three.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—230

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—193

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

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2034

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 292, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—131

Adams
Aderholt
Ashford
Barletta
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Esty
Fitzpatrick

Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McNerney
Meeks
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Poliquin
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Sinema
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Zeldin

NOES—292

Abraham
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2038

Mr. PAULSEN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. KENNEDY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—12

Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
O'Rourke
Poe (TX)
Speier
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2042

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 14, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—409

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

NOES—14

Amash
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Franks (AZ)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Long
Lummis
Marino
McClintock
Palmer
Perry
Yoho

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2047

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)

Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
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
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
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
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Larson (CT)
Meadows
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2050

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the last two lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017''.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 794, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PETERS. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5485 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the ''Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence—Salaries and Expenses'' account, on page 4, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount relating to rental of space, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not require that it go back for further action. My amendment would increase funding for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence by $5 million.

It is our responsibility as a Congress to provide the American people with financial security, national security, and security in the belief that their voice counts in Washington, D.C. Instead, the underlying bill rolls back reforms put in place after the 2008 financial collapse, further undermines the campaign finance system, reduces access to affordable health care, and underfunds the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which is tasked with targeting the finances of terrorist groups.

In an era of new and dynamic threats, we need a tough, smart national security strategy to keep Americans safe. Even as we counter aggressors like China and Russia, we are faced with threats from nonstate terrorist groups like ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban.

Our military has taken the fight to them. In May, an American drone strike in Pakistan killed Taliban leader Mullah Akhtar Muhammad Mansour, and as of June 28, the U.S. military and its coalition partners had conducted over 13,000 strikes against ISIS. Those strikes have destroyed over 26,000 targets in Iraq and Syria.

Coupled with our brave special operators on the ground, this air campaign has helped our allies make considerable progress in the fight against ISIS. ISIS has lost 45 percent of the territory it once held in Iraq and 20 percent of what it once held in Syria, and ISIS no longer occupies strongholds like Fallujah and Ramadi. Pentagon spokesman Captain Jeff Davis recently said: ''There has been no strategic victory for ISIS in over a year now.''

But even as we have taken back territory and degraded their capabilities, the last few months have demonstrated ISIS' prevailing ability to direct or inspire attacks in the West. Paris, Brussels, Baghdad, Istanbul, and recently Orlando—ISIS' ability to direct or inspire attacks poses a clear threat to our security and to American lives at home and abroad.

In the United States, we have seen how difficult it is for our law enforcement and intelligence agencies to stop lone-wolf attackers inspired by ISIS, and in Europe we have seen the devastation that highly coordinated ISIS-directed terrorist attacks can inflict on soft targets like airports and train stations. These attacks involved terrorist fighters financed by ISIS using military-grade weaponry. In many cases, the fighters traveled to and from the Middle East to be trained.

Even as we kill their leaders, destroy their safe havens, and take back their territory, the threat from ISIS will not be eliminated until we remove their ability to direct and finance terrorist attacks.

Created by President Bush in 2004, the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence has extensive and critical responsibilities that include combating terrorist financing domestically and internationally. They work with law enforcement, diplomats, and intelligence agencies, and with the private sector and foreign governments to identify and eliminate sources of financing for terrorist networks. They also combat financial support for the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence cuts lines of financial support, freezes assets, and makes it harder for terrorist cells to finance and carry out attacks. By hitting the terrorists where it hurts—in their wallets—our financial intelligence officers make Americans safer.

My amendment will provide the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence with the additional resources it needs to carry out this mission; and moving forward, the House should also consider bipartisan legislation introduced by Representatives SINEMA and FITZPATRICK to develop a coordinated governmentwide strategy to combat terrorist financing.

By supporting this smart, targeted approach to undermining terrorist networks, we can support the American pilots and special operators who are risking their lives in the fight against terrorism, and we can help prevent future attacks.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would really like to thank the gentleman for bringing this motion to recommit to increase funding for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence by $5 million because it makes an excellent point as to why this bill is such a good bill, because this bill already funds the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence higher than it has ever been funded in the history of that office. I don't think we need to give them another $5 million. They have got more than they can deal with right now. They are happy we did that.

What this bill does is deal with the big problems we face here in Washington. Number one, we spend money that we don't have, and up here in Washington, we exercise power that nobody gave us, and we deal with that right here.

We lower the spending under this bill by 5.6 percent. We are getting a handle on the out-of-control spending.

But we spend money where we ought to spend it, like the SBA. They help small businesses get the loans and make the next big deal. They grow the economy. They create jobs.

□ 2100

The Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence enforces sanctions. They get extra money. That is great. But guess what? The way we reduce spending overall is we take money away from those agencies that waste money. In fact, we cut spending on 12 different agencies. We lower spending and we eliminate 6 agencies altogether.

So we are dealing with that part of it. And, by the way, one of the big problems in Washington is exercising all this regulatory overreach. We kind of rein that in here. We say to some of these agencies: Stop, stop, stop. Pause.

The Federal Communications Commission, they oversee one of the most creative, innovative aspects of our economy; and yet they are more active than ever before. So we say: Stop making these politically charged rules and get back to your core mission.

So at the end of the day, it is a good bill. Let me just tell you I have got four good reasons, but let me tell you two quick good reasons. This is the fourth time I have brought this bill before the House. Every year, the bill gets better and better. I am going tell you right now, this is the best bill that I have ever brought before the House. That ought to be one good reason. The other reason is, since I am leaving this year, this is the last time I will ever bring the bill.

Finally, just let me say to everybody here, if everybody is willing to rein in this wasteful spending, then you will like this bill; if you are ready to exercise a little courage and say to those nameless, faceless bureaucrats, We are going to put an end to regulatory rampage, then vote ''no.''

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for one purpose. I rise to recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) on his last Financial Services bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know they are not rising because it is his last bill. They are rising because this man has always been a gentleman and a statesman regardless of what side of the aisle he has been on.

He has represented the Fourth District of Florida for 15 years. His leadership will be shown on so many pieces of legislation, but his heart, his passion, and his persuasion was really shown on the ABLE Act. He never gave up. Because of the ABLE Act, it is now helping millions of Americans with disabilities lead more independent lives. He has changed their lives.

So I think I speak for all Members in wishing him well in his retirement and his quest to become a scratch golfer.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for the electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 241, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

YEAS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
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
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
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
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—9

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2109

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her 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.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
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
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Vela
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—185

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
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
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2115

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IT IS TIME FOR ACTION

(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, I said this earlier today. When I left my hometown, four people were gunned down during the July Fourth holiday, and over the time period we have all been working to find common ground on making sure that we have sensible, safe gun legislation.

But right now, outside the United States Capitol are throngs of individuals who have come because of the incidents of the last 48 hours, the loss of Mr. Sterling in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, in an unfortunate and unspeakable and inexplicable shooting by law enforcement; and then, unfortunately, the tragic shooting of Mr. Castile, a cafeteria manager loved by children and a licensed gun owner.

We love our police. We call 911. But there have to be hearings, meetings with the Attorney General, and an understanding of how we can address the question of the shootings of African American men.

The numbers are high, the statistics documented, and we must find relief—not a moment of silence, but action.

The phone in my office is ringing constantly. People are in pain. Young people want to ask the question, ''Do Black lives matter?'' and we want to answer the question, ''Yes.'' We want to do it in a bipartisan, multicultural way.

America has to address these concerns and do it now.

SOMETHING IS WRONG IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart, knowing what has transpired in the last 48 hours has been horrific. Two men—fathers, brothers, sons—gunned down by law enforcement.

We understand that our police have a job to do that can be difficult, but we need restraint from our law enforcement officers until they are able to determine whether there is a threat or not. You cannot be a threat just because you are an African American in a car.

No one should die being stopped for a taillight. And Mr. Castile, in Minnesota, was very compliant. He had told the officer he was reaching for his wallet and lost his life.

There is something wrong in the United States of America, and we need to address it soon.

AN AMERICAN PROBLEM

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I made a request in the Judiciary Committee to our chairperson to have hearings on this issue. We have a bill that would require each State to set up a system of independent prosecutors to look at law enforcement killings, shootings.

The fact is an Attorney General can't look at a law enforcement shooting without prejudicing their ability to do their jobs. They work hand in glove with law enforcement, and if they have to police law enforcement, they have a problem in effectively doing their jobs later on.

We have asked that each State set up a system of independent prosecutors so people know there is justice and fairness and oversight. That is reasonable, and we should have hearings.

What happened in Baton Rouge, what happened in Minnesota has happened in New York, has happened in North Charleston. It has happened in Cleveland, Ohio. It has happened in Memphis, Tennessee. And African American men are subject to being shot for reasons that others aren't.

Police need to be more careful, and we need to see that our country takes this, as President Obama has in his statement from Europe: this is an American problem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today after 6 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TURNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for July 6 after 7:30 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of his address to the Heads of State and Government in his role as President and Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly at the 2016 Warsaw Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3766. An act to direct the President to establish guidelines for covered United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1252. An act to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 2845. An act to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 8, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5912. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Community Facility Loans (RIN: 0575-AD05) received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5913. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report for CY 2015, in accordance with Sec. 5.64 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5914. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the total dollar value of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities during FY 2015, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 8305; Public Law 104-201, Sec. 827 (as amended by Public Law 111-350, Sec. 3); (124 Stat. 3833) and Public Law 113-235, Sec. 8028; (128 Stat. 2258); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5915. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael S. Tucker, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5916. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Israel, Transmittal No. 16-40, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(b) (as amended by Public Law 106 -113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 536); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5917. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers [Release No.: 34-78167; File No.: S7-25-15] (RIN: 3235-AL53) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5918. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report entitled ''Coming Into Focus: the Future of Juvenile Justice Reform, 2014 Annual Report'', pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; Public Law 93-415, Sec. 207 (as added by Public Law 100-690, Sec. 7255); (102 Stat. 4437); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5919. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and

Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''The Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances'', pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 290ff(c)(2); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title V, Sec. 565(c)(2) (as amended by Public Law 106-310, Sec. 3105(c)) (114 Stat. 1175); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5920. A letter from the Director, Office of Technology Transitions, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''Technology Transfer and Related Technology Partnering Activities at the National Laboratories and Other Facilities for Fiscal Year 2014'', pursuant to the Technology Transfer and Commercialization Act of 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5921. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Integrated Light-Emitting Diode Lamps [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-TP-0071] (RIN: 1904-AC67) received July 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5922. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Exceptions Applicable to Certain Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-1484] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5923. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's 2016 status report on the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and the Pediatric Research Equality Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5924. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2015 Compounding Quality Act Annual Report as required by the Compounding Quality Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5925. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standard Review Plan for Renewal of Specific Licenses and Certificates of Compliance for Dry Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel [NUREG-1927, Revision 1] received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5926. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Evaluation of the BWRVIP-234 Report ''BWR Vessel and Internals Project: Thermal Aging and Neutron Embrittlement Evaluation of Cast Austenitic Stainless Steel for BWR Internals (BWRVIP-234)'' [TAC No.: ME5060] received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5927. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5928. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5929. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting proposed legislation to authorize the Inter-American Foundation to create a subsidiary corporation, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 290f; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5930. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's strategic plan for fiscal years 2016 through 2021 in compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5931. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh 2015 Statement on the Systems of Internal Controls and the 2015 audited financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; Public Law 97-258, Sec. 9106; (96 Stat. 1044); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5932. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Agency Response for the period of October 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016, in accordance with Sec. 5 of Public Law 94-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5933. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''Review of Sustainable Energy and Energy Assistance Trust Funds''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5934. A letter from the Executive Director, World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's periodic report for the period ended March 31, 2016, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, Sec. 5(b)(1); (126 Stat. 2450); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5935. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a decision on United States v. Pawlak, No. 15-3566, 2016 WL 2802723 (6th Cir. May 13, 2016), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5936. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a letter with information on locating the annual report on bankruptcy statistics online, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 159(b)(3); Added by Public Law 109-8, Sec. 601(a); (119 Stat. 119); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5937. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Court's annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); Added by Public Law 90-351, Sec. 802; (82 Stat. 222); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5938. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Danville, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4836; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-16] received June 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5939. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ketchum, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2016-1288; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-23] received June 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5940. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1428; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-18499; AD 2016-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5941. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report to the Congress Concerning the Emigration Laws and Policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 402(b); (88 Stat. 2056) and 19 U.S.C. 2439(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 409(b); (88 Stat. 2064); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5942. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress entitled, ''Alternative Payment Models and Medicare Advantage'', pursuant to Public Law 114-10, Sec. 101(e)(6); (129 Stat. 123); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5943. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2016 Indian Health Service and Tribal Health Care Facilities' Needs Assessment Report to Congress; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5651. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from approving under subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, any project for the relocation of Runway 24R at Los Angeles International Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for coverage by high deductible health plans of medical management of a chronic disease without deductible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 5653. A bill to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROGERS

of Alabama, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. JONES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BARTON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. YOHO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BUCK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 5654. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5655. A bill to establish programs related to prevention of prescription opioid misuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 5656. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict interstate waste imports and impose a higher fee on out-of-State waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 5657. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform and reduce fraud and abuse in certain visa programs for aliens working temporarily in the United States, 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. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5658. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 5659. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to expanding Medicare Advantage coverage for individuals with end-stage renal disease (ESRD); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 5660. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide that the stable retail deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5661. A bill to establish the Flag Office Revolving Fund for services provided by the Flag Office of the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 5662. A bill to provide an exception to certain mandatory minimum sentence requirements for a person employed outside the United States by a Federal agency, who uses, carries, or possesses the firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence committed while on-duty with a firearm issued by the agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 5663. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to deliver high-quality career and technical education opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 5664. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to strengthen debt collection exemptions to protect debtors and their families from poverty or bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 5665. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for a net benefit review of certain covered transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 5666. A bill to limit the authority of States and local governments to impose taxes payable with respect to the sale of certain firearms or ammunition, or to impose new or increased taxes payable for background checks incident to sales of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 5667. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the way beneficiaries are assigned under the Medicare shared savings program by also basing such assignment on services furnished by Federally qualified health centers and rural health clinics; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 5668. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from taking the social cost of carbon or the social cost of methane into account when taking any action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 5669. A bill to provide emergency unemployment compensation to coal mining workers who lost their jobs due to Federal environmental regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5670. A bill to guarantee the right of individuals to receive Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act in full with an accurate annual cost-of-living adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5671. A bill to expand economic opportunities, improve community policing, and promote common-sense gun violence prevention in underserved communities, and for other purposes.eliminate the requirement that a firearms dealer transfer a firearm if the national instant criminal background check system has been unable to complete a background check of the prospective transferee within 3 business days; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Ways and Means, Small Business, Oversight and Government Reform, Agriculture, Rules, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 5672. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 5673. A bill to authorize the President to provide major disaster assistance for contamination of drinking water from public water systems; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5674. A bill to provide for the award of medals or other commendations to handlers of military working dogs and military working dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YODER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 5675. A bill to provide for the conversion of temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 5676. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6300 N. Northwest Highway in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Officer Joseph P. Cali Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5677. A bill to establish the United States-Israel joint commission to address

Iranian compliance with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5678. A bill to authorize assistance and training to increase maritime security and domain awareness of foreign countries bordering the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Sea, or the Mediterranean Sea in order to deter and counter illicit smuggling and related maritime activity by Iran, including illicit Iranian weapons shipments; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5679. A bill to establish a grant program at the National Science Foundation to encourage States and local school districts to develop and implement sustainable engineering education programs in elementary and secondary schools, through public-private partnerships; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. SALMON:

H.R. 5680. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 with respect to periodic beach renourishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5681. A bill to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test the efficacy of providing Alzheimer's Disease caregiver support services in delaying or reducing the use of institutionalized care for Medicare beneficiaries with Alzheimer's Disease or a related dementia; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5682. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Ms. MENG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JONES, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 5683. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize, in connection with the permanent change of station of a member of the Armed Forces requiring relocation to another State, the reimbursement of the member for qualified relicensing costs incurred by the spouse of the member to secure a license or certification required by the State to which the member and spouse relocate, to encourage States to expedite license portability for military spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCARTHY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. LEE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution supporting the bid of Los Angeles, California to bring the 2024 Summer Olympic Games back to the United States and pledging the cooperation of Congress with respect to that bid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOLD, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H. Res. 810. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the life and work of Elie Wiesel in promoting human rights, peace, and Holocaust remembrance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. DUFFY):

H. Res. 811. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2016 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. FINCHER):

H. Res. 812. A resolution commending the Tennessee Valley Authority on the 80th anniversary of the unified development of the Tennessee River system; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H. Res. 813. A resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to exclude provisions relating to existing or proposed water resources development projects of the Corps of Engineers from the definition of congressional earmark, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H. Res. 814. A resolution calling on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to invoke Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and conduct a military campaign against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which states, ''(t)he 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.''

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress

the authority to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states 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 Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5656.

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. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 which grants to the Congress 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. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5660.

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'')

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached language falls within Congress' enumerated authority to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States, found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and to make rules for the government, found in Article I, Section 8, clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5663.

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. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 5664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 5666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to ''lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises.''

Article VI, Clause 2 clarifies that federal law ''shall be the supreme law of the land.''

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 5667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 5668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 5669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clauses 1 & 3

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 5672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 5673

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United State Constitution This states that ''Congress shall have the power to. . .lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 5675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9: The Congress shall have Power to. . .constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court.

Article 1, 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 Power, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 5676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 5679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5680.

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 Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5681.

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 Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 239: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 430: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 449: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 546: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 571: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 610: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 612: Mr. BABIN and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 711: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCALISE, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 775: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 932: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1076: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1151: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1192: Mr. NADLER, Mr. VALADAO, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1217: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1358: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1439: Mr. WELCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1459: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1464: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1549: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1559: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1608: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1643: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1752: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1904: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1905: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2058: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2096: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2142: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2189: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2216: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2221: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2302: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2315: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2342: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2566: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2799: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VELA, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2846: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2887: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2903: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2962: Ms. TITUS and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2994: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3012: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 3051: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3092: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 3108: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3110: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3308: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3312: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
H.R. 3381: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3395: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3406: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3411: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3666: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3706: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3710: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3815: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 3888: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3929: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4043: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4172: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4177: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4186: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4247: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. MESSER
H.R. 4352: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 4362: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 4381: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 4474: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 4479: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4481: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4526: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4559: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4584: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4591: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4594: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4603: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4616: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4625: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4626: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 4632: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4681: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4764: Ms. GRANGER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4828: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 4864: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4893: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 4918: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4932: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4954: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4992: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 5009: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5025: Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 5045: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5082: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5119: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5127: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5129: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 5146: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 5172: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5180: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5183: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 5187: Mr. VALADAO and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 5232: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 5258: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 5263: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5292: Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 5299: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 5324: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 5365: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5374: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 5396: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5423: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5440: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 5475: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 5488: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5513: Mr. KATKO and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 5523: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 5543: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5545: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5555: Mr. BERA and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 5560: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5578: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5587: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5589: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 5593: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5594: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 5598: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 5599: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5606: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5607: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 5619: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 5625: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5639: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5646: Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. HIMES, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. BLACK.
H. Res. 28: Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Res. 112: Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 130: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 174: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 393: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Res. 647: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 729: Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H. Res. 752: Ms. BASS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. DOLD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KIND, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOLLY.
H. Res. 784: Ms. NORTON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COOK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 807: Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 808: Mr. POMPEO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. NUNES

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in H.R. 5631 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2016 No. 109

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, draw near and walk with us today. Lead our Senators beside still waters and restore their souls. Comfort them with Your grace as they strive to keep America strong. Use them to make our Nation a less dangerous place to live.

May our lawmakers find fellowship with You as they seek Your guidance and rely on Your wisdom. Direct their steps, providing them with confidence for every contingency. Make them more than conquerors in all of life's alternating and fluctuating intricacies. Fill them with reverential awe as they comprehend their accountability to You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The majority leader is recognized.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democratic leader, who has been leading a partisan filibuster of anti-Zika funding for over a week, said this about anti-Zika funding yesterday:

There's no excuse for inaction and partisanship. We can't afford to waste another day, a week, another month.

Maybe Democrats are finally ready to end their partisan attack on women's health. I certainly hope so, and, as I have said many times, they will have that opportunity soon.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, far too many Americans know the toll the prescription opioid and heroin epidemic is taking on our families, our communities, and each of our States.

Anti-drug groups certainly know the toll this crisis is taking. Nearly 200 groups dealing with this crisis in their communities called for action in a letter to Congress just this week. They wrote to endorse the conference report for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act.

Let me share what they wrote:

We commend the conferees for the final bill and are calling on Congress for quick action to send this to the President's desk for signature.

The report is truly a comprehensive response to the opioid epidemic, which includes critical policy changes and new resources. The report also acknowledges that the six pillars of a comprehensive response are each of equal import and interdependent as a whole, including prevention, treatment, recovery support, criminal justice reform, overdose reversal, and law enforcement. Only through a comprehensive response can we reverse current trends and provide individuals and families impacted by addiction with the services they need.

As you know, 129 Americans die each day as a result of drug overdose and this epidemic affects the public health and safety in every community across this country. This bill is the critical response we need.

These are groups such as the Vermont Recovery Network, the Free Heroin's Hold in Minnesota, Kent County Memorial Hospital in Rhode Island, and Voices of Hope, in my home State of Kentucky, among dozens and dozens more. Many have seen the impact of this epidemic firsthand. They know the difference this legislation could make, and they are calling for us to send this bill to the President as soon as possible.

There is no reason our Democratic colleagues shouldn't support this conference report now as well, especially given their support for CARA when the Senate voted 94 to 1 to pass it.

The senior Senator from Vermont called the bill ''historic'' and said he was ''proud to be a cosponsor.''

The senior Senator from Ohio has commended colleagues for ''coming together in a bipartisan way'' and ''taking action on the opioid epidemic that is devastating communities across our country.''

Just last week, the senior Senator from Washington penned an op-ed praising the progress on addressing the epidemic. She wrote: ''I'm proud to be working with Republicans and Democrats to conference legislation, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA), which would offer cities and states stronger tools to confront opioid addiction.''

It is understandable why she should be proud. The Trilogy Recovery Community, an organization in Washington State that has joined the chorus of those calling for passage of the CARA conference report, would certainly agree.

The conference report the Senate will soon consider can make a difference for the American people. It is the product of years of hard work, and it is very similar to the CARA bill that already passed the Senate with no Democratic opposition. Now is the time to finalize it, as the nearly 200 groups that fight this epidemic in our States are advocating, because this issue is just too important to be caught up in partisan politics.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

FOOD PRICES AND LABELING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the top Republican and the top Democrat from the Agriculture Committee came to the floor to talk about the compromise bill that would protect middle-class families from unnecessary and unfair higher food prices while also ensuring access to more information about the food they purchase.

Chairman ROBERTS said this bipartisan bill will benefit consumers ''by greatly increasing the amount of food information at their fingertips'' while avoiding ''devastating increases in the price of food.''

Ranking Member STABENOW noted that it will ''prevent a confusing patchwork of 50 different labeling requirements in 50 different States,'' and it ''recognize[s] the scientific consensus that biotechnology is safe.''

It is the result of bipartisan work to address an issue that could negatively harm consumers and producers. We could actually pass it today.

SANCTUARY CITY POLICY LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we all know that so-called sanctuary city policies are extreme. They undermine the safety of our communities. They can inflict incredible pain on innocent victims and their families. President Obama's own Secretary of Homeland Security has called such policies ''not acceptable'' and ''counterproductive to public safety.''

Yet Democrats voted to block two proposals that would have worked to prevent so-called sanctuary city policies from existing in the first place and would have enhanced penalties to keep more criminals off our streets when cities refuse to do away with such policies.

Senator TOOMEY offered one of them, the Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act, which he described this way:

> My legislation stands for the simple proposition that the safety of the American people matters. The life of Kate Steinle matters. Protecting our neighborhoods from violent criminals and terrorists matters.

Senator TOOMEY's bill would have ensured more fairness for citizens and governments that do the right thing. It would have supported police officers, who risk everything for our safety, and it enjoyed critical support from several law enforcement organizations.

Democrats again chose partisan politics over making a difference for the American people.

I know Senator TOOMEY won't be deterred. I know he will continue his work to do something about this issue. He has been an outspoken leader against the dangerous and extreme policies of sanctuary cities for some time now. I thank him for his leadership on this issue and his tireless work to advance this measure.

I also recognize Senator CRUZ for his legislation, Kate's Law, which would have helped protect the public even when jurisdictions continue to follow so-called sanctuary city policies by putting more dangerous criminals behind bars and off our streets.

These measures would have sought to prevent the kind of pain that Kate's family has been forced to endure, a pain that no family should have to experience.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION, OPIOID CRISIS, AND ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader talks about playing politics. There is no better example of that than what has taken place this week.

Everyone knows the innate problems with what was tried on sanctuary cities and on the so-called Kate's Law. Everyone knows they are just a political message that means nothing for comprehensive immigration reform or immigration reform of any kind. So that is why those matters were brought up.

It is obvious we have a Senator in Pennsylvania, a Republican incumbent, who is in deep trouble politically, and that is why they tried to jam us with that. There is no better example than what is going on with this opioid matter that is sweeping the country.

I came to the floor 15 minutes ago. In another half hour there will be another two people who die from opioids in America, all over the country. To show how disingenuous and political the majority is on opioids, one need only look to Tennessee. In Tennessee, Knoxville chief of police David Rausch knocks Congress over opioid funding.

My friend talks about the authorization that shot through here. Of course it came through the Senate pretty easily—because it was an authorization. There is no money there. That is why you have the chief of police from a place such as Knoxville, TN, who is saying: Shame on you for not giving us money. We can't do anything. All you are doing is authorizing more programs that cost more resources. In the police department we can't do it all. Rausch said:

> It's absolutely disappointing that Congress didn't move today on funding. Unfortunately, today Congress did not do their job.

He is right. He said:

> That's the message it sends to our communities. If they're not getting treated, they die.

That is the way it is.

We are having a conference report come to us that gives no resources. That is why you have people all over the country, and Rausch went to the White House with 20 other law enforcement leaders from across the country to talk about this. They came for one reason and one reason only—to get money so they can do something to stop this terrible thing that is going on in America today.

But, again, just like Zika, it is all for show—no money.

The threat of Zika continues to rise. Republicans are intent on wasting time with their partisan and deeply unserious conference report. They will force yet another failed vote on this cynical legislation and then pack their bags for the longest Senate vacation since 1954. The Senate will not pass this Republican conference report. President Obama will not sign it. This reckless exercise will leave the public health experts and officials no closer to getting the funding they need to help combat this horrible epidemic.

As we speak, there are more than 2,900 people in the United States and our territories with Zika. Nearly 500 pregnant women are showing evidence of infection by the Zika virus. At least seven babies have been born in the United States with Zika-related birth defects. We all know what they are—little heads, skulls caved in, brains that are small. And it is only going to get worse unless we act.

There is a path forward toward a bipartisan solution combating this terrible virus if Republicans are willing to do something. In May, the Senate passed a bipartisan compromise to address the Zika crisis. It had money in it—real money. It got 89 votes, which is an unimaginable margin for many pieces of legislation. Only the most conservative, conservative rightwing Members of this body voted against it. So maybe that is not a plus for my Republican friends. Maybe they want to be a part of that. You don't receive anything from the Koch brothers if you are not way over there.

The bill we approved with 89 votes wasn't perfect. I didn't like it because I thought there should be more money. We asked for $1.9 billion, but with 89 votes, we got $1.1 billion in funding, which is short of what we feel is needed. It is not sufficient, but at least it is a step in the right direction.

When our country is faced with an emergency, the American people should be able to turn to us—Congress—to act. They expect us to put politics aside. We have already done that in the Senate—we Democrats. The Senate bill, while imperfect, was not riddled with toxic, partisan provisions. We need to get the compromise to the President's desk.

Today I call upon Speaker RYAN to bring the Senate-passed Zika bill to us

for a vote. It would pass. The $1.1 billion is not to my liking, but I would accept it in a heartbeat. This legislation would save lives, and it would pass the House of Representatives if they would let the Democrats vote. But Speaker RYAN has this deal that he is following, which is a deal into oblivion. It didn't work for my friend, whom I care so much about, former Speaker Boehner. It didn't work for him, and it is not going to work for Speaker RYAN. He cannot do this. He cannot try to do everything in his power to appease the far-right crazies in his caucus. They are even adhering to the Hastert rule, named after the disgraced former Speaker Dennis Hastert, who is now in prison.

Speaker RYAN should listen to the American people. They desperately want Congress to act. Americans have had enough of Republicans putting party over country this year—and any year, frankly. They want us to responsibly solve problems like the Zika virus and opioids and not waste time appealing to the most extreme elements in our political system.

The Hastert rule is that the Speaker will not allow a vote unless it can pass with the majority of the majority. To get a majority of the majority over there is worse than trying to get a majority of the majority over here. We have some dandies over here, but they take the cake in their efforts. It is not going to work for us, Speaker RYAN. We are willing to work with you to get this done.

We shouldn't just leave here for this 7-week-long vacation with nothing done on Zika, this terrible scourge we have. It is time for Speaker RYAN and his fellow Republicans to put politics aside and let the whole House vote on this. Our country is facing an emergency with Zika, and it is time for Republicans to start treating it as such.

Mr. President, I heard a Republican Senator come to the floor yesterday and she said: I don't know what they are talking about. The words ''Planned Parenthood'' are not in the legislation we have.

Of course it doesn't say ''Planned Parenthood,'' but if you read the English language, it stops people from going to these Planned Parenthood clinics to get their advice on birth control, where millions of American women go.

My Republican friends have an obsession with Planned Parenthood. They want to do everything they can to stop them. In fact, as you know, there were Republicans who went and got phony pictures that were proven false. And, oh, that gave the Republicans such—oh, they loved that. Oh, what terrible stuff is going on; they are selling body parts. That was totally wrong. It was a scam by some rightwing character who has been shown to be just that—a scam artist.

The provision we are asked to vote for exempts pesticide spraying from the Clean Water Act provisions. It cuts veteran funding by $500 million below the Senate bill. What was that money for? It was to process veterans' claims. They whack it out. It cuts Ebola funding by $107 million. It cuts ObamaCare by $543 million.

I am sure my Republican friends are happy voting for this one. What we sent over there said you can't have the Confederate flag flying over military cemeteries. They took that out. That must be a real joy, that we can now start flying Confederate flags in cemeteries.

This legislation sets a terrible precedent of offsetting emergencies. It is wrong.

Mr. President, I ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 764, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 764, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill, with McConnell (for Roberts) amendment No. 4935, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell amendment No. 4936 (to amendment No. 4935), to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AUDITING THE BOOKS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to send a message to Secretary of Defense Carter. I wish to alert him to a problem that needs high-level attention. It is standing in the way of one of the top priority goals of the Congress—auditing the books of the Defense Department.

The need for annual financial audits was originally established by the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. By March of 1992, each agency of the Federal Government was supposed to present a financial statement to an inspector general for audit in accordance with the prescribed standards. To date, all departments have earned unqualified or clean opinions. But there is one glaring exception; that is, the Defense Department. It has a dubious distinction, under both Republican and Democrat administrations, of earning an unblemished string of failing opinions known as ''disclaimers.''

In the face of endless slipping and stumbling, Congress finally cracked down—except it looks as though the crackdown hasn't done any good. At that time, there was a new line drawn in the sand. It was placed in section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2009. In 2009, the Department was given a charitable 7-year reprieve from the requirement to have their books auditable, and it was given until September 30, 2017. Those 7 bonus years did not buy us in the Congress much. All the slipping and sliding and stumbling have continued undiminished.

The 25-year push to audit the books is stuck at a roadblock. Billions of dollars have been spent trying to solve the root cause of the problem, but the fix is nowhere in sight. And until it is, auditing the books will remain an elusive goal for the Department of Defense but a goal that has been met by every other agency of the Federal Government.

What I am talking about is the Department's broken accounting system. This problem has been a festering sore for many years. It adversely affected every facet of the audit effort. The broken accounting system is driving the audit freight train. How could the mighty Defense Department be buffaloed for so long by something so simple? The Pentagon develops and produces the most advanced weapons the world has ever known and does it with relative ease. Yet the Defense Department can't seem to acquire the tools it needs to keep track of the money it spends.

With little or no fiscal accountability, Congress cannot exercise effective oversight of defense spending. If Congress can't do that, then adding money to the defense budget, and borrowing at the same time to do it, is foolish, in my book. That is precisely why I opposed a recent amendment to add $18 billion to the Defense bill.

I want to take a moment to put my spotlight on the issue. My hope is to stimulate creative problem-solving and innovative solutions that seem to not be getting their proper attention at the Department of Defense.

A recent press report pinpointed the cause for all the stumbling that is going on at the Defense Department. It drew on testimony by the government's preeminent authority on accounting, Comptroller General Gene Dodaro. His testimony before the Senate Committee on the Budget had a razor-sharp edge. It zeroed right in on the old stumbling block—underlying accounting problems. While the Pentagon is spending in excess of $10 billion a year to modernize its vast accounting system, the GAO director said these investments ''have not yielded positive results.'' And since DOD officials ''continue to make system investments that don't produce better systems,'' he said, those responsible ''need to be held accountable.'' They are wasting money, in other words. As a clear, unambiguous indicator of the continuing accounting mess, he cited

in excess of $1 billion in Antideficiency Act violations incurred by DOD. The Antideficiency Act violations, according to the Comptroller General, means the Department is ''spending money that it should not be spending.''

I agree with the Comptroller General. That is what I call unlawful spending. A good accounting system, one with effective internal controls, should be able to detect and should be able to stop illegal spending and particularly fraud and theft. What is in place today doesn't accomplish that goal. Unauthorized spending is usually discovered, instead, by chance and long after the fact.

When asked how much of DOD's $600 billion in yearly expenditures is actually accounted for, the Comptroller General stated bluntly—his words—''very little.'' The Comptroller General's assessment is a very bruising indictment of how the taxpayers' precious money is mishandled in the Pentagon.

The Secretary of Defense has a fiduciary responsibility under the Constitution and under the law to account for every penny spent. None has honored that responsibility. One Secretary of State, however, made a good-faith effort. Leon Panetta formally launched the audit readiness initiative in October of 2011. While giving it a big boost with visibility, this effort sputtered to a standstill, like all the others, over the past decades.

During Secretary Carter's nomination hearing, Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia questioned him about the faltering efforts to audit the Defense Department. The Secretary replied: ''I am committed on the audit front.'' In response to a followup question, he stated: I will hold the Chief Financial Officer ''responsible and accountable for making auditability one of my top business reform priorities.'' During a meeting in my office, he provided me similar assurances. These solemn vows don't give me a whole lot of confidence. His predecessors spoke the same words, but all we see is a trail of broken promises.

To win this war on making the books auditable, it will take perseverance and guts. It will take top-notch, hands-on leadership skills and a chief financial officer who grasps the root cause problem and is committed to solving it.

In watchdogging the audit process for years, I have come to know the underlying problem all too well. I have been down in the trenches and have seen it up close with my own eyes. I was introduced to the problem when it just popped up right in the face. It came in the form of unusual notations in audit reports published by the inspector general. They read: ''No audit trail found.'' That red flag prompted me to dig deeper. So I asked: How do you perform financial audits with no money trail to follow?

The answer: You don't, except with great difficulty, risk, and expense.

One question led to another and eventually to my first indepth audit oversight report. It was published in September 2010. It zeroed right in on the root cause problem. I call it the audit-accounting mismatch.

My observations were derived mainly from reviewing Corps of Engineers audits for fiscal years 2008 to 2010. These were some of the Department's earliest attempts to comply with the Chief Financial Officers Act, requiring all agencies of the government to have auditability of their books.

The results of my study were mixed. This work provided a startling introduction to a problem. During extensive interviews, senior managers readily admitted that auditors had to do manual workarounds that are prone to errors. They could not connect the dots between contracts and payments and accounting records and make the necessary match-ups. Transactions were not properly posted to accounts and supporting documentation had gone missing. In fact, financial records were so bad it took hundreds of highly paid certified public accountants doing manual labor, characterized as ''audit trail reconstruction work'' or ''pick-and-shovel work'' to finish the job. Such labor-intensive accounting procedures are very costly—$50 million for the Corps of Engineers alone—and leave gaping holes in audit evidence even after it is spent. Such unorthodox procedures place outcomes on very shaky ground.

True, these observations were made 5 years ago, but I keep running into the same old problems. For example, I am seeing it again today in my ongoing inquiry into the Department's Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan. I see it everywhere I go.

The recently concluded Marine Corps audit is a perfect example of the same old problem. The broken accounting system is still driving the audit freight train. The Marine Corps, which is the smallest of the military services, had been claiming for several years that it was audit ready. However, when the time came, the Marine Corps flunked the test. Oversight audits by the inspector general and the Government Accountability Office concluded there was not sufficient, appropriate audit evidence to support a clean opinion. The transaction data was largely incomplete, unreliable, unverifiable, and unsupportable. In the opinion of the experts, the final call ''was not even close.''

When I spoke about the results of the Marine Corps audit on the floor last August 4, 2015, I underscored the need for reliable transaction data. Transactions are the lifeblood of financial statements, and the lack of those transaction statements doomed the Marine Corps audit from the get-go.

I ask Secretary Carter to pause and reflect on why the Marine Corps audit was unsuccessful. I urge him to explore the questions with Chief Financial Officer Mike McCord. He might be surprised at what he hears. Maybe Mr. McCord does not understand the problem. If he did, why would he continue throwing money at solutions that don't produce what is needed most; that is, reliable transaction data. Why doesn't he know the same old garbage is still coming out the other end of the sausage machine? How is it Comptroller General Dodaro knows it? Why do I see it plain as day? It is written all over that Marine Corps audit that failed—and a whole bunch of other audits—in big bold print. So why can't Mr. McCord see it? He does not seem to have a handle on the core problem—the so-called feeder systems. Though ridiculed recently on Federal News Radio as being ''museum ready,'' they remain the heart and soul—the foundation—of any accounting system.

In most business operations, transactions are transmitted instantaneously from the cash register or other points of origin to finance and accounting. At the Pentagon, they take a roundabout route. From their points of origin, transactions must first pass through a series of gates—literally thousands of feeder and other business systems. The trip through the bureaucratic maze is neither smooth nor certain. Somewhere along the way, vital linkages are broken. When ledgers and account balances are no longer hooked up to transactions, forget about auditing the books. It is nothing more than a pipedream.

In a nutshell, this is the root cause of the problem that still has the very mighty Pentagon buffaloed, and it is lying in wait for the next go-around. According to Comptroller General Dodaro, Mr. McCord is making the wrong choices, wasting billions of dollars on systems that don't work. CFO McCord wants us to believe that staying the course offers the best chance for success. I disagree. More of the same will not cut it. He needs to refocus on doable solutions. Maybe it is time for some new ideas, a whole new approach.

The audit strategy needs to be rebalanced. It is out of whack. The roadblocks need to be bypassed. Other agencies seem to be taking care of business by pooling accounting resources to save money. So why not draw on those skills and capabilities from other government agencies that meet the requirements of the law and use them to leverage a potential solution—maybe where we know things have worked successfully.

Why not allow a service provider—let's say, at the Department of Defense as an example, take any Department—to handle a slice of the Defense Department's bookkeeping pie, like civilian pay? Run a test and see if it works. If it works, build on it. For the next go-around, tear off a bigger chunk, farm it out, and see what happens. Try alternative solutions. Keep experimenting until the answer is found. After all these decades, nothing seems to be right for this agency, compared to all the other agencies of government that

meet the requirement of the financial records law.

CFO McCord needs some direction. Secretary Carter needs to challenge him to do the impossible. As difficult as it may be in the Pentagon bureaucracy, the Secretary needs to encourage him to think outside the box. Maybe Comptroller General Dodaro and CFO McCord could put their heads together. Maybe if they would team up, they could figure out how to simplify the whole system and make it play like a symphony orchestra.

Mr. McCord seems to be having trouble shaking mistaken notions, and here is a new one. He thinks the whole Department is poised for a major breakthrough; that the looming congressionally mandated September 2017 deadline is within reach. The Marine Corps audit proves that isn't possible. The military services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force—echo his assessment. They claim to be ''on track to be ready for audit'' by the deadline. I suspect they are about as ready as the Marine Corps was. The experts think the other services are in far worse shape than the Marine Corps. If true, the probability of earning a departmentwide clean opinion is slim to none.

Now, suddenly, to my amazement, Mr. McCord appears to be backing away from his prediction about meeting the deadline. On June 15, he told the House Armed Services Committee that the Department is, in his words, ''many years'' away from a clean opinion. How can the Department be audit ready and meet the deadline if it is still years away from a clean opinion? His messages are downright confusing and maybe contradictory. If he knows DOD is years away from a clean opinion, then he must also know it is not audit ready or even close to it. Mr. McCord needs to explain his apparent inconsistency.

Clearly, the impending deadline remains an elusive goal. However, of one thing I am certain, the next round is being touted as ''the largest audit ever undertaken.'' If Mr. McCord fails to come up with some workable solution that gets a firm handle on transactions, there will not be enough auditors in the universe to tackle this job. This job is just too big for the pick-and-shovel routine, and the cost could be astronomical.

I want Secretary Carter to succeed. I am counting on him to get the faltering audit readiness initiative back on track and moving in the right direction. The taxpayers deserve nothing less.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The assistant Democratic leader.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if a student is failing in school, many people will rally around that student and ask: What is missing? Is the student working hard enough? Is the teacher connecting with the student? But we are concerned.

Then, when we take a closer look at the situation, sometimes we find the student has a problem, a challenge, a learning disability. One of those is attention deficit disorder: The student can't focus, can't really put his mind on a specific issue and stick with it until the task is completed, the mind wanders, the student loses focus, and unfortunately the net result is the lack of a positive learning experience.

There are many critics of Congress today and of the Senate for our failure to address some of the major issues that are challenging us in America. It turns out that when it comes to one issue, the problem in the Senate is attention deficit disorder. Let me be specific.

A few weeks ago, we had the worst mass shooting in the modern history of the United States of America. A crazed person went into the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, FL, killing 49 people and injuring dozens more. It was a shocking experience, and we heard about it early on Sunday morning. The entire Nation responded. The President spoke to the issue, even going down to Orlando with the Vice President to meet with some of the families and some of those who survived this terrible mass shooting.

Then we came back to Washington, and the obvious question was: What will the Senate do in response? The Senate had a plan, and the plan from the Republican leadership was to have a moment of silence. Well, that is entirely appropriate. I am glad we did, and we should, but it is not sufficient. It is not enough. So a number of us came to the floor—under the leadership of Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, and Senator BOOKER of New Jersey—and initiated a filibuster on the floor of the Senate, demanding that we at least consider legislation that would reduce the likelihood of more mass murders and reduce the likelihood of more violent crimes and gun deaths in America.

The proposal we suggested was straightforward. It said we should close the loophole in the background check system. It turns out that if you go to a licensed gun dealer in America, you will go through a background check through a computer. They will see if there is any evidence that you are a convicted felon or have a history of mental instability or other prohibitor. If that is the case, you are disqualified. You can't buy a firearm. But those who are paying close attention know there are alternatives to a licensed gun dealer. If you went instead to a gun show—which happens in Illinois and many other States on a regular basis—many of them have no background check for firearm sales. That is the case in northern Indiana where the laws are very flexible and light when it comes to background checks. The bill we supported from Senator MURPHY, similar to an earlier bill by Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY, would have closed the so-called gun show loophole so you would have a background check before a firearm is sold, keeping the firearm out of the hands of a convicted felon or person who is clearly mentally unstable.

The second proposal we had reflects the times we live in. We now have no-fly rules. If you are suspected of being a terrorist or having terrorist connections, our government can stop you from boarding an airplane. The theory behind it is obvious. We want to keep the passengers on the airplane safe, and we would rather run the risk of a suspected terrorist being denied a flight than run the risk of a suspected terrorist coming onto an airplane and endangering innocent lives.

The proposal Senator FEINSTEIN brought to the floor of the Senate said that if you are on the no-fly list or the selectee list, which means you go through a special search, or are reasonably suspected of terrorist involvement, you would be disqualified from buying a firearm. It seems to stand to reason, does it not, that if we are worried about a terrorist in our midst hurting innocent people, we certainly don't want that terrorist to legally buy an assault weapon in the United States of America. That seems obvious.

These assault weapons, semiautomatic and automatic, are dangers to not just a few but to dozens of people. There was a Snapchat that was taken by one of the victims in Orlando during the last 9 seconds of her life. The shooter at the Orlando nightclub fired off 17 rounds in 9 seconds. You can see the devastating impact of these weapons when they get in the wrong hands. The Feinstein amendment attempted to close that loophole.

Over 90 percent of the American people think the issues I just described—closing background check loopholes, closing the gun show loophole, keeping guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists—are reasonable steps toward gun safety. We have to do more to keep guns out of the hands of people who have no business owning them and might misuse them.

In light of that, you would have thought that this proposal would have passed, that there wouldn't have been much controversy, particularly after the mass murder in Orlando. At the end of filibuster, we had votes. Both measures were defeated on the floor of the Senate. Then Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine, a Republican, decided to try her best to come up with a bipartisan compromise. I salute her. She worked long and hard. It wasn't easy, and it certainly wasn't popular in some corners of the Senate. She brought her measure to the floor—a no-fly, no-buy measure, a variation on the Feinstein amendment—and there was an attempt to table it, to stop the amendment in its tracks, but Senator COLLINS managed to get eight Republicans, including herself, to vote with the Democrats, and the measure was not tabled, but the measure now sits as part of an appropriations bill and has not been addressed again.

While we have gone through this in the last several weeks, the House had a different approach. There was a sit-in that lasted over 24 hours to call attention to the need for debate and votes on gun safety. We have been told the Speaker of the House, PAUL RYAN, has promised them a vote this week. It is unlikely that anything is going to pass in the House of Representatives.

What is next? The American people ask us: Is that it? Are you finished with gun safety? You play to a draw on the amendments in the Senate, you take up a measure in the House, which has a dim likelihood of passing, and that is all you are going do? And then we leave. Next week will be the last week in session before September. We will be gone for 7 weeks, the longest period of recess in 50 or 60 years in the U.S. Senate, while we recess for the conventions and for the August period when we spend time with our families. My concern, of course, is one that is shared by many. It would be miraculous if we didn't have another mass shooting in that 7-week period of time. I hope we do not. I pray we do not. History tells us that it is highly likely it will happen. Then we will return and have a moment of silence, and then we will do nothing.

You see, it is attention deficit disorder in the Senate when it comes to issues involving gun safety, but for many Americans all around this country, this is an issue they think about regularly. I can certainly tell you that in my home State of Illinois, the city of Chicago I am honored to represent, it is an issue that is on the front page of every newspaper every day.

Over the holiday weekend, the Fourth of July holiday weekend, at least 66 people were shot in the city of Chicago. At least five of them died. The victims of the gun violence include children. A 5-year-old girl and her 8-year-old cousin were shot and wounded while playing with sparklers on the Fourth of July. An 11-year-old boy was hit in the arm. A 15-year-old boy was shot in the chest while he was coming out of a store. These shootings took place, despite a surge in police presence and thousands of additional officers over the weekend.

Sadly, it is not rare to see a weekend like this in Chicago marked by dozens of shootings. The weekend before this, at least 58 people were shot in Chicago, 7 of them fatally; Memorial Day weekend, 69 people were shot in Chicago, 7 of them fatally.

Last week I visited the 11th District police station on the West Side of Chicago. The 11th is the Harrison District. It is one of the most violent in the city. More than 270 people have been shot in the Harrison Police District this year. I met with the commander, Chicago Police Deputy Chief James Jones, as well as other officers in the district. We had a long talk about the violence and drug sales taking place on the streets in that district. We talked about so many different challenges—the lack of economic opportunity in that area, gang activity. They showed me a map, which looked like a map of Europe with all of the different countries—in this case, all of the different gangs that controlled a few blocks here or a larger section there.

We talked about the lack of trust and cooperation between citizens and law enforcement. We talked about the overwhelming number of children and young adults who have either been the victims of violent trauma or who have directly witnessed it. Solving any of these challenges is difficult, but we need to do all we can to reduce the devastating level of gun violence and to save lives. We can't wait for the next mass murder.

The most immediate problem in the Harrison District in the city of Chicago is that it is far too easy for dangerous people to get their hands on guns. So many of the shootings that kill and injure people in Chicago are preventable. They never would have happened if our laws did a better job of keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives division of the Federal Government told me last year that they had looked at the crime guns that were confiscated in the deadliest sections of Chicago and that up to forty percent of those guns were coming from gun shows in Northern Indiana where there are no background checks. The traffickers and gang leaders literally opened the trunks of their cars and filled them with firearms in Northern Indiana and then took a one-half hour trip back to the city and sold them at night in the neighborhood and alleys.

That is the reality—no background checks. We can close that loophole. Will it end gun violence? Of course not. Will it make it more difficult for those who have no business to own guns to get them? Yes. Why shouldn't we do it?

We cannot allow this to continue. We need to stand up to the gun lobby and their allies in Congress who block commonsense gun reforms that are supported by 90 percent of the American people.

Let's be honest. Reforms like requiring universal background checks to keep guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists are no-brainers. The only reason these reforms get tied up and dropped in Congress is that the politicians in Washington are afraid to death of the gun lobby. The truth is, the gun lobby is not about the Second Amendment. The gun lobby is about selling guns. If you reduce their volume of sales, you reduce their profits, and they will fight you. Many of the colleagues I joined in this Chamber are scared to death of what they might do to them in the next election.

The gun lobby may care about selling guns, but I care more about saving lives. I have been fighting their agenda for many years in the Senate. I am going to keep at it. I am proud to join my colleagues in the House and Senate in saying ''enough'' to this bloodshed in our streets.

Several weeks ago when I joined Senators MURPHY, BOOKER, and BLUMENTHAL, we decided to move for votes on commonsense gun reform. Our friends in the House of Representatives had a similar effort. I was also proud to support the Democratic Members of Congress, ROBIN KELLY, JAN SCHAKOWSKY, DANNY DAVIS, BILL FOSTER, MIKE QUIGLEY, and STENY HOYER, who joined with local leaders and community members last Thursday in Federal Plaza in Chicago to protest Congress's failure to act on gun violence.

The American Medical Association a few weeks ago declared that gun violence is ''a public health crisis.'' It is. Each year more than 32,000 Americans are killed by guns, and 80,000 are injured. On average, 297 Americans are shot every day—every day—and 91 die. The daily toll of gun homicides, suicides, assaults, and accidental shootings is devastating. Our Nation suffers from mass shootings on a daily basis.

Since 49 people were murdered in Orlando, FL, and 53 injured in the worst mass shooting in modern American history, there have been at least 47 more mass shootings in America. These are shooting incidents where at least four people were hit gun by gunfire. That is a staggering total.

No city has suffered more from the epidemic of gun violence than my city of Chicago. So far this year, 2,026 people have been shot in that city, and 329 have been murdered. And 7 of the 47 mass shootings that have occurred since Orlando have taken place in Chicago. No city in America has experienced the number of shootings and gun deaths that we have in Chicago. These shootings are the result of a flood of illegal guns brought into the city by gun traffickers and straw purchasers. They take advantage of clear loopholes in our Federal gun laws, and they put guns into the hands of gangbangers and dangerous people. It has to stop.

There are so many victims of gun violence in Chicago it is overwhelming. Let me mention a few recent ones. On Father's Day, a 3-year-old boy named Devon Quinn was sitting in a car seat next to his father in the Woodlawn neighborhood when their car was riddled with bullets by a drive-by shooter. The gunman tried to target nearby gang members. He was a terrible shot. Innocent people were hurt. The boy's father dove in front of his son to try to shield him, but a bullet struck 3-year-old Devon, who almost died. This 3-year-old is currently alive but paralyzed, unable to breathe on his own.

On June 30, Chanda Foreman was killed on her 37th birthday in a mass shooting in the Washington Heights neighborhood that also injured 4 other people. She was described by her family as a great person and responsible worker. She had a 6-year-old daughter

who will now grow up without a mother. She was sitting in her car when apparently two rival gangs started shooting at one another, and she was killed in the crossfire.

On July 2, a father named Dionus Neely, his 10-year-old daughter, Elle, and his 3-year-old daughter Endia were shot and killed in their home in Hazel Crest. Investigators said this appeared to be a targeted attack. They described it as pure evil. Erin Neely, the wife of Dionus and mother of Elle and Endia, said:

> Endia was the light of this world, always smiling and hugging and laughing. And Elle was a dancer. She was the life of the party. And my husband, he was a stay-at-home dad. He was a good father.

She said:

> They did not deserve this.

I am going to keep these shooting victims and families in my thoughts and prayers, but thoughts and prayers and moments of silence are not enough. Lawmakers have a responsibility to do everything in their power to protect innocent Americans from being shot and killed in their homes, their cars, and in their neighborhoods. We can't allow this to continue.

I am going to join my allies in Congress to try to stop it with real gun reform. I am going to focus my attention on the problem that will not go away. My colleagues who think if they just wait long enough we will forget this issue are just plain wrong. I am not going to quit. We need the American people to stand with us. If they will help us in speaking out for commonsense reform, we can finally beat the gun lobby and stop putting guns in the hands of people who have no business owning them and save lives across America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for what he said. As he knows, like many Vermonters, I consider myself a responsible gun owner, but I don't think it is responsible when people are allowed to come in and buy guns with no background checks, get whatever they want, and then make a profit selling them to gangs. I don't know how anybody, any lobby or any Member of Congress, can say they can support that. I thank the Senator from Illinois for what he said. He is absolutely right.

Mr. President, it has been just 2 weeks since negotiators released what can only be called a farce of a proposal to require the labeling of genetically engineered foods. Less than a week after it was released—without any committee action, any testimony, no recorded feedback from either proponents or opponents—the Senate majority leader filed cloture on a privileged vehicle to fast-track this bill.

Gone are the promises of regular order. Gone are the pledges of an open amendment process. Instead, the Senate will now consider whether to preempt carefully considered, long-debated State laws that protect and enforce a consumer's right to know.

Make no mistake: Vermont's first-in-the-Nation GE labeling law is what is under attack here. Vermont's carefully debated law is the threat that has driven millions of dollars in lobbying to the doors of the U.S. Senate. And the millions of dollars from lobbyists seem to have paid off because suddenly, even with all of the unsolved problems facing America—we don't have our appropriations bills done, we don't have money for Zika, and we can't do anything about the sale of high-powered weapons to gangs who then use them to shoot innocent people—lobbyists can come in and say: Change all the rules. Ignore all of the precedence. Forget the pledges you have made. Let's just zip through this bill and get it done because we want it.

No wonder this Congress is disfavored by the American people. This bill does not consider that 9 out of 10 consumers support a mandatory GE label on their food products. What this bill does not recognize is that 64 countries around the world mandate GE labeling. This bill does not benefit from a thorough, open, constructive debate, but it has apparently benefited from millions of lobbying dollars and campaign contributions. Consumers want a simple, easy to read label. Instead, this concoction of a so-called deal would offer them a complicated scavenger hunt.

I was here in March when the Senate voted, convincingly, to reject the DARK Act. Well, what do we have today? We have a rebooted DARK Act that makes modest improvements, but falls far short of the disclosure that consumers demand and Vermonters have required. It does not have the disclosure that 9 out of 10 consumers say they want. We are listening to a handful of very well-financed lobbyists and campaign contributors, but we will not listen to 9 out of 10 of the American people. Once again, their objective is not to honor and empower consumers' right to know, but to derail State laws that do and to get by with as little consumer transparency as possible.

In this shortened period of debate, I hope to create for the RECORD what the Agriculture Committee has not: the shortcomings of this proposal, and the ways in which it should—and could—be improved.

I will first discuss the uncertainty the definition in this bill creates. We have heard repeatedly these past 2 weeks both worry and apprehension that the legislation before the Senate would actually exclude virtually all the GE products that are now on the market. This concern stems from the very narrow scope of the definition in this bill. This definition excludes any foods that do not actually contain the genetic material of a GE crop. So what does this mean in practice? This definition would exclude a wide variety of highly processed foods, from soybean oil to corn oil, corn syrup to sugar beets, and an array of other products that do not possess the actual genetic material after they have been processed.

Now, the sponsors of this bill tell us, no, no, no—we have it all wrong. They say that our analysis and interpretation of the legislation is incorrect. They say to trust them. They say this bill gives USDA broad authority to label GE products. They point to a letter from USDA last week—and remind us that USDA would be the only agency with authority to implement and enforce the GE labeling rules. In that letter, USDA said that the bill as currently drafted would include all traditional gene modification products which have come through the USDA approval process, such as GE corn, soybeans, sugar, and canola products on the market today, as well as products developed using gene editing techniques.

So, yes, on the surface, this bill appears to give USDA broad authority to develop a label for GE products. However, with the swift speed with which the proponents of this bill have moved, with no committee process, no debate or amendment process, we will not be able to ensure the language in this bill does exactly what they say that it does. Just take their word for it. The language and definition for a bioengineered food for this new label—and let me quote directly from the bill here—is a food that ''contains genetic materials that has been modified through in vitro recombinant DNA techniques.'' Well, let me interpret that for Vermonters and consumers across the country. That means that, if the food does not have genetic material in it, then it is not considered bioengineered under this bill. So even with the assurances from USDA last week, a simple study of this definition says that those foods that are highly processed and no longer have the modified genetic materials would not fall under this new label.

The definition also goes on to say that a bioengineered food is one that—and, again, let me quote directly from the bill—''for which the modification could not otherwise be obtained through conventional breeding or found in nature.'' This raises more red flags because many of the genes that have been modified or introduced do occur in nature, just not in the particular crop the gene has been added to. They might occur naturally—in frogs, say—but not in our crops.

We have heard countless questions asking: Well, would it apply to this crop, or is it their intention that this other variety would have to be labeled if the gene being introduced occurs in nature? USDA says yes today, but will it say yes tomorrow? If you look at this bill, there is no clear-cut answer. We have seen with the Vermont labeling law, where the Grocery Manufacturer's Association took the State of Vermont to court to challenge its

label, claiming it infringed on the association's freedom of speech, that such details matter. We know that the details of this bill are very important if we are going to ensure that it will hold up through the complicated regulatory process and in court, where surely a farm group or food manufacturer will challenge this law.

If the sponsors of this bill would allow us to improve this definition and clarify what is covered, there would be a lot less concern and heartburn, and it could help to shed light on the true congressional intent of this proposal. That is why I have filed an amendment to strengthen the definition in this bill and to bring it more in line with what we have seen in other countries, where many of these same food manufacturers are labeling already for their export markets.

Moving on to genetically engineered fish, another point the sponsors of this bill have tried to refute is how this bill treats genetically engineered salmon, potentially exempting such salmon from labeling. Again, the sponsors say we have it all wrong—that this bill would require the labeling of GE salmon and will not affect the FDA's authority to require a label under the agency's existing authority.

However, at issue is that this bill preempts more than just Vermont's Act 120 on GE labeling. It also blocks laws like Vermont's seed labeling law and Alaska's fish labeling law, which requires that any GE fish in the State of Alaska bear a simple label to let consumers know. The salmon industry is vitally important to Alaska, and that is why the Alaskan Legislature passed their fish labeling law a decade ago.

And what do we hear again from the bill's sponsors? I will tell you: They say don't worry. The FDA could still require GE labels for salmon. But we all know how the FDA has dragged its heels already in responding to concerns from Congress on the labeling of genetically engineered fish. Just last year, the omnibus appropriations bill directed the FDA to provide guidelines for the labeling of a fish as genetically engineered before the approval of a new genetically engineered salmon.

By preempting Alaska's law, the Senate will tell the people of that great State that folks here in Washington know best. Even though you have a State law in place today to require this label, a law you have had on the books for a decade, Congress is going to preempt your State law and give USDA another 2 or 3 years before completing their labeling regulations. In the meantime, not your State—or any State—may have a law in place to ensure this label. That is not fair to the seafood industry in Alaska or to consumers who are looking for this information. That is why I have offered an amendment to grandfather in those State laws that were enacted before January 1, 2016. We took this same step in the recent Toxic Substances Control Act reform bill. States that had already enacted strong chemical safety laws were able to continue implementing them. We should be able to do the same with this labeling law today. Doing so would ensure there would be no ''patchwork'' we have been warned about and would let existing laws to stay on the books.

On another matter, the sponsors of this proposal took careful steps to ensure that there are no teeth in this bill for any enforcement by the USDA. They specifically spell out in the bill that there is no authority for the USDA to recall products found to be improperly labeled under the requirements in the bill for GE foods. This bill is also void of any fines or punishments for violators, and there is no compliance deadline for companies. How, with a straight face, can we call this a mandatory label?

The sponsors tell us again: Don't worry—there is enough ''strong enforcement authority through several mechanisms in the bill.'' First, they assert that, since USDA has been given the authority to audit any company that mislabels a food product or does not otherwise comply with the GMO disclosure requirements, it will allow them to ''hold them publicly accountable.'' They point out that State and Federal consumer protection laws are preserved in this bill and that the FDA retains its existing authority to regulate ''truthful and misleading'' claims on the labels.

Now, that is a confusing point since the proponents of this bill have just told us that USDA was the only agency with authority to implement and enforce the GE labeling rules. So how is it that the FDA can still regulate ''truthful and misleading'' claims? Are we to then believe that the FDA will use its authority to enforce these labels that actually comply with a USDA requirement? Perhaps if we could clarify that issue in this bill, it would help to set the record straight when it comes to congressional intent and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. But, again, no. We will be blocked from offering any amendments to this bill to clear up this confusion and to ensure that the FDA can use their residual authority in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act's section 403, which covers truthful and misleading labels.

To go from a State law that has some teeth and enforcement capability, as we have in Vermont, to a Federal standard with no penalties, recall opportunity, or other ways to enforce this new labeling requirement is alarming. The proponents point out that states have the ability to enact an identical State GMO labeling law and can provide additional enforcement authority if desired.

So first they want to take away strong meaningful State laws on labeling. Then they tell those States they can pass something identical to the Federal law, as weak as you may think it is, and enforce it on behalf of USDA. All this because Congress appears too busy bending to the whims and interests of powerful interests to include any meaningful enforcement mechanisms in this bill.

The sponsors of this bill also tell us that they feel that ''public sentiment'' will be enough to get these companies to comply and just do the right thing. Will our consumers have to be the cops on the beat to go after these companies? When these families are already having a tough enough time trying to squeeze every minute out of their days, now they will police these multimillion dollar companies to make sure they comply? That is highly unlikely, and it is patently unfair.

Of course, then there is the matter of international labeling laws. Although some groups and Members of the Senate try to make it appear that what Vermont has done is completely novel, the fact is that labeling laws for GE crops exist in 64 other countries today. Certainly, they are not all identical, but I will tell you one thing: The definition for bioengineered food used in this bill is unlike any other in the rest of the world.

On this point, we hear from the proponents of this bill that, among the 64 countries who require labeling of GMO foods, there is no consistently used definition of biotechnology or consistent way that this is applied to foods. In fact, they highlight that some of our major trading partners exclude some of the very products that they believe this bill provides authority to USDA to label.

The fact is that consumers want the right to know for many varied reasons. For some, the question is a religious point. For others, they want to know the extent to which GE crops may increase herbicide use, not just the presence of the genetic materials in the food. That is why I have filed an amendment to strengthen the definition for the foods that must be labeled under this bill. My amendment is based on the United Nations' Codex, an intergovernmental body with more than 180 members, established by the framework of the Joint Food Standards Programme established by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Health Organization. A broader definition, as I have proposed, will also allow for this new label and USDA to keep up with modern science and the rapidly changing pace of gene modifications we are seeing developed and our researchers working on today.

This bill should not be so narrowly drafted that it ties USDA's hands and ignores the fact that there are dramatic advancements in biotechnology every day. Ten years ago, it would have been hard to have predicted the scientific innovations in today's world, and who knows what developments we will see in the next 10 years. This bill should be drafted so that we ensure that USDA has sufficient authority to make these determinations in the future, without Congress needing to update this authorization every time

there is a new scientific advancement in biotechnology.

And then there is the so-called patchwork. I have heard from the proponents of this bill that their efforts are to prevent a patchwork of different State labeling laws. They claim that the existing State laws will cause confusion for consumers and food companies. But what they fail to explain is that we do not have a patchwork of State laws today. What every Member of the Senate should know is that Vermont is the only State that has a broad labeling law in place and in effect today. Maine and Connecticut's laws have yet to take effect due to trigger clauses in those laws. Even if they were to take effect, these three States have worked in tandem and all require that the same language—''Produced with Genetic Engineering''—appear on the package.

In Vermont, our attorney general was given the authority to make amendments and changes to the State's labeling standard to ensure it is in line with other state standards to prevent consumer or industry confusion. So we do not have this fictional ''patchwork'' that some have claimed and used as reason to act immediately, without thorough debate and without opportunity for improvement. That is why I have filed another amendment to grandfather existing State laws for labeling, whether it be for seeds, GE salmon and Frankenfish, or GE foods.

Given the mounting unanswered questions and legal ambiguity that surrounds this bill, I cannot fathom why the Senate is intent to fast-track it. Rather than going through any sort of orderly committee process, with hearings and markup, its sponsors have sought to use procedural tactics to avert a lengthy, controversial debate. It is in part why there was commotion and confusion last week when the Senate held a rare rollcall vote on the motion to lay before the Senate a message from the House to accompany a bill. The Senate Library and the Congressional Research Service had to hunt back to an example from 1976 that is cited in Riddick's Senate Procedure for when the Senate had to have such a vote.

This is a complex issue, one that the Senate should consider deliberately, with a full and open debate of reasonable, germane, and relevant amendments. Only that process would ensure that we truly have a mandatory Federal label that does encompass the GE foods in the marketplace today and future advancements in biotechnology.

Again, I am discouraged that Senators—Senators like me who have the benefit of their States creating a long record to support effective, mandatory GE labeling—have been cut out of the process in crafting this proposal. That is why I have nonetheless joined other Senators, including Senators MERKLEY, SANDERS, TESTER, BLUMENTHAL, FRANKEN, and MURKOWSKI, in filing amendments for consideration. I would like to take a moment to explain to the Senate—and for the RECORD—just how modest and reasonable some of these amendments are. I have already mentioned a few.

First, I have filed a series of amendments to address serious flaws in this proposal's use of electronic or digital codes. I am a proud supporter of Senator MERKLEY's legislation, long-pending in the Senate, to require a mandatory, on-package label of some kind to identify genetically engineered food for consumers. This proposal includes among its options digital codes—or QR codes, for those versed in the lingo. They are black and white boxes. The idea is a consumer takes their smartphone, scans the code; the Internet takes them to a page, where they can then scroll to find the information they seek. I don't know if many of you in this Chamber have been to Vermont. If you haven't, you should. It is beautiful, especially this time of the year. It is also rural. We still face internet challenges. More than that, consumers should not be forced to scan the codes of 30 items in their shopping basket, simply to learn if they include GE ingredients. What was once a quick trip to the market for milk and bread will turn into a 2-hour ordeal—and that is if you can access the Internet in the store. I have filed an amendment to strike the use of these so-called QR codes as a means of labeling.

While this bill requires the Department of Agriculture to study the potential challenges to consumer access, it does nothing to assess consumer awareness. One of my amendments would expand this study. Another amendment would require that if such a study determines that consumers will not have sufficient access to information via electronic or other digital codes, the Secretary of Agriculture will require only on-package disclosure. Another amendment I have filed would simply require the language accompanying an electronic or digital code to say ''GE information,'' instead of simply ''food information.'' What harm would there be in giving consumers more descriptive and direct information?

Another amendment that I have filed would strike this proposal's effort to preempt Vermont's longstanding seed law. On the books since 2004 and supported by organic farmers and hobby gardeners alike, there is no need for this bill to go so far as to preempt this longstanding law that gives farmers more information about what they are buying.

Like others, I have filed an amendment to strengthen the definition of bioengineering and to strengthen consumer privacy with in the bill's requirements. I have an amendment to match the amount of GE food required to trigger a label to the 0.9 percent required in Vermont's Act 120 and other international labeling standards.

And, importantly, I have filed an amendment to grandfather in Vermont's Act 120 and any other similar labeling laws enacted before January 1, 2016. The bill before us throws away the work of the Vermont Legislature. Rather than treat the Vermont law—the first-in-the-Nation GE labeling law—as the gold standard and the floor for any national law, instead of using Vermont's law as an instructive starting point for a national label, we throw away the work of our legislature, the voices of my constituents. Well, Vermonters will not be silenced on this matter. I am here to give voice to their views, even as the Senate muffles the progress our State has made in advancing a consumer's right to know.

Speaking of which, I have heard from hundreds of Vermonters about this so-called mandatory labeling bill. For the benefit of the Senate's short record on this issue, I will take this opportunity to share with the Chamber some of the messages that I have received over the past few weeks.

This is a map of our State, and the dots show where I have heard from my constituents. Many have shared their concerns about digital or electronic disclosure options. I could read thousands of these letters, but I will just read from a couple of them.

John from Fairlee, VT, wrote: ''I am incensed over the Senate proposal to allow companies to put a bar code style label on packaging that could be read by using a smart phone to determine GMO content. First, I don't even have a smart phone and have no plans to buy one since we have no cell reception where I live. Even if stores have Wi-Fi, and I were willing to buy a smart phone, why should I have to go the extra step of connecting to a company's website to determine if its product contains GMOs?''

Well, John from Fairlee makes a lot of sense. For example, suppose you have a peanut allergy. Packages today will say if the food has peanuts in it or not. Suppose you have a gluten allergy. You can go into a store and the store will have whole aisles of gluten-free products, which would also be labeled that way. Why shouldn't you be able to just look at a simple label and see whether the ingredients were produced with genetic engineering? Campbell's Soup is going to do it. Why can't we just have a label?

Katharine from Brattleboro, VT, wrote: ''I'm one of the many people who cannot afford a cell phone. The federal proposal for GMO labels that requires a cell phone would be useless to me and many others on fixed incomes, disability, etc. Please pass a federal law that doesn't require a cell phone to access information. I deserve to know what I am consuming as much as people with extra money who can afford a cell. It just isn't fair to the rest of us to keep us in the dark. I pay my bills and live frugally and responsibly. I do not use my money for entertainment or extras. But I do not deserve to be restricted from access to important information.''

She went on to say: ''Additionally, cell coverage in Vermont is, at best, poor. So even people with cell phones might not be able to access information.''

Well, this Senator agrees with her.

Maureen said: ''I do not have a smart phone, as is true for most older Americans, and should not have to buy one in order to find out if the food I buy is genetically modified. This is a dishonest attempt to pander to big industry at the citizens' expense.''

Others, like Carl from Putney and Barbara from Hinesburg, said: ''I don't use a smart phone, and a label I have to scan will do me no good. I doubt I would want to scan everything I looked at in my supermarket, in any case.

''The proposed 'labeling law' is in fact not a labeling law at all. As I understand it, the food producers would not need to disclose anything, just provide a phone number or website that consumers could use to find out whether the food is genetically modified.''

Carl and Barbara went on to say: '' . . . to have a label that can be read only with a phone app is ridiculous. We personally do not have such a phone and will not obtain one because where we live reception is challenging.''

Hundreds of Vermonters even joined together in sending me a letter that said: ''The bill requires the labeling of packaged foods containing GMOs in one of three ways: an electronic code that consumers can scan; USDA-developed symbol; or a label. The bill leaves it to manufacturers to decide which of the three methods they prefer.

''Now guess which method Big Food will choose? I have no doubt that they will choose the electronic code that can only be read with a scanner. They know that few will want to do this and even fewer will be able to.''

The letter continued: ''A recent national survey showed that only 16 percent of consumers have ever scanned a QR code for any purpose. Unless I want to take each item to the customer service desk in the grocery store, I must download a scanning app onto my smartphone—assuming I even own one! No matter which app I choose, it may take a few tries to actually scan the code properly. Then I will have to wait for the website to pop up on the screen, which could take a long time depending on your network coverage inside the store, after which I might have to sift through the company's information to find the GMO information I am looking for.

''The QR code is hardly a label in any meaningful sense of the word. It adds a barrier between the consumer and the information he or she wants, and discriminates against those who do not own smartphones—which is half of people living in rural areas, 75 percent of those over 65, and half of those making less than $30,000 a year. This legislation discriminates against all these people and especially the poorest Americans.''

Well, it is clear that the proposal before us today is driven more by the perspectives of powerful special interests than by a commitment to honor a consumer's right to know or by a legitimate effort to make information available to all Americans. Consumers are far from this deal's highest priority. If they were, we would not be contemplating an electronic or digital disclosure method when many rural areas, including most of Vermont, face significant technological challenges, not to mention that this digital disclosure would also discriminate against low-income and elderly populations.

I have also heard from a number of Vermont organizations, all with grievous concerns about the proposal before us today.

The Vermont Public Interest Research Group wrote: ''VPIRG opposes the . . . proposal because it is a thinly veiled attempt to keep consumers in the dark about what is in their food. This proposal is nothing but a sham aimed at eliminating Vermont's labeling law without replacing it with any meaningful federal standard.

''Vermont's labeling law took effect on July 1, and companies are already providing consumers with clear on-package labeling that allows them to make informed decisions about the food they are purchasing.''

They went on to say: ''Vermont's law is not novel or unique. Over 90% of Americans support labeling genetically engineered foods, and these products are already labeled in more than 64 countries around the world.''

Others, like Rural Vermont, said: ''On behalf of the members of the Board of Directors of Rural Vermont, who are all working farmers, and our statewide membership of other farmers and their customers, I am writing to urge you to do everything you can to prevent passage of this bill that proposes to provide a national standard for the labeling of food that is genetically engineered. This bill does not meet the fundamental needs of the over 90% of Americans who want genetically engineered food products to be labeled.

''This bill is no better than its predecessors in the Senate or the bill passed by the House in 2015. The fact that the bill offers as a 'label' the option for food producers to require customers to use so-called QR codes to access information about the content of the product they are considering purchasing is absurd and blatantly discriminatory. The use of a QR code as a 'label' requires that the customer A) Own a 'smart' cell phone, B) Have the application required to read the QR code installed on that phone, C) have adequate access to cellular service inside their grocery store (highly problematic, esp. in Vermont), and D) Have the time and patience to navigate the web site to which the QR code will direct them in order to find the information regarding the product they are holding in their hand—the content and transparency of which is still entirely determined by the food producer. Try suggesting this scenario to a busy mom with a couple of kids in tow and you are likely to be laughed, if not chased, out of the room.''

The Northeastern Organic Farming Association of Vermont wrote: ''Vermont's GE food labeling law Act 120, which is in effect as of July 1, provides a more meaningful, enforceable, and consumer-friendly labeling framework than the current federal proposal. It should be allowed to stand.''

I heard directly from Ben & Jerry's, which wrote: ''We are incredibly proud of the ingredients we use and we couldn't be happier to tell our fans and consumer about them. That's why we find it so hard to believe that there are food companies that do not want to disclose the ingredients they use. That they are fighting so hard to oppose what polls show 90% of American's want, the ability to look at a food package and know whether or not the product contains GMO ingredients.''

And others have reached out as well, saying this from the League of Conservation Voters: ''Under the proposal, companies may disclose GMO content through a QR code, a digital code which requires a smart phone or other scanning device to decipher. Those who do not have access to a smart phone—more than 50% of rural and low income populations, and more than 65% of the elderly—will have to rely upon scanners provided by another party to access information about GMO content.''

Other Vermonters have reached out to me to share their concerns about the right of States to legislate in a way that furthers the legitimate and significant interests of the State. They have reached out, urging me to reject this ''deal'' or any other bill that would prohibit states from requiring the labeling of genetically engineered foods unless it is replaced by a strong mandatory national label.

Jennifer from Bethel, VT, said: ''I and many other Vermonters urge you to reject this bill, we want Vermont's precedent-setting, mandatory labeling bill to go into effect, and for it not to be thwarted by efforts for a weaker, overriding federal program of voluntary, or QR-code based labeling, which would only let some consumers know what's in their food some of the time.''

James wrote: ''We have worked too long and hard to have our efforts scrapped by politicians who know little or nothing about growing natural nutritional food.''

He continued to explain that he and his wife testified before the Vermont State Legislature in support of Act 120, Vermont's GE labeling law.

Another Vermonter said that this bill, which would nullify Vermonters' right to know what is in their food and legally bar any other State from enacting such a law, is ''an outrage.'' Many others also reached out to express their concerns that this ''deal'' is really just an attempt to undermine Vermont's law.

The overwhelming message that I have heard loud and clear from so

many Vermonters is that they simply want to know what is in the food that they feed their families.

Leslie from Middlebury, VT, wrote: ''The people of Vermont have made their voices known. We want to know what is in the food we eat and feed our families.''

Eric from Strafford, VT, said: ''I strongly urge you to fight to defeat the GMO labeling agreement proposed by Senators STABENOW and ROBERTS. It would undermine the Vermont labeling law and fails to offer consumers the clarity they deserve about what's in their food.''

And others have reached out as well, saying: ''I am very disappointed that legislators in Washington are more interested in protecting the food industries than they are in providing information to the consumer. We consumers have a right to know what's in our food, how it was produced, and its origins.''

And: ''We have the right to know what is in our food in order to make informed choices about what we eat and feed our families.''

''People need to have the right to know the contents of their food, it is ludicrous to deny this information to the people of this nation.''

''Consumers have a right to know what is in their food. And providing consumers that information shouldn't be left up to the manufacturer.''

''As a concerned consumer, I want the choices I make for my family to be completely informed.''

As well as: ''Like most Americans, I simply want to know what's in my food and how it was produced. That is why I support GMO labeling.''

From the many letters that I have received from Vermonters since this ''deal'' was announced, there is one in particular that I would like to share in full.

Michael of Brookfield, VT, writes: ''Dear Senator LEAHY, I have recently learned that Senators ROBERTS and STABENOW have proposed GMO labeling legislation. The proposed measure has numerous defects, and I urge you strongly to oppose it.

''The bill allows the agency to set the thresholds so high as to render the labeling requirement practically toothless. It also contains a loophole that could exempt corn and soy, the two most widely grown GMO crops in the country. Further, the actual required labeling would not require any actual information about the food to be put on the label, but instead can direct consumers to a website that has the required information. This would require both a smart phone and in-store internet connectivity in order to make a point-of-sale purchasing decision, neither of which are universal, especially here in Vermont. It seems that the authors of the bill are trying to make it as hard as possible to learn about what's in our food.

''I can understand the desire to prevent numerous conflicting GMO labeling laws from being enacted at the state level, but this ill-conceived substitute should be rejected.

''Sincerely, Michael''

I would hope Members of this body will heed Michael's advice. I am sure constituents in your own States feel the same way.

The legislation before us today undermines the public's right to know and preempts labeling requirements for genetically engineered ingredients in States. While it is true that the proposal makes modest improvements to the legislation that the Senate wisely rejected in March, the fact remains that this was hastily crafted solely in an effort to undermine Vermont's GE labeling law that just took effect last Friday. And so I would like to recap some of these concerns.

I remain concerned that this legislation takes away the rights of Vermont—or actually any other State—to legislate in a way that advances public health and food safety, informs consumers about potential environmental threats, avoids consumer confusion, and protects religious tradition. Not only would this legislation preempt Vermont's Act 120 GE disclosure requirement, but it would block other State laws like Alaska's requirement to label all products containing genetically engineered fish and shell fish, and Vermont and Virginia's laws requiring the labeling of genetically engineered seed or transgenetic seed.

I remain concerned that the bill's definition of ''bioengineered foods'' has been written so narrowly that it allows some of the most common foods to go unlabeled. Whether this bill was drafted with the intent to exempt certain foods remains unclear. What is clear, is that the definition has created significant confusion, not just among consumers, but also in this very Chamber and across Federal agencies. That is why we should be having a full debate and amendment process to allow for technical corrections and to ensure clarity.

I remain concerned that this bill allows for the use of electronic disclosure methods. In many rural parts of the country—including rural parts of the distinguished Presiding Officer's State, the rural parts of the distinguished Senator from Oregon's State, who is on the floor, and the many rural parts of Vermont—we have significant technological challenges that make it nearly impossible for consumers to access the electronic or digital disclosure methods allowed in this bill. I do believe that by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a study on this issue, these difficulties unavoidably will be recognized. However, significant questions remain. If the Secretary finds, as I am sure will be the case, that additional disclosure options are required for rural areas, will the USDA be responsible for installing scanners in grocery stores? Or are the proponents of this proposal going to put the burden on our retail establishments, large and small, to install costly digital scanners? A scannable code or a 1–800 number is not true disclosure. It is a burden on consumers. It creates an obstacle course from consumers. It is the exact opposite of what we mean when we say, ''Just Label It.''

I remain concerned that this proposal doesn't truly support a consumer's right to know. Consumers were an afterthought in the crafting of this ''deal.'' We should stay true to the kinds of things most of us say in our campaigns and our political advertising. We say: We are there for you. We are there to protect you. We are there for you.

Well, that is not true. You, the consumer, were an afterthought of the crafting of this deal. The prime motivation was to allow large corporations to get by with doing as little as possible, and the bill's lack of transparency is counterproductive. The more information that we seek to hide from consumers about how their food is grown and manufactured, the more unnecessary red flags we raise for them. Our farmers and food producers should be proud to inform consumers about what they plant, how they grow it, the choices they make, and why.

I also remain concerned that this proposal—even if you like the proposal—has no enforcement mechanism. I have trouble believing that public pressure will be enough to force these multimillion-dollar corporations to comply. You would think that 9 out of 10 consumers would be enough public pressure for Congress to respond, but it didn't do a single thing for this legislation. Consumers are not going to be able to make these multimillion-dollar corporations comply. This proposal makes consumers the cops on the beat, policing companies to provide information about the contents of their product.

These corporations show that they don't really care what the consumers think, with some notable exceptions. Campbell's Soup, which is a multibillion-dollar corporation, has voluntarily decided to label their products, and I applaud them for doing that. So many others are not going to do so. Surely our Nation's families, who are busy squeezing every minute, out of every day, will not have time to hold companies accountable in the court of public opinion. We should not place this added burden on consumers who only want to know what they are feeding their families.

Since this proposal was unveiled, I have heard from many Vermonters who care deeply about this issue. Just last Friday, I joined several hundred Vermonters on the statehouse lawn in my hometown of Montpelier to celebrate Vermont's Act 120 law taking effect on that day, July 1. I heard their voices loud and clear on this issue. The proposed ''deal'' before us falls short. It doesn't offer consumers what they need or what Vermont's legislators had in mind when they passed Vermont's Act

120, which is to have a simple and clearly written, on-package label. All we want is a simple on-package label so that, when we look at it, we know what we have.

Dozens of Vermonters have told me that they do not own smart phones or do not get cell phone service in their towns. Katharine, from Brattleboro, VT, wrote to me and said: ''I'm one of the people who cannot afford a cell phone. . . . Please pass a federal law that doesn't require a cell phone to access information. I deserve to know what I'm consuming, just as much as people with extra money who can afford a cell phone. It just isn't fair to the rest of us to keep us in the dark.''

Katharine's sentiments were echoed by Maureen, from Fairlee, VT, who said: ''I do not have a smart phone, as is true for most older Americans, and I should not have to buy one in order to find out if the food I buy is genetically modified.''

Carl from Putney, VT also wrote to me, saying: ''I don't use a smart phone, and a label I have to scan will do me no good. I doubt I would want to scan everything I looked at in the supermarket, in any case.''

And you know Katherine and Maureen and Carl and the hundreds of other Vermonters who I have heard from are right. It is not fair, and it is exactly what these large corporations want: They want to hide information behind a QR code or a 1–800 number.

Americans want to make informed decisions for their families and with their limited grocery budgets. One Vermonter, Denis, said it well in his message to me: ''The issue is simple: consumers deserve to know what they are consuming, including whether or not the ingredients are produced naturally or through genetic engineering, so they can make personal choices about what to purchase. GMO information needs to be clearly disclosed on the label as part of the nutrition and ingredient details.''

Lewis from Enosburg Falls also wrote to me about the importance of a consumer's right to know. He said: ''Everyone has the right to know what they are eating. Period. Vermont's labeling law will not judge GMOs as good or bad, it will simply confirm their presence in any product. I want to make informed decisions about what is in the food my family and I eat, whether it's salt, sugar, fat, or GMOs.''

What Vermont did, unlike the U.S. Senate, which had no hearings or open discussions—the Republican leader brought this bill out here under a fast-track so we couldn't have any real debate on it—was debate this issue for years. They held over 50 hearings on the subject. They had over 130 witnesses testify and all sides of the issue were heard. Yet the U.S. Senate has failed to hold a single hearing to debate these issues and hear expert testimony.

The little State of Vermont had over 50 hearings and more than 130 witnesses. Our legislature represents 625,000 people. We had over 50 hearings and heard from more than 130 witnesses, while this Congress, which represents 325 million people, didn't have time for a single hearing on GE labeling. This Congress didn't have time to debate these issues and hear expert testimony. The U.S. Senate did not have one single hearing so that any of those 325 million Americans could be heard.

If you saw this in a movie or something where they were poking satirical fun at the Congress, you would say: Oh, they have gone too far; that would never happen. Unfortunately, it has happened.

This backroom deal made by the food industry has left too many gaping holes and questions that should have been addressed before this bill was fast-tracked through the Senate.

Is the Vermont law perfect in every way? No, I do not contend that it is. The State was blocked and preempted from requiring a label on products that contain meat. And I will be the first to point out that there are challenges with Vermont being out there on its own with a label, but what we need to replace it is a strong national label that has been thoroughly debated and any confusion over intent clarified.

This bill has been brought forward at this time simply to preempt Vermont's GE labeling law that just took effect on July 1. This, despite the fact that Vermont has a 6-month safe harbor or grace period until January 1, 2017. With 6 months left before Vermont's grace period ends, why are we not taking the time to hold a hearing? Why are we not having a full debate and amendment process? Why are we not listening to consumers in Vermont and across the nation who simply want to know what is in the food they feed their families and how it was produced?

I hope other Senators will join me in rejecting these efforts to undermine the ability of States, such as Vermont, Alaska, Virginia, and others that choose to offer consumers and farmers purely factual, noncontroversial, and commercial information that furthers the legitimate and substantial interest of the State.

I really can't support this so-called compromise. There have been no hearings and we have heard no testimony on it. It was suddenly handed to us as a fait accompli. We were told to take it or leave it. After all, the Big Money interests want us to take it. It is a last-minute attack on Vermont's law, and it is a last-minute attack on States' rights to set priorities at State government level.

Instead of caving in to the lobbyists, we should be moving in a direction that offers consumers more information and more choices rather than hiding behind a toothless law that puts the industry's interests ahead of a consumer's right to know and sets industry interests ahead of consumers' right to know.

This ''deal'' substitutes an easy-to-read label that everyone can understand, with a complicated scavenger hunt, which most people won't complete. It is a sham. It does not let people know what they need to know. It is a sham. Let's accept that. The Senate will vote one way or the other, but let's not have anybody going home saying we are protecting consumers. Instead, some Senators voted for a sham put up by a few well-heeled corporate lobbyists.

I have said it before and I will say it again: 625,000 Vermonters deserve better. But even more importantly, all 325 million Americans deserve better. They should at the very least have had the benefit of hearings and full debate—to have people talk about this bill and have the opportunity to have our amendments considered. Instead, it was written in back rooms by heavily financed lobbyists, with input from corporate interests not the interests of the American people.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time run equally on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREATIES

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to discuss the importance of treaties to the United States and to express my strong support for the ratification of a number of treaties whose consistency with current U.S. law, coupled with the tangible and material benefits they would deliver to U.S. citizens, businesses, and law enforcement authorities, should make their ratification noncontroversial.

Treaties enhance and increase stability in an uncertain world. They offer a framework for U.S. global engagement in which we can work to promote American values such as equal rights, freedom of navigation, and the promotion of global commerce. Yet, with the 114th Congress drawing to a close, the Senate has not yet ratified a single treaty—a situation I consider to be an extraordinary state of affairs for this body, and I hope we can change this shortly.

The value and importance of treaties to the interests of the United States and its citizens can be seen in the seven treaties the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently reported out. I thank Senator CORKER and the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for reporting these treaties to the floor of the Senate for its consideration.

These treaties include the Convention on the Law Applicable to Certain

Rights in Respect of Securities Held with an Intermediary, known as the Hague Securities Convention, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, two extradition treaties with the Dominican Republic and Chile, and three mutual legal assistance treaties with Jordan, Algeria, and Kazakhstan.

Let me talk about these treaties. I am sure they are not getting the headlines of many other actions, but they are important to U.S. interests.

The Hague Securities Convention was negotiated to address uncertainty as to what law governs cross-border transactions in stocks, bonds, and other securities. That legal uncertainty has imposed friction costs on securities transactions and increased risks for investors. The convention provides voluntary choice-of-law rules for securities that are held by an intermediary. It was drafted with close attention to the relevant passages of U.S. law on secure transactions, articles 8 and 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code. The result modernizes these transactions and greatly enhances their predictability. It is totally consistent with current U.S. law. U.S. ratification of the Hague Securities Convention would be the deciding vote in bringing the convention into force, which will encourage other countries to sign on to this treaty that promotes global commerce and legal certainty with a system patterned on longstanding U.S. commercial law. The benefit of this treaty to U.S. business is obvious, which is why the convention is unanimously supported by the relevant stakeholders in the United States, including the Uniform Law Commission, which drafted the Uniform Commercial Code on which the convention is based, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Commercial Finance Association and Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, the Financial Services Forum, the Emerging Markets Traders Association, the Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation, and numerous other securities clearance and banking entities. The stakeholders who understand the importance to U.S. business interests all support the ratification of this treaty.

The second treaty the Foreign Relations Committee just reported is the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources. This treaty has been in force for 12 years and already has 139 contracting partners. The U.S. ratification of the plant genetics treaty will benefit U.S. farmers as well as U.S. agricultural and research institutions.

Plant breeders, farmers, and researchers need access to raw plant materials to develop improved plants that are more productive and nutritious. The plant genetics treaty aims to address this need through the creation of a formal global network for banking and sharing seeds. The treaty establishes a stable legal framework for international germ plasm exchanges of 64 different crops, including wheat, rice, potatoes, oats, maize, rye, strawberries, and apples. The sharing of these crops benefits both research and commercial interests in the United States through the development of new crop varieties that are more nutritious, more resistant to pests and diseases, show improved yields, and can better tolerate environmental stresses such as drought.

The treaty is also unanimously supported by relevant U.S. stakeholders.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full list printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING U.S. RATIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TREATY ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

AgReliant Genetics (Indiana), American Farm Bureau Federation, American Phytopathological Society, American Seed Trade Association, American Society of Plant Biologists, American Soybean Association, Arkansas Seed Dealers' Association, Bayer CropScience LP (North Carolina), Beck's Hybrids (Indiana), Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO), California Seed Association, Colorado Seed Industry Association, Condor Seed (Arizona), Crop Production Services (Colorado), Crop Science Society of America, Curtis & Curtis (New Mexico), Delaware-Maryland Agribusiness Association, Dow AgroSciences (Indiana), DuPont Pioneer (Iowa), Enza Zaden U.S. (California).

Georgia Agribusiness Council, Georgia Crop Improvement, Georgia Seed Association, Grain and Feed Association of Illinois, Grassland Oregon, GROWMARK (Illinois), HED Seeds (California), HeinzSeed (California), HM.CLAUSE, Inc. (California), Idaho-Eastern Oregon Seed Association, Illinois Fertilizer & Chemical Association, Illinois Seed Trade Association, Independent Professional Seed Association, Indiana Seed Trade Association, Iowa Seed Association, J.R. Simplot Company (Idaho), JoMar Seeds (Indiana), Justin Seed (Texas), Kansas Seed Industry Association, Kansas Wheat Alliance.

Keithly-Williams Seeds (Arizona), Land O'Lakes, Inc (Minnesota), Latham Hi-Tech Seeds (Iowa), Limagrain Cereal Seeds, Monsanto (Missouri), National Association of Plant Breeders, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Commercial Plant Breeders, National Farmers Union, National Sorghum Producers, Nebraska Agri-Business, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES) at Rutgers University, New York State Agribusiness Association, North Carolina Seedsmen's Association, Northern Seed Trade Association, Northwest Nursery Improvement Institute, Ohio AgriBusiness Association, Oregon Seed Association.

Oregonians for Food & Shelter, Pacific Seed Association, Produce Marketing Association, RiceTec (Texas), Rocky Mountain Agribusiness Association, Rural and Agriculture Council of America, Sakata Seed America (California), Seedway LLC (Pennsylvania), Sharp Bros Seed (Kansas), Southern Crop Production Association, Southern Seed Association, Syngenta North America (Minnesota), Texas Ag Industries Association, Texas Seed Trade Association, University of California, Davis College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, Food and Environment, US Rice Producers Association, USA Rice, Vilmorin, North America (California), Warner Seeds (Texas), Washington Tree Fruit Research Commission, Wisconsin Agri-Business Association, Wyoming Ag-Business Association, Wyoming Wheat Marketing Commission.

Mr. CARDIN. The list includes the American Seed Trade Association, the National Farmers Union, the Biotechnology Industry Organization, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Soybean Association, numerous universities, and nearly 100 other farm, agricultural, and research groups. This agreement again is supported by all these stakeholders that understand the importance to American farmers, American commercial interests, and American consumers.

I am deeply grateful to Chairman CORKER and my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee who worked hard to advance these treaties to the Senate floor. My only regret is that I hoped we would have considered these two worthy, uncontroversial treaties earlier. Both the Hague Securities Convention and the plant genetic treaty provide tangible benefits to the United States and its stakeholders. Neither requires changes to U.S. law. Let me repeat that. Neither of these treaties would require us to change U.S. law. The Hague convention was signed by the United States in 2006 and has been awaiting ratification in this body since 2012. The plant genetics treaty was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 2008, received a hearing on November 10, 2009, and was reported by the committee in December 2010. Almost 6 years later, it still has not been considered by the full Senate. We can do better.

I am hopeful the Senate will soon act to ratify these two treaties. However, I fear the long delay in their consideration speaks to a larger problem. I am dismayed some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not see the value of treaties and the benefits they accrue to U.S. citizens and businesses.

As the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I call attention to my colleagues that we also have eight tax treaties pending on the floor of the Senate: tax conventions with Poland, Hungary, and Chile; protocols amending existing tax conventions with Japan, Switzerland, Spain, and Luxembourg; and a protocol amending the Multilateral Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters. With the exception of the Japan treaty, which was sent to the Senate relatively recently, each of these treaties has been considered and reported multiple times by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in recent years. They reflect the practices and procedures consistent with the tax treaties and protocols passed by the Senate since 1973. Since then, 68 tax treaties have been passed by this body by unanimous consent. Yet, because of the opposition of a single Member, the Senate has not ratified these vital treaties.

Like the Hague Securities Convention and the plant genetics treaty, there are material benefits to U.S. ratification of these tax treaties. They establish a common framework with facilitating trade and investment and can reduce the taxes assessed on U.S. companies and individuals who have interests or work overseas. The seven countries with pending tax treaties have invested approximately $700 billion in the United States, with hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs and businesses tied to these investments. Ratification of these treaties would provide increased certainty and facilitate further investment in the United States and its people.

The sole declared opponent of these tax treaties has raised privacy concerns regarding the collection of financial records. So let me be absolutely clear. These tax treaties are entirely consistent with the Fourth Amendment protections ensuring that American citizens are protected against unreasonable searches and seizures. As stated so eloquently by Chairman CORKER, tax information exchanges with another country under any tax treaty are subject to stringent controls, are forbidden from so-called fishing expeditions, and are explicitly prohibited from information exchange requests for nontax purposes. That is protected in the treaty. The exchange of information standards in the pending treaty is in fact already being used in 56 tax treaties currently in force.

The proposed threshold of these treaties would apply the same statutory standards to Americans with bank accounts abroad as already applies to Americans with bank accounts in the United States. We are not imposing any additional burdens on these accounts that are outside the United States. It is identical to what we impose on Americans in the United States. There is no reason people with foreign bank accounts should be able to hide their money from the IRS in a way that the average hard-working American cannot.

Continued obstruction and indefinite delay of these eight tax treaties is an unacceptable state of affairs that does harm both to U.S. businesses and individuals who invest and work overseas and to U.S. businesses and citizens whose livelihoods remain linked to continued foreign investment in the United States. The Senate should act as soon as possible to give these treaties the long-awaited up-or-down vote they deserve.

There are other vital treaties that are pending before the Senate that are critical to American security and law enforcement interests. I hope the Senate will move forward in an expeditious fashion to ratify these treaties. In particular, I want to highlight five pending law enforcement treaties—two extradition treaties with the Dominican Republic and Chile and three mutual legal assistance treaties with Jordan, Algeria, and Kazakhstan. The extradition treaties update century-old treaties with the Dominion Republic and Chile, replacing outmoded lists of offenses with a modern dual criminality approach, in which instead of a long treaty list of extraditable offenses, offenders can be extradited if the offense is a crime in both the United States and the other country. The treaties incorporate a series of procedural improvements to streamline and speed up the extradition process.

Mutual legal assistance treaties are agreements between countries for the purpose of gathering and exchanging information in an effort to cooperate on law enforcement issues. America can provide some assistance without these treaties, but ratification makes this process much clearer and much more streamlined.

Ratification of these enforcement treaties will be of great benefit to the United States. To give but one example of how beneficial these treaties are to the United States, it has been estimated that for every person extradited from the United States to the Dominion Republic, 10 are extradited here to face charges for crimes they have committed against the laws of the United States. So these treaties are very much in the U.S. interest.

Of the 15 treaties I have discussed thus far, all should be entirely uncontroversial and capable of being passed without delay. Indeed, until very recently, tax and law enforcement treaties were passed routinely by unanimous consent, but there are other treaties the Senate has considered in recent years where ratification would also bring tangible benefits to the United States and its citizens. I want to highlight two in particular—the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Law of the Sea Treaty.

The Senate owes a great deal to former Senator Kerry and Senator MENENDEZ for their work on the disabilities convention. Through multiple hearings across the 112th and 113th Congresses, it was established, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the treaties' principles are firmly based on American values. From the U.S. Constitution, the treaty borrows principles of equality and the protection of minorities; from the Declaration of Independence, it borrows the unalienable right to pursue happiness; and from the Americans with Disabilities Act, the gold standard for disability rights, the treaty borrows the concept of reasonable accommodation. U.S. ratification of the disability treaty would deliver material and palpable benefits to the 58 million Americans who have one or more disabilities, including 5.5 million American veterans. Ratification would impose no additional obligations on the United States but would give the United States a leadership position on the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, from which we could effectively promote human rights and equal rights for those with disabilities and lend our expertise to other nations as they work to implement the treaty. Friendly countries would be able to rely on proven U.S. standards in crafting disability and accommodation policies that would not only positively affect their citizens but also U.S. students, tourists, servicemembers, and veterans who travel abroad.

The disabilities treaty was overwhelmingly supported by veterans and disabilities groups. Unfortunately, and to the great dismay of so many, the Senate fell five votes short of ratification of the disabilities treaty in December of 2012. In July 2014, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee again advanced the disabilities treaty out of committee. I was proud to vote in favor, and it is my hope the United States will ratify this valuable treaty so we can give the United States a say with how people with disabilities, including our own citizens, are treated around the world.

It has now been over 2 years since the committee has acted on this, and I would hope the Senate would act on this in a responsible manner and that the United States would join with the other nations in support of the disability community.

The failure to pass the Law of the Sea Treaty has been a failure of many Congresses. The United States played a critical role in developing the treaty in the 1970s, and we have the most to gain from being a part of this treaty. We shaped the construct of the treaty to be very favorable to the United States, including giving the United States the only permanent seat on the international council that would oversee and make decisions about deep seabed mining. Unfortunately, the permanent seat remains vacant and decisions are being made about seabed mining in international waters without U.S. participation. The estimated area of the territorial expansion over which the United States could claim sovereignty under the continental shelf expansion conventions of the treaty is an area estimated to be about 291,000 square miles, or roughly 1.5 times the size of the State of Texas. Though the Senate's failure to ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty is a longstanding one, recent events have brought the viability and wisdom of U.S. nonparty status even further into question.

For example—and we talked about this before on the floor of the Senate—the disappearance of the Arctic sea ice, coupled with increased access to mineral resources in the Arctic seabed, is influencing the territorial claims our Arctic neighbors—Canada, Russia, Denmark, Greenland, Iceland, and Norway—are making, and all of these countries are making legal claims under the Law of the Sea Treaty. The United States is the only Arctic nation not staking any expanded claims in the Arctic, nor are we challenging the actions of our neighbors who may be encroaching on waters to which we could

have a claim. The State Department cannot be blamed for not making claims or challenging our neighbors. It is the Senate that has failed to give the State Department the ability to rightfully stake claims and challenge the legality of our competitors' claims—purely out of an unfounded and ideologically partisan opposition to the United States being a party to the Law of the Sea Treaty.

The situation in the Arctic is just one reason to reconsider ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty. Our failure to be a party of the treaty framework means we lack the ability to fully work with our allies and partners in the South China Sea region to address the ongoing maritime security issues. A broad set of stakeholders—ranging from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the environmental organizations and our Nation's military to industry-specific trade groups representing commercial fishing, freight shipping, and mineral extractions—all support U.S. accession to the treaty.

I remember the hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where we had our generals testifying before us that it is in our U.S. national security interests to be a member of the Law of the Sea and to ratify that treaty.

In particular, our naval leaders have made it clear that the United States' participation in the Law of the Sea will help them maintain navigational rights more effectively and with less risk to the men and women they command.

I can only hope that the Senate will soon ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty, which will secure U.S. interests and reaffirm the principles of freedom of operations and freedom of navigation in international waters and airspace, in accordance with established principles and practices of international law.

I must note that for many of the treaties whose benefits I have just described, there is a disturbing pattern to the continued obstruction and delaying their consideration. Regardless of how many hearings are held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine the treaties, regardless of how many benefits would accrue to the United States, and no matter how many stakeholders weigh in in favor of ratification, even the most inoffensive treaties can languish for years without advancing and sometimes be scuttled by one lone objector whose reasoning has nothing to do with the facts about the treaty in question but has everything to do with partisan politics and ideology. Continued delay on treaty ratification only hinders the interests of the United States and its citizens.

I welcome the recent movement of the Hague Security Convention and the plant genetics treaty and the five law enforcement treaties by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported out last week. But I believe it is time for the Senate to do more—much more—to ratify additional treaties that deliver tangible, material benefits to the United States and its citizens.

It is time to ratify these treaties.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARVA

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I had the privilege of visiting the Mid-Arkansas River Valley Abilities Workshop, better known as MARVA, in Russellville, AR, just over the bridge from my hometown of Dardanelle.

For more than 40 years, MARVA has provided individuals with developmental disabilities meaningful work in a supportive environment and given them access to a variety of social services. Those employed at MARVA produce and sell, for example, top-quality recyclables, planners, and calendars.

My visit to MARVA deeply moved me. I saw firsthand how important this organization is to so many Arkansans, and I met and heard from some truly amazing people, like Ron, who has been at MARVA for 17 years. Ron said he had dropped out of 3 different colleges and was fired from 10 jobs before he was diagnosed with a mental illness. Ron was actually told by one former employer: ''You are dumb and have no future.'' Ron moved back to Arkansas and found his place at MARVA, where he is currently thriving. In Ron's words:

> MARVA has helped me to feel that I can be independent and encouraged me to feel a sense of worth. I feel that my life has come from the gutter to glory. I can't imagine any other life. I don't want to get fired again.

I also met Mike, an Arkansan who has been employed at MARVA for 38 years—38 years. Mike was diagnosed with cerebral palsy at the age of 2. He was lucky enough to have parents who took him to the best schools and the best physical therapy, but there are still real limitations from his disability. For Mike, MARVA has been a saving grace. His mom said it is a safe environment for him to grow as a person, providing purpose for his life and a network of friends with whom to socialize—and earn a little money while doing it.

MARVA offers Ron, Mike, and 28 other Arkansans a chance to be part of a team, a chance to do meaningful work, make friends, and have loving, understanding coaches and mentors who recognize their limitations. It offers them integration and a chance to live a full and meaningful life.

I talk about MARVA today not just because it is an incredible place with incredible people but because there is a movement afoot in Congress that could harm or even eliminate places like MARVA.

Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act helps create employment opportunities for persons with disabilities that prevent them from finding jobs at market rates. In nearly all cases, these waivers are used for sheltered workshops like MARVA. These organizations are nonprofits with a mission to help persons with disabilities, not companies getting rich from subminimum wage labor.

I recognize that some in the disability rights community oppose 14(c). I met with some good people who devote their lives to serving the disabled and have this point of view. There are bills in both the House and the Senate to eliminate 14(c), and, in turn, likely shut down organizations like MARVA. I am sympathetic to their concerns, especially in rare isolated cases of abuse. And if there is a choice between a workshop job and a suitable market job in, say, a retail store, for many disabled persons the market job would be a better option. But as the client-workers and their families told me, at MARVA they don't have this choice. They can't choose between a sheltered workshop job and a market job. It is this employment or nothing. And who can argue that the client-workers of MARVA would be better off not having this opportunity? Would that be progress? Or would that be an unintentional but tragic return to the failed and limiting policies of the past?

I encourage all of my colleagues to visit a workshop like MARVA and talk to the full-time staff and the client-workers, talk to the family members of the client-workers, and see for yourself how important these organizations are in the lives of people with disabilities who have found a place that offers them meaningful work in their community. MARVA and similar organizations are a true blessing to their client-workers, their families, customers, and all Arkansans. I am committed to protecting MARVA and organizations like it from any effort to close them down. And if you want the simplest reason why, I will close by reading a Facebook post from Mike's brother:

> Whether it's shredding by hand outdated phone books or making ballpoint pens for area businesses, these people WANT to work and are fiercely dedicated to doing their jobs with pride, and they want to work in the environments where they feel sheltered, safe, and where their needs are met. God bless MARVA and may all healthy sheltered workshops survive and keep giving life and a sense of purpose to people like Mike.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I come to the floor to urge all my colleagues to stop denying science and to start understanding that GMO ingredients are just as healthy for American consumers as any other ingredient.

We all recognize that there are a fair number of consumers—some of whom we heard from loudly yesterday—who have concerns. So as we address this issue and as we see the growing interest in knowing more about ingredients in our food, the more we realize that

we can't have 50 States—and even the potential of some political subdivisions—passing different labeling standards. We have to have a unified labeling standard.

But I think I have been disturbed over the last couple months as we have debated this issue from the standpoint of a public health issue and not a consumer issue. I think it is critically important that we set the record straight on genetically modified ingredients and that we make sure everyone in our country understands the science of what we have been doing over almost centuries of work in growing more resilient and better yielding crops. We wouldn't be able to do that in America today or across the world without genetics, without actually looking at applying science to the work we do in agriculture.

As I have said on this floor many times, North Dakota prides itself in being the top producer of a wide variety of crops, and our diversity is something I am particularly proud of. This includes conventionally bred, organic, and genetically modified, or GMO, crops. We grow GMO sugar beets, corn, soybeans, and canola. I will say that again, and I will say it proudly. We grow GMO sugar beets, corn, soybeans, and canola, but we also grow non-GMO products, including many organics.

I think that is what makes American agriculture so resistant and resilient, and it makes American agriculture great. GMOs increase and stabilize productivity, and high yields can make a big difference in the prices we have today. Non-GMO options provide paid premiums to farmers, and there are a group of consumers willing to pay it. That is the diversity we see in agriculture today.

We should be encouraging this innovation and doing what we can to encourage new products, not just for our farmers' benefit but for the benefit of agricultural biotechnology all across the world and the benefits that biotechnology provide.

After all, when you look at the story of American agriculture, it is one of innovation. Some of our greatest accomplishments as Americans have come from our agricultural research and our innovation. Whether it is our land grant universities, extension services, co-op organizations, or Federal research investments, agricultural innovation has helped to increase production, preserve resources, and literally save lives.

I want to remind everyone about a person who is a great American hero. This person is Nobel Peace Prize laureate Norman Borlaug. Borlaug is thought of as the forefather of modern agricultural biotechnology. Because of Borlaug's dedication to innovation and making sure we can feed a growing world, he is known as ''The Man Who Saved a Billion Lives.''

His wheat breeding work created a wheat that didn't bend and break as it grew, enabling increased production and revolutionizing farming in America and across the world. As he saved countless lives, he sparked the Green Revolution. That is why we know biotechnology isn't just good for farmers—although it is, especially, during price downturns. It increases and stabilizes yields and fights against crop pests and disease.

Agricultural biotechnology is also great for consumers, not just in stabilizing or reducing prices. It can literally save lives, like the golden rice can. Just last week, as we prided ourselves on this side by saying we need to make decisions based on science, over 100 Nobel laureates wrote to dispute claims involving golden rice and to talk about how important those innovations were to saving populations from blindness and from disease.

If we really are concerned about science, let's start talking about science, and let's start realizing that in no place has there ever been a study that said these ingredients, GMO inputs, are bad for consumers or in any way injure our livelihood or our health.

The bottom line is this technology is safe, and we have nothing to hide. If anyone has heard me talk about GMOs, I frequently say, when people come in to argue with me: I give them to my grandchildren. There is no higher endorsement for any woman than being willing to gladly feed her grandchildren GMO foods, and I realize I wish every grandchild throughout the world had access to the quality products we grow.

I also have said time and again that the more we fight efforts to provide this transparency, the more we look like we have something to hide. That is why I proudly support the Roberts-Stabenow compromise bill. I don't think GMO labeling is something I am particularly interested in. It is not something I am going to look for in my label, but if you want to know, then you should have a right to know.

If consumers want to know the ingredients in their food, let's tell them. Let's tell the real story of the compromise bill and what that means for consumer information literally across the country. Today in America, there is just one piece of legislation, one State that requires GMO labeling on their packaging, and that is the State of Vermont. The other States that have enacted this will only implement their bill if four more States adopt the same kind of provision.

What it means is for all of these other consumers who want to know what is in their ingredients, they are going to have to wait generations or they may never have access to that kind of information.

The GMO label, what consumers can know about their food and whether their food actually contains genetically modified ingredients, will be nationwide. Instead of that very small group of consumers in Vermont knowing, the entire country will have access to that information.

For people to suggest that access can't be provided using modern technology is a fallacy. We all know the information that we receive about our ingredients, about our life, how many times have we turned to ourselves and said: ''I don't know the answer to that; Google it.'' It has become almost a knee-jerk reaction for us to get that instant information. This is an opportunity not only with this label and with this packaging to know about genetically modified ingredients. There is a possibility if you want to know about antibiotics in your food, if you want to know about whether it is gluten-free or whether it contains some kind of peanut oil. All of that information would readily be provided to consumers.

If consumers don't have the ability to scan when they are in the grocery store, most places, especially major grocery store chains, will provide that access. We are expanding, in a way that really is unheard of, access to consumer information. That is why I think all of the arguments we have been hearing that we somehow are hiding something or that we are trying to keep this in the dark—what we are trying to say is this: If we are going to have a label, it should be a national label and that label should provide the information to all the people of our country or access to that information for all the people of our country.

I don't want to leave this debate without reiterating once again that what this bill does is for the first time to give national access to every consumer in this country and a way to find out what the ingredients are in their food, particularly whether their food has been processed or manufactured with genetically modified ingredients.

As to people who suggest that we are not looking at a bill that provides transparency, that label is going to be mandatory. It is going to provide essential information, and it resolves that issue of transparency. As the time bottom line, what we need to do in this country is we need to do a better job of educating consumers about what genetically modified ingredients are, why they are safe, why every agency and 100 Nobel laureates have told us we have nothing to fear from genetically modified ingredients. We need to learn the lesson of Norman Borlaug—the lesson that through technology, through application of good science, we can feed a very hungry world. We ought not to hide from that. We ought to be proud of that.

I know this debate is not yet over. I know we will continue to have a debate, certainly, among consumer groups, and I am more than willing to engage in that debate and defend what our farmers do, which is to provide options to all consumers. Whether it is genetically modified organisms, whether it is organic or non-GMO, we are ready to provide that kind of input, but we have to educate on the science why these products are completely safe. I think that is where we have failed.

I urge everyone to support the Stabenow-Roberts compromise. I think it achieves that label and achieves that access, and it does this: It tells every consumer in the entire country that they will have access to this information instead of the one small State of Vermont.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Arkansas.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK COMBS

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I would like to recognize Patrick Combs, of Hot Springs, AK, as this week's Arkansan of the Week, for teaching Arkansas students to share his love of music and pushing them to succeed in everything they do.

Patrick just completed his fourth year as band director for the entire Fountain Lake School District. As the program's sole instructor, Patrick teaches instrumental music for all middle school and high school students and directs both the marching and symphonic bands. To put that in perspective, the Fountain Lake Middle School and High School have a combined student body of over 800 students.

Patrick is remarkable not just for teaching so many students, although I know that is a feat in and of itself. Under his direction, the Fountain Lake music program has truly soared. Over the last 4 years the number of Fountain Lake students who earned a place in all-region bands more than doubled, and the number of students who won competitive tryouts in the Four States Honor Band and the Arkansas All-Star Band both more than tripled.

As a group, the Fountain Lake band earned a first division ranking in concert assessment for all 4 years of Patrick's tenure. In 3 of his 4 years, the band also had the honor of being an Arkansas Sweepstakes band. Most recently, the Fountain Lake band was one of only two Arkansas bands selected to participate in this year's National Independence Day Festival on the Fourth of July here in Washington. I was able to see the Fountain Lake band while they were in town and congratulate them on this big achievement. While I, unfortunately, wasn't able to see the parade in person, all reports indicated their performance was spectacular. I know I speak for all Arkansans when I say they truly made the Natural State proud. I am confident their success was due in no small part to Patrick's leadership, as well as the hard work of Fountain Lake students.

I am honored to recognize Patrick Combs as this week's Arkansan of the Week and commend him for his dedication to music education and the Fountain Lake School District. Arkansas is lucky that a passionate educator like Patrick calls our State home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

FCC ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the importance of keeping independent agencies accountable to Congress and to the American people. Congress created independent agencies to be places where expertise in complex areas of the Nation's economy informs policymaking within limits set by Congress. One such congressional creation is the Federal Communications Commission.

Congress conferred independence on the FCC so it would be free from the normal control exercised by the President over the executive branch. In recent years, the FCC has behaved less like an independent commission accountable to Congress and more as a de facto arm of the executive branch, wholly subservient to the President. At the same time, the FCC has become more partisan than ever before and an institution that has seized greater regulatory power while simultaneously shutting down bipartisan dialogue and compromise.

The recent rulemaking proceedings regarding title II common carrier authority, the massively expanded E-rate and Lifeline programs, backward-looking set-top box rules, and the agency's power grab over privacy regulations have all been characterized by a lack of bipartisan compromise or respect for the limits of the authority delegated by Congress. Much of the responsibility for this downward trajectory rests with the current FCC chairman, Tom Wheeler.

For example, during Chairman Wheeler's confirmation process, I asked him if he would commit to coming to Congress for more direction before attempting another iteration of net neutrality rules. Mr. Wheeler unequivocally said that he would do so. However, not only did Mr. Wheeler not come to Congress for more direction, at the behest of President Obama, he jammed through the most radical implementation of net neutrality rules ever—a power grab of stunning proportions—and he did so on a purely partisan vote.

The number of 3-to-2 party-line votes on Commission meeting items during Mr. Wheeler's tenure are a clear indication of an FCC Chairman who embraces partisanship over compromise. In just the first year of his chairmanship, Mr. Wheeler forced through more items on party-line votes than the previous four chairs combined. Chairman Wheeler speaks often of his belief in the importance of competition and market forces. Hearing that, one might think he might exercise his agency's powers with a light touch in order to promote the incredible innovation in which our communication sector is capable. Instead, Chairman Wheeler seems more focused on waging partisan battles and accumulating more power while at the same time avoiding accountability to Congress and the American people.

I have come to the floor to talk about the most recent example of Chairman Wheeler utilizing questionable legal authority while simultaneously trying to dodge public accountability. This example relates to the FCC's rules about disclosure of nonpublic information. The FCC's own rules prohibit its employees from disclosing nonpublic information to anyone outside the Commission unless expressly authorized by the Commission or its rules. Nonpublic information includes details of upcoming rulemakings or other actions the Commissioners are still negotiating. These rules are intended to foster the Commission's ability to have honest and fulsome negotiations among the Commissioners and staff and to prevent any special interests from gaining a particular advantage over other stakeholders.

Earlier this year, however, Commissioner Michael O'Rielly wrote a blog post expressing his concerns that Chairman Wheeler was instead using these rules to muzzle other Commissioners. Though Commissioner O'Rielly respected the Commission's rules against disclosing details without authorization to the press or other stakeholders, he pointed out that Chairman Wheeler was freely disclosing nonpublic information whenever he wanted. Commissioner O'Rielly was concerned that this allowed Chairman Wheeler to frame and influence the public's understanding of upcoming issues to his advantage by selectively disclosing information that no other Commissioner is allowed to discuss publicly. Indeed, the Chairman's staff would later tell my staff that Commissioner O'Rielly would not be permitted to correct a factual error stated by Chairman Wheeler if doing so meant discussing nonpublic information.

As chairman of the Commerce Committee, I sent a letter this past March asking Chairman Wheeler to explain whether he discloses nonpublic information to outside groups and how the Commission authorizes the disclosures.

Madam President, I refer my colleagues to the letters with the exchange between myself and Chairman Wheeler that can be found at http://bit.ly/29r76uO.

Chairman Wheeler maintained that as chairman he can unilaterally authorize disclosures of nonpublic information whenever he wants without any need for approval by the Commission, despite the clear prohibition against doing so in the Commission's own rules.

The events surrounding the FCC's March 31 open meeting are a striking example of how the selective leaking of nonpublic information can be used to distort an ongoing debate and turn an emerging bipartisan consensus into a partisan power grab. The open meeting agenda included an order expanding Lifeline, which is a program that has spent billions of ratepayer dollars in an effort to improve access to communications technology for low-income Americans. While the goal of this program is

important, unfortunately, it has been replete with rampant fraud for years, which the U.S. Government Accountability Office has recognized on more than one occasion. A compromise on Lifeline between a Democratic Commissioner and the two Republican Commissioners was emerging. This compromise would have included a spending cap to prevent the program from wasting ratepayer dollars. However, it turns out Chairman Wheeler was not on board with this compromise.

On the morning of March 31, Chairman Wheeler delayed the open meeting by several hours, a highly unusual move. During the delay, Politico published a story about the emerging bipartisan compromise, citing ''sources familiar with the negotiations.'' Disclosure of any information about ongoing negotiations right before an open meeting is a direct violation of the FCC's sunshine rules, which protect Commissioners' deliberations.

What happened next is exactly what you might expect. The Politico story spurred outside political pressure against the emerging bipartisan compromise, which subsequently fell apart. Ultimately, the Lifeline order moved forward on a 3-to-2 party-line vote, without a cap or other bipartisan reforms, right in line with Chairman Wheeler's preference. Yet another 3-to-2 party-line vote—forced by the Chairman—thwarting a commonsense and bipartisan compromise. Just last week, 12 States, including my home State of South Dakota, sued the FCC in the Federal appellate court here in Washington, DC, challenging the regulatory overreach of the FCC's Lifeline order that came out at that very March 31 open meeting.

In April, I sent another letter asking Chairman Wheeler to explain the source of his claim of authority to disclose whatever nonpublic information he wants whenever he wants, which was the assertion he made. I also asked a direct question: Did you, Chairman Wheeler, authorize the disclosure of nonpublic information to Politico on the morning of March 31 in advance of the open meeting? Chairman Wheeler responded that his position as chief executive of the Commission empowers him to do anything that streamlines the FCC's work. According to his interpretation, if the Chairman decides on his own that releasing nonpublic information will make the FCC operate more efficiently, he can do it, even though the FCC's rules explicitly prohibit the disclosure of nonpublic information.

I appreciate the role the Chairman plays in the day-to-day management of the Commission, but this appears to be a specious attempt to exempt the Chairman from a very clear rule. Indeed, there is no record the Commission ever intended for its Chairman to be exempt when the agency adopted the rule 20 years ago, and the rule very clearly gives the Commission, not its Chairman, the authority to disclose nonpublic information.

In responding to my April letter, Chairman Wheeler also ignored the question of whether he personally authorized the leak to Politico on the morning of the open meeting. My staff followed up with Mr. Wheeler's staff several times on this matter, and they emphatically stated that Chairman Wheeler refuses to answer this question.

Everyone who cares about government accountability should pause to think about this. Even though Chairman Wheeler claims he has the legal authority to leak whatever nonpublic information he wants whenever he wants, he nevertheless has refused to answer this simple question about whether he indeed authorized the leak on the morning of March 31. Since Mr. Wheeler could have just said no, if he did not actually authorize the leak of nonpublic information, that leaves only two possible conclusions; one, that Chairman Wheeler did authorize the leak but is not confident in his roundabout interpretation of the rules and fears admitting to violating them or, two, Chairman Wheeler simply does not respect the legitimate role of congressional oversight and believes he is unaccountable to the American people.

I would also note that while Chairman Wheeler refused to answer whether he authorized the disclosure, he sought to obfuscate and cast blame by stating it was the Republican Commissioner Ajit Pai who leaked the public information in advance of the open meeting. This shell game is unworthy of a chairman of an independent commission.

Indeed, Mr. Wheeler's attempt to cast blame on another Commissioner only adds emphasis to the overall point I am making; that is, that Chairman Wheeler seeks to use the rule prohibiting the disclosure of nonpublic information as both a shield and a sword. On the one hand, he claims the rule prohibiting the disclosure of nonpublic information does not apply to him, but on the other hand he seeks to shut down criticism and debate from another Commissioner by stating the Commissioner may have violated the rule prohibiting disclosure of nonpublic information. The FCC's nonpublic information rules were intended to facilitate and protect internal communication deliberations. Chairman Wheeler is instead using them to stifle or manipulate the other Commissioners.

Fortunately, the FCC Office of the Inspector General is now investigating what happened on March 31. The IG is looking into who disclosed the nonpublic information about ongoing negotiations among the Commissioners, including any role Chairman Wheeler had in the leak to Politico. I look forward to the IG's findings and expect we will learn the answers to the questions I have posed to Chairman Wheeler, particularly the one question he has refused to answer so far. Taken alone, the Lifeline leak may seem to be just a minor transgression that can be chalked up to business as usual in Washington, DC, but in the case of current FCC leadership, it is just one example out of many that demonstrates a disregard for the limits Congress has placed on the agency's authority.

The regulatory power grabs over title II's common carrier authority and the FCC's recent privacy rule are further evidence that Chairman Wheeler shares the Obama administration's propensity for legal overreach and the intentional circumvention of Congress. In this environment, congressional oversight is more important than ever as a critical check on bureaucratic power. Regardless of who sits at the helm of a commission, such oversight must be pursued, and I am committed to make sure it does.

FORMER SECRETARY CLINTON'S USE OF AN UNSECURED EMAIL SERVER

Madam President, this week FBI Director James Comey announced the results of Hillary Clinton's email use during her time as Secretary of State. What we discovered was this: As Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton repeatedly mishandled classified intelligence.

Here is what Director Comey had to say:

> Although we do not find clear evidence that Secretary Clinton or her colleagues intended to violate laws governing the handling of classified information, there is evidence that they were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information.

That is a quote from FBI Director Comey. Let me repeat that quote. The FBI concluded that President Obama's Secretary of State—our Nation's chief diplomat and the person who is fourth in line to the Presidency—displayed gross carelessness when handling information related to our national security. If Hillary Clinton can't be trusted to safeguard national security information as Secretary of State, she cannot be trusted to protect national security information as the Democratic nominee for President, and she certainly can't be trusted as our Commander in Chief.

There are some who would like to take the FBI Director's speech as vindication for Secretary Clinton, since the FBI Director ultimately did not recommend prosecution, but the FBI Director's statement is no vindication. It is an indictment. The Secretary betrayed the trust the American people had placed in her. She repeatedly lied to the American people about the purpose of the server, what was on the server, and the threat it posed to our national security. Secretary Clinton repeatedly claimed there was no classified information on her server, but the FBI investigation found otherwise.

According to Director Comey, Secretary Clinton sent or received at least 110 emails in 52 separate email chains containing classified information—52 separate classified conversations. And of those 52 classified email conversations, 8 contained top secret information, the highest level of classification,

and 36 contained secret information. Secretary Clinton knew she was placing national security information at risk.

The FBI Director said—when discussing the top secret emails transmitted over the Secretary's unclassified email system—''There is evidence to support a conclusion that any reasonable person in Secretary Clinton's position, or in the position of those government employees with whom she was corresponding about these matters, should have known that an unclassified system was no place'' for top-secret communications.

As a reasonable person, the Secretary unquestionably knew that the proper place for classified information was on a classified server, but she decided to use her personal server anyway.

Secretary Clinton has tried to argue that using a private server in violation of State Department rules did not jeopardize our national security. Even President Obama, in what was a highly suspect public comment on an ongoing FBI investigation, said her private server wasn't a national security threat. But according to the FBI Director, that certainly wasn't the case. Director Comey explicitly stated that it was entirely possible that ''hostile actors gained access to Secretary Clinton's personal e-mail account.'' And he wasn't just referring to ordinary hackers. The Director noted that Secretary Clinton ''used her personal e-mail extensively while outside the United States, including sending and receiving work-related e-mails in the territory of sophisticated adversaries'' and that that fact was one that led the FBI to the conclusion that her email account might have been compromised. In other words, it is entirely possible that our Nation's enemies gained access to Secretary Clinton's emails thanks to her decision to use her personal account.

Despite Secretary Clinton's claim that the servers were protected, Director Comey went to great lengths to describe how the servers had substantially less protection than government servers and even had less protection than common commercial servers like Gmail.

Yesterday, Senator GARDNER introduced legislation, which I cosponsored, that would remove the security clearance of Secretary Clinton and any of her staff members involved in the mishandling of classified information and block Secretary Clinton from accessing classified information in her capacity as a Presidential candidate. I have to say, unfortunately, that I think that is the right call.

Secretary Clinton has demonstrated that she has no respect for the security of classified information, and she, like anybody else, should face the consequences. As the FBI Director noted, most people who had done what the Secretary did would face consequences for their actions. Other individuals found by the FBI to have engaged in such reckless handling of classified information would, at a very minimum, have their security clearance revoked and would likely face termination. The rules shouldn't be different for Secretary Clinton because she held a powerful position. In fact, those in a position of such great trust should be held to a higher standard, not a lower one. Do we really want to set the precedent that wielding political power places an individual above the law? Boy, I sure don't think we want to go there, but that is exactly what is happening as a result of this decision.

I look forward to hearing what Director Comey has to say in his testimony today before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I hope we will hear him discuss the reasoning behind the decision not to recommend prosecution when the Secretary so clearly displayed, in the Director's own words, extreme carelessness in handling classified information.

I also hope the FBI will release the transcript of Secretary Clinton's FBI interview and other documents requested by Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. A Secretary of State mishandling classified information is a grave matter. The American people deserve to know all the facts, and they deserve the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE OVERREACH

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, Senator THUNE was just on the floor talking about Executive overreach. Well, let me tell my colleagues that 2 weeks ago, the Supreme Court of the United States issued a stinging rebuke and a stinging defeat to the Obama administration and to its immigration amnesty plan. There have been a string of stinging defeats for the President's approach of what I believe is an Executive overreach. The courts agree with me. For years, President Obama has been acting as though he believes he has unlimited power to do whatever he wants to do, regardless of what the law of the land says. Now the courts have finally said: Enough is enough.

In this case, President Obama decided that for political purposes, he was going to stop enforcing some of the country's immigration laws. Twenty-six States said that was outrageous and they filed a lawsuit.

It is the President's job to enforce the laws of the United States, and the law is very clear. The law is clear when it comes to immigration, and the President deciding to change it basically says he is willing to ignore the law, because he didn't come to Congress to get it changed, he decided to do it with regulation alone. The courts have said it is not the President's call, and they have now blocked the President's amnesty plan.

During an event in 2013, the President actually seemed to understand that he was just one part of America's Government. He said: ''The problem is that I'm the President of the United States, I'm not the emperor of the United States.'' He went on to say: ''My job is to execute the laws that are passed.'' He understood at that time that it was his job—at least he understood it in 2013. So what happened between then and now?

If the President says, as he did, ''I'm not the emperor,'' why is it that it seems that almost every action he takes seems to show that he wants to act as if he is the emperor? Time after time, he has shown that he considers himself above the law. We know he doesn't like to deal with Congress—not with Republicans or with Democrats; he likes to ignore Congress—and he doesn't like having to deal with the courts, so he tries to pack them full of people who will rule the way he tells them to rule. We saw that when HARRY REID changed the rules of the Senate. It seems the President doesn't like to listen to the voters, either, so he goes ahead and does what he wants to do no matter what the American people say they want.

This case last month is not the first time a Federal court has said that President Obama acted above the law or even against the law. Last June, the Supreme Court struck down a regulation that was a big part of the Obama administration's War on Coal. The Supreme Court said that the Washington bureaucrats who wrote this rule never even considered the overwhelming costs—this is the Supreme Court saying this—never even considered the overwhelming costs that they were imposing on hard-working American families. The President never even considered that. The Court said: ''One would not say that it is even rational''—the President's actions weren't even rational—''never mind appropriate, to impose billions of dollars in economic costs in return for a few dollars in health and environmental benefits.'' The Supreme Court told President Obama that he is the President of the United States, not the emperor of the United States.

Then look what happened last October. Another court, a U.S. appeals court, blocked the Obama administration's new regulation that vastly expanded the definition of ''waters of the United States.'' The Environmental Protection Agency wanted to give itself control over all the waters—all of them, including huge chunks of private property in this country, including farms and ranches—and do it by taking control of isolated ponds, prairie potholes, and irrigation ditches—all of these little areas the government can take control of, and they control the land. What did the appeals court do? The appeals court stepped in and stopped the administration's actions because of what it called ''the sheer breadth of the ripple effects caused by the rule.'' This appeals court told President Obama that he is the President of the United States, he is not the emperor.

That is the same thing the Supreme Court told President Obama back in February. The Supreme Court stopped another EPA rule over carbon dioxide emissions from existing powerplants—powerplants that have been there and are functioning. Just like the so-called waters of the United States rule, the Court said that the administration could not just go ahead and do whatever it wanted to do. The rule could do so much damage that the Court said they had to stop the President in his tracks.

The Supreme Court said that it was skeptical anytime a Washington agency claims to suddenly find broad powers. And that is what has been happening now—the Washington agency is going back to old laws and finding new broad powers that have been in law and that have been on the books and functioning for a long time. The Supreme Court said they are very skeptical of an administration that does that.

The Court said: ''We expect Congress to speak clearly if it wishes to assign to an agency decisions of vast economic and political significance.'' Well, Congress never did that with carbon dioxide. The Obama administration just made it up, and the Supreme Court told the President that he is the President of the United States, not the emperor.

In May, the Supreme Court issued another decision to stop the Obama administration from taking away people's rights—the rights to use their own land. This had to do with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers taking control of private land. The Obama administration went so far overboard that they said people shouldn't even be allowed to challenge the Obama administration's decisions in court. I mean, can my colleagues imagine that? The Obama administration went so far overboard that they said people shouldn't be allowed to challenge the Obama administration's decisions in court. This President doesn't want Congress to have any say in what he does, and now he doesn't even want the courts to have a say in what he does. American families shouldn't have to fight Washington just to use their own property. They certainly shouldn't have to fight with one hand tied behind their backs.

Amazingly, this was a unanimous decision against the President by the Supreme Court. Even the most liberal Justices voted against the President on this issue, to show how much Executive overreach we are dealing with. The Supreme Court told the President once again that he is the President of the United States, not the emperor of the United States.

It has been one case after another saying the exact same thing.

I wish to give one final example of this string of stinging defeats for President Obama. Last month, the U.S. district court in Wyoming shut down President Obama's latest attempt to stop American energy production. It had to do with regulations on hydraulic fracturing on land controlled by Washington and by Indian tribes. The judge in this case said the administration had no authority whatsoever to issue the regulation in the first place. This was a judge appointed by President Obama. The judge wrote that ''Congress has not directed the [administration] to enact regulations governing hydraulic fracturing.'' The judge went on to say: ''Indeed, Congress has expressly removed federal agency authority to regulate the activity, making its intent clear.'' The judge said Congress made it clear. The President wanted to ignore it. The court told President Obama definitely and definitively that he is the President of the United States, not the emperor of the United States.

There have been six different court decisions in the past year, and all of them have been against the President. Even the Justices that he handpicked for the Supreme Court are refusing to play along with all of his power grab and his illegal overreach.

The American people are no longer buying the President's excuses and his promises. Back in January the White House Chief of Staff promised that the Obama administration—and I was astonished when I saw this on television, saw a video of it, saw it again, listened to it again. The White House Chief of Staff promised that the Obama administration is going to in this final year—this eighth year of his administration—have a year of audacious Executive action. There is going to be audacious Executive action in the President's last year in office.

It is time for the President and his staff to rethink their plan. They should recognize that they do not have the legal support or the popular support for all of the regulations and all of their illegal action.

The President is not an emperor, although he may think that he is. It is time for him to recognize this fact. It is time for the President of the United States to do the job he was elected to do and to follow and to obey the law of the land.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I rise again to talk about the heroin and prescription drug epidemic that has gripped our country and has affected every single State represented in this body. Sadly, it is a problem that is getting worse, not better. I say that having been in Dayton, OH, where sadly we had 15 people overdose in the space of the Fourth of July weekend in one that city in Ohio. This is happening all over our country, and it is an issue we have to address.

The Federal Government has an important role to play. There is much more we can do. This body recognizes that. Back on March 10, the Senate passed something called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act—CARA. CARA was on this floor for 2½ weeks, and there was some back and forth about the legislation, but by the end of the process—I think partly because Members were going home and hearing from their constituents about it—94 Senators in this body voted yes on it. One voted no, and it passed 94 to 1. Those kinds of votes almost never happen around here. It happened because people realize this is a crisis that we do need to address, and the bill that we came up with actually made sense because it was based on the best practices from around the country.

So I have come to the floor every single week we have been in session since March 10 to talk about this issue, to urge my House colleagues to act, which they did, and over the past several weeks to urge that the House and Senate versions be brought together. That happened yesterday.

Finally, from March 10 until now, going back and forth, we have what is called a conference committee report, meaning the House and Senate versions have been reconciled. There were compromises made and changes made, and we have one bill to go back to both the House and Senate for a vote and to the President for his signature and, most importantly, to get to our communities to begin to provide more help on prevention and education, recovery, treatment, helping law enforcement, and stopping overprescribing of drugs. It is a comprehensive approach to have the Federal Government be a better partner with State and local governments and nonprofits to be able to address this issue that unfortunately millions of families in America are now facing.

I want to thank the Members of the conference committee. On the Senate side that would be Senators GRASSLEY, ALEXANDER, HATCH, SESSIONS, LEAHY, MURRAY, and WYDEN. I also want to thank all the House conferees. They did some good work. Each one of these Members I just mentioned has a real passion for this issue. They care about this issue.

I want to thank my coauthor, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, because he did a pretty good job of talking to the conferees on his side of the aisle, as some of us did, including me, talking to conferees on our side of the aisle. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I started this process 3 years ago. We had five conferences here in Washington, DC. We brought in experts from all around the country. So we had a real interest in getting this done, and I commend him and congratulate him for this result as well.

I know that those who are in the advocate community—in other words, people who work in this field every day in prevention and treatment, law enforcement folks, and health care folks—are also very happy that this conference report has come together. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I are very happy that the conference report kept to the substance of the Senate bill and frankly added some good elements that came out of the House legislative process. They had 18 separate bills, we had one comprehensive bill, and we had to bring them all together.

There are now more than 230 groups from all around the country. A lot of them are national groups, and some are State groups that have come out in support of this conference report—in other words, supporting the final CARA product. Yesterday I met with about two dozen of these groups to talk about the process and how we got to where we are, to talk about the need to act quickly to get this into law because they are desperate. If you are a professional in the area of treatment and recovery, you want this help. You wanted it yesterday. We need it now.

By the way, these are people we consulted with during these 3 years. They all came and participated in these five conferences. We also consulted with many others, including the Obama administration. They testified at these conferences. They also testified at the hearing we had at the Judiciary Committee. They were supportive of CARA in part because we took their input. We took everybody's good ideas, not Republican ideas and Democrat ideas but good ideas. We kept this not just bipartisan but nonpartisan. It would be nice if we keep it that way.

I understand this is an election year and that some people may want to score a few political points. But having gone through this process in a nonpartisan way, having gotten this great vote out of the Senate and a strong vote in the House, and now having this conference report that has the right mix of good House and Senate substantive policies, I would hope to be able to make a difference in the fight. I would hope that we would not hear any more talk threatening to block this conference report at the last minute.

Some of the concerns people are bringing up in the last minute are concerns that were never raised on the Senate floor. Some conferees did not sign the conference report because they said they wanted the mandatory spending that is in the President's budget be a part of the bill. That was never raised on the Senate floor. It was never raised even as an amendment in the appropriations process. It just took place over the past several weeks. So this is new.

It doesn't mean we shouldn't have more spending. In fact, as some of you know, we had a vote on the floor on more spending. It was about emergency spending—not mandatory spending, which happens to be offset with cuts and other entitlement programs or tax increases, but emergency spending. I believe emergency spending is appropriate because I believe this is an emergency, and I voted for that emergency spending, but many of my colleagues did not. It did not pass.

On the mandatory spending side, again, it is interesting because that was never brought up before. I for one would be for more spending, but I certainly wouldn't want to block the new spending that we have in CARA, which is a substantial increase in spending, because I am concerned about having more spending.

Every day we are losing about 129 Americans. This is why there is a group out there called the CARA family coalition that came to Washington recently. There were 129 families representing that one family who every day loses somebody to heroin and prescription drug addiction through overdoses. Those families are waiting. Some of them are here this week because they are interested in seeing what happens.

More Americans are now dying from drug overdoses than car accidents. It is the No. 1 cause of accidental death. In Akron, OH, 2 days ago, over a 10-hour span—this is one city, Akron, OH, 2 days ago—15 people overdosed on heroin. Two more people overdosed later the same day. It included a woman and her two daughters, all of whom were found unconscious. It included a 44-year-old man who died of an overdose. There have been 55 people just in Akron, OH, who have died from heroin overdoses this year. This means they will set a tragic record this year in terms of overdose deaths. The problem is getting worse, not better.

On Tuesday in Dayton, OH, I met with law enforcement and treatment service providers. We announced a new program called the Front Door Initiative. Sheriff Phil Plummer was there. He told me that in one weekend in one town—again, in Dayton, OH—15 people died of overdoses. No one is immune from this. We have lost moms and dads, college students, grandmothers, celebrities, rich, poor, and people of every background to this epidemic. It knows no ZIP Code. It is in the inner city, it is in the suburbs, and it is in the rural areas. In the 117 days that have passed since the Senate passed CARA on March 10, approximately 14,000 Americans have died of overdoses from prescription drugs and from heroin—14,000 Americans. It is time to act.

Again, the good news is, we had a meeting yesterday of this conference committee between the House and Senate to finally pass this legislation, then to the House and Senate for a final vote, then getting it to the President, and most importantly out to our communities.

By the way, the 14,000 is not the whole story, as tragic as that is, because of course there are millions of other casualties—fellow Americans who may have lost a job or their entire career, have broken relationships with their families and friends—and I hear this all the time back home in Ohio. I heard it over the weekend, when someone came up to me at a parade and said: I am one of those people who cares about this issue. Thank you for fighting on it. We have had this issue in my family, and it broke our family apart.

People say the drugs become everything.

We don't have time for partisan games. This is urgent. I think it is more urgent than any issue we are dealing with. Nine out of ten of those who are struggling with addiction are not getting the treatment they need. I think if this were the case of any other disease, it would be viewed as a national scandal. It is wrong and it is unacceptable.

Addiction is a disease. One of the tenets of this whole legislation is to acknowledge that. With all of the specific improvements we have in terms of grants going out—for treatment, recovery, prevention education, helping police with Narcan, and so on—in a sense, the biggest thing for this legislation is to say: Let's get this stigma out of the way. Let's deal with this as a disease and get people into the treatment they need to get back on their feet.

Again, a few months ago, I, along with others, worked with the Senate Appropriations Committee to be sure we did have additional funding to fully fund CARA, of course, and to get more funding into the pipeline for treatment, recovery, education, and prevention. When people talk about the funding issue, let me just be clear, we are increasing funding. Of course, the CARA bill itself increases funding in the authorization, but here is what the Appropriations Committees have done.

The 2015 number was $41 million. This is for the Department of Health and Human Services, discretionary spending for heroin and opioid abuse. It went up to $136 million for this year, the year we are in now. That is a 237-percent increase. Next year, for 2017—when and if we can get CARA passed this week or next week, this is what would apply—we are seeing a 93-percent increase from the 237-percent increase. That is more funding. I wasn't great at math in school, but that is more funding. In fact, it is a 539-percent increase from 2015.

For those who say we are not taking this seriously enough on the funding side—of course, I would like to do more, but we have to acknowledge that a lot has been done. In terms of the overall spending, not just the HHS spending, we have also seen increases. This would include Department of Justice and other grantmaking. We have seen an increase from 41 to 136 to 262 in the Senate appropriations. I am sorry. This is to add to the House version of the appropriations for 2017. For next year, again in the Senate, we have a big increase that will start on October

1, if we are able to pass our appropriations bills—whether it is a CR or an omnibus or whatever form it takes—this is what the increase would be, at a minimum, I would hope, because that is what passed out of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

This week, this is what the House reported passing. So as big as this increase is in the Senate—again, a 93-percent increase from this year's increase—it looks like, from what we have seen from reports from the House Appropriations Committees and in conversations with them, they are talking about a 393-percent increase in 1 year. Again, this is the House Appropriations Committee—a 1,500-percent increase over, again, 2015.

For those who say there is not new spending being dedicated to this, of course there is. That is good.

With regard to the total discretionary spending, this is not just HHS but all the different areas, including the Department of Justice and so on, which has also seen an increase. This is the Senate only. We don't have the House number yet, but for the Senate, we have gone from 220 to 320 to 470, a 113-percent increase over last year's spending. We are seeing more spending, and that is good.

By the way, this spending is connected to the CARA legislation. This increase was increased with the provisions that were in the CARA legislation to be sure that the two matched up.

Finally, this is the increase we got in the conference committee for the amount that is authorized—not the actual spending but the amount that the Senate and the House would authorize for increased spending for new programs in CARA. Again, the Senate-passed bill, 94 to 1, had a $78 million-per-year increase. The conference report more than doubled that to $181 million.

This is what is interesting to me. There are Senators on this floor who voted for CARA because it was the right thing to do—a nonpartisan exercise with a lot of bipartisan support, a 94-to-1 vote.

All that has changed since then is we have it more than doubling the authorized amount of spending in CARA. With regard to the appropriations process—because we didn't have this appropriations in place then, the Senate committee had not acted, the subcommittee had not acted—in those 117 days since CARA was passed, we now see a 46-percent increase overall in the discretionary spending. With regard to HHS, which is where most of the treatment money is, we see a 93-percent increase. For the House version, it looks to be an over 393-percent increase.

All that has changed since CARA has passed with a 94-to-1 vote were these big increases in spending. Again, I voted for emergency spending on the floor. I think it is an emergency. I would go further, but for those who say they now cannot support this good legislation because of spending, it makes no sense. There is no way to argue that.

There must be some other reason. I hope it is not politics. Again, that is what people hate about Washington. If partisanship is going to slip into this at the end of the process and keep people from getting the help they need and save lives, that would be a tragedy.

These new spending programs will help, but we also have to point out that CARA is not just about spending, it is about authorizing better programs. There are lots of examples of that where we have done that in this body in other areas. I am the author of the Drug-Free Communities Act. It authorized spending to create anti-drug coalitions around the country. It has helped spawn the creation of 2000 coalitions. I founded one in my hometown of Cincinnati over 20 years ago. Another 2000 have benefited from that.

That legislation did not have an appropriation—because it was an authorization, as CARA is—but it set up new programs, as CARA does. That program to date, the Drug-Free Communities Act, has spent $1.35 billion focused on prevention and education on drugs.

We have more prevention and education programs that I think are even an improvement in the CARA legislation, but that is an example of what an authorization bill does. In 2013, the Senate voted to reauthorize a bill called the Violence Against Women Act. I voted for it. Every single Democratic Member of Congress voted for it. It passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis, 78 to 22.

The bill increased authorizations to $655 million annually and made policy changes, but it did not—and I repeat it did not—include the spending in the bill. It was an authorization bill. The spending bills come with the appropriations process. It didn't have mandatory spending. It didn't have immediate appropriations. It was an authorization bill. It was an incredibly important issue, violence against women—a priority. Yet we didn't see some of these same concerns raised. Nobody voted against the Violence Against Women Act because it didn't have appropriations attached to it. That just wouldn't have made sense, as it would not for any other authorization we pass around here. I know that wasn't an election year, but we voted for it. Then we fought for the funding as part of the appropriations process. We were successful in doing that, just as we will be successful in fighting for these appropriations, as we did this year, getting a big increase, a 237-percent increase, and as we will next year—as we see already. Thanks to our advocacy, those of us who were focused on the issue, we are getting the increases to cover these changes in CARA.

Of course, all the funding in the world isn't going to make a dent in this issue if it is not spent the right way, and that is why you have the authorization bills like CARA because we actually say, not just for the new spending but even for the existing spending, let's spend it in a way that is evidence based, where we actually look at what is working and what is not working in treatment and in recovery.

The number of people who relapse is shockingly high. The success rate is not what any of us would like it to be. Part of that is because some treatment and recovery programs work better than others. We want to be darn sure the tax dollars we are putting against this are being responsibly spent because we are good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars and because this crisis needs to be addressed.

Again, this legislation is not just about more money, although it does authorize more money and that is good. It is also about changing the way we spend the money so it goes to evidence-based prevention, treatment, and recovery programs that have been proven to work. That is why we cannot let a debate about funding jeopardize the critical policy changes that CARA would make and because CARA would help ensure that these new resources would be spent on what we know works. That is what this 3-year process was about. That is what the conferences were about. That is what all the experts coming to Washington to tell us what works in the States was about—getting those best practices into this legislation.

Again, the CARA legislation improves prevention by sponsoring a national awareness campaign about the dangers of abusing prescription opioids. Probably four out of five heroin addicts who overdose today started on prescription drug. That information needs to get out there. We need to explain this connection to people if we are going to get at this issue.

The legislation also targets anti-drug coalitions in areas where the epidemic is worse. So where it is at its worst, there is more funding targeted to these anti-drug coalitions to focus on prevention and education. That is key to keep people out of the funnel of addiction, the grip of addiction. We should all be for that. That is in this legislation.

It would increase access to treatment by increasing the availability of naloxone, which is a miracle drug. It can actually reverse an overdose while it is happening. It will train our first responders to be able to use Narcan or naloxone more effectively. These provisions will save lives, particularly when it is connected—when saving a life is connected to getting somebody into treatment.

The conference agreement would also improve recovery for those who have been treated for addiction. It will build recovery communities like the ones at colleges and universities—perhaps at the State of the Presiding Officer. We have one we are very proud of at Ohio State University.

These recovery communities will give the peer support that is necessary to follow through on addiction treatment over the long term. We know that

works. That is one of the keys, not just the treatment but the longer term recovery to keep people heading in the right direction.

I think people in your State, people in Ohio, certainly understand the urgency of this problem because everywhere I go, whether it is in the cities, the suburbs, or the rural areas, people ask me about it. And they ask me why we aren't doing more, why we are not acting on this.

Two weeks ago in Southwest Ohio, in my hometown of Cincinnati, a 28-year-old was arrested after a young man in the Cincinnati area who bought heroin from him was found dead of an overdose. A 17-year-old teenager was found dead of an overdose. That is what is happening on our streets today.

A few days ago, a man from Canton, OH, was pulled over in Akron, in Northeast Ohio, for speeding. He had 13 pounds of heroin on him. By one measure, that is about $400,000 of heroin—enough for 20,000 injections. If not for that apprehension, we would have had a lot more distribution of heroin and overdoses and potentially lives lost.

In Madison County, in Central Ohio, police arrested 16 people for trafficking heroin. At one of the drug houses they went to, there was a 5-year-old child. That is what is happening. According to the sheriff's office, a high percentage of property crimes in that county are directly tied to opioid addiction. Sheriff James Sabin says that out of all the problems facing law enforcement in Central Ohio, heroin is the No. 1 issue we are dealing with. That is what is happening.

Ohioans know this is happening to their friends, their neighbors, and their family members. They understand the urgency of this crisis. That is why all over the Buckeye State people are taking action at the local level and at the State level. But they want the Federal Government to be a better partner in helping them do what they know has to be done to fight this epidemic.

As I said, on Tuesday I was in Dayton. There have been over 400 overdoses just this year in Dayton. By some measure, Dayton, OH, has been named the top big city in America for overdoses—not something we are proud of. These 400 overdoses are going to be helped by a new program that was just launched and announced on Tuesday—I was there for the announcement—called the Front Door Initiative. It will get treatment to those who have overdosed. Once they are clean, it will get them skill training, help them find a job, and teach them how to be better moms and dads. The notion is that instead of putting people into prison, get them into treatment. It is a diversion program that is going to be customized and personalized for the particular person's problems. Through looking at what works and what doesn't work, we have found that is an effective way to get people back on track.

This innovation is happening in other places, too, around Ohio. Sheriff Tharp in Lucas County is doing some very innovative stuff—again, connecting people whom they arrest with treatment. In my view, it is going to be more effective, more compassionate, and it will also save taxpayer dollars.

I thank Sheriff Phil Plummer, the Cornerstone Project, and the entire Montgomery County Drug-Free Coalition in Dayton, OH, for their daily fight to get treatment to those who need it and help people get their lives back on track.

The conference report that has just been voted out will help. It will help law enforcement agencies like those in Dayton and Lucas County and other places around Ohio find alternatives to incarceration.

Ohioans are taking action, and they expect Congress to take appropriate action too. This is a crisis. They want the Federal Government to be a better partner. They have been patient.

Let me just say respectfully that, in my view, this is not like every other issue we address here. And we address some very important issues, as we did yesterday on sanctuary cities, issues that relate to spending bills, but this is about saving lives and allowing people to achieve their God-given purpose in life by not getting off track and not being casualties of this addiction epidemic.

I think this is urgent. And for those who might say ''Well, what hope is there? How can more money help?'' I will tell you, No. 1, it is money that will be wisely spent. That is how it will help. Secondly, if it is well spent, treatment can work and it does work. Recovery can work and it does work. There are so many stories I can tell because I have been at over a dozen treatment centers around Ohio and spoken to hundreds of recovering addicts and heard so many stories.

Let me tell you one about Bethani Temple from Prospect, OH. When she was 18 years old, her dad died of cancer. To help her cope with her grief, she tried one of the pain killers he had been prescribed. He had pain medication for his cancer, and she was grieving, so she thought she would try one of these pain killers, and she became addicted to these pain killers. Soon they were too expensive and not as accessible as something else, which was heroin. Bethani became addicted to heroin. While she was addicted, she gave birth to a daughter who was dependent on opioids.

By the way, there has been a 750-percent increase in babies born in Ohio in the last 12 years who are dependent on opioids. It is tragic.

Bethani's boyfriend got into a car accident while he was high on heroin and he died. Bethani was eventually arrested. Fortunately, she was in an area of Ohio where, although she got arrested, they helped get her into treatment. They diverted her into treatment. She got help. Bethani was the very first graduate of the Marion Ohio Court family dependency treatment program. It is a drug court. We had a roundtable discussion in Marion with Bethani and others and got to see some other young women who have been able to benefit from that.

Her daughter got treatment, too, by the way. Now they are both healthy—and not just healthy; Bethani is now a college graduate, she is now married with two kids, and she is now the coordinator of the same program that got her back on track and, as she would say, saved her. She is the coordinator there, and she is helping others get their lives back on track as she did. She is beating this because she got the right treatment for her, the right recovery program for her.

Mr. President, this is personal for me. It is personal for all of us—it should be. I know too many people who have gotten caught up in this grip of addiction. I know too many families who have gone through what may be viewed by some as the ultimate grief, which is to have your child predecease you because that child got involved with prescription drugs, then heroin, and then overdosed.

Two families I have gotten to know lost their children because when their children had their wisdom teeth taken out, they were given pain medication and they got addicted to the pills and then heroin. These were teenagers who had to have their wisdom teeth taken out. These families are waiting, but they need help, and we need to give it to them.

I would urge my colleagues to set the politics aside. This is not a partisan issue. It hasn't been from the start. This is an issue of helping the people we represent.

For all those people who voted for the legislation as it came through—94 to 1—remember, all that has changed is that there is more money in this bill now than there was before. Remember, in the 117 days since you voted for this legislation, over 10,000 Americans have died, including Americans in each of our States. Remember, there is an election every 2 years. There is always going to be politics. This needs to come above politics. We need to get this done, and we need to get it done now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the Senate is presently on the verge of approving a measure that is supposedly a compromise to provide for GMO labeling. I want to express my thanks and respect for the principal authors of this legislation, my colleagues Senators ROBERTS and STABENOW. They have worked hard to forge this compromise.

Unfortunately, this falls far short of what is necessary to really inform consumers, provide the essential facts they need to make informed and educated choices about what they want to eat and to have their families eat, what they want to put on their dinner table.

Nothing is more fundamental or important than what we eat. It is essential to energy and the ability of our children to learn. It is important to our productivity as adults. People of all ages care about what they eat, and they care more than ever now because they know how important it is. They also know about the unwanted features of food that could impair their health.

Not long ago, we as a body rejected a measure called the DARK Act, which stood for Deny Americans the Right to Know. Unfortunately, this legislation will continue to leave consumers in the dark about what they are eating. This new compromise is as misguided and anti-consumer as that bill was, even though it may seem better.

The bill also betrays the desires of 90 percent of the American people who want clear, comprehensive, truthful, accurate information—labeling they can understand and readily see when they shop in their supermarkets or grocery stores, labels that tell them whether there has been genetic engineering.

Not only do 90 percent of the American people want it, but the people of Connecticut have spoken. My State adopted a law that requires it. That law will go into effect if 4 other States comprising 20 million people move ahead with the same legislation. It is not arbitrary. It is not dictatorial or draconian. It is simple, commonsense, effective legislation adopted by the legislature and signed by the Governor of my State.

What probably offends me most about this legislation is that it overrides the will of the people of Connecticut, their determination that they want clear, comprehensive labeling on GMO products. When the Connecticut Legislature adopted its statute—and now as we are considering ours—the debate has never been about whether GMOs are safe or unsafe to consume. I will leave to the scientists—readily delegate to them those judgments about the science of GMOs. Nor is this a debate about whether we should have warning labels. The labeling on these packages would not be in any way a warning to consumers; it would be informational only. The debate here and the objective of this measure is simply to provide information as dispassionately and clearly and objectively as possible. That is the goal, and that is what the legislation I have cosponsored with my colleague Senator MERKLEY would achieve. That is what we have sought to do through the amendments we have offered to correct the deficiencies in this measure. Among those deficiencies is the lack of an adequate definition of ''bioengineering.'' Right now, that definition fails to include many of the forms of GMOs that could be adopted.

The deficiencies include the reliance on QR codes, which discriminate against people who don't have smartphones or are in areas not served by the Internet or go to shop in stores that don't have that service.

It is also defective in a number of specific provisions, and I will cite just one more. In the provision that applies to additional disclosure options, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed by this legislation that when there is insufficient access to bioengineering disclosure through electronic or digital disclosure methods, he ''shall provide additional and comparable options to access the bioengineering disclosure.'' The Secretary of Agriculture will become responsible and accountable for the cost, the mechanical process, and all of the aspects of providing this disclosure when, in fact, electronic or digital disclosure methods available to manufacturers or retailers are insufficient. What will be the cost? What will be the obstacles? There has been no hearing that would indicate those facts.

So what we have here is a failure of drafting and of process. In this sweeping so-called compromise, the laws of Connecticut will be decimated. My State will be stripped of robust, grassroots GMO labeling measures—including in Maine and Vermont—not only applying to food but also to seeds planted in the ground and information about whether they have been bioengineered. These deficiencies are fundamental to this legislation. I repeat, the issue here is not about warning and not about safety, although those topics are reasonable to debate. It is simply about the public's right to know.

I have a basic faith in our markets in the United States and in our free enterprises that consumers will make smart judgments and wise choices if they have the information that enables them to do it. But only if they have that information.

My question to the proponents of this bill is this: What do we have to fear by providing that kind of information that consumers need and want, and that 15,000 Connecticut citizens have written to me asking to defend, and that constituents of mine, such as Tara Cook-Littman, have shown is desperately and dramatically needed? Tara has said:

> Anything short of on package, clear labeling shows total disregard for what it is like to be a mom shopping in a store with her children. When I'm shopping, I need to get in and out as fast as I possibly can. And, whether a product contains GMOs is only one of the many things I am looking for before making my purchasing decision. My son is allergic to nuts so I always look at packages to make sure the item is nut free. I like to know the calories, fat and sugar of an item before I purchase it. I look at how many ingredients a product has. All of that information I can get in seconds. I pick up the item, I scan the box for the information I need and keep moving. I should be able to do the same for GMOs. I would never have the time to pull out my phone and scan the packages or go to a website in order to get the simple information I am looking for. Assuming I would have the time or ability shows a total lack of understanding about shopping in the real world. When shopping for a family of 5, my shopping cart could end up having over 50 items. Having to scan or look up items on a website is not feasible.

I agree with Tara, and I agree with anyone who has shopped and has the same views. In a crowded grocery store at the end of the day or with a child, especially a young child, navigating these aisles is challenging enough. The last thing a parent has is spare time to take out their phone and scan every product before placing it in their cart, even assuming the store has the Internet service that would enable someone to do so, and even assuming that person has a smartphone.

This proposal is simply not practical, logical, or fair to consumers. It is in fact anti-consumer. It is unacceptable as a consumer protection measure. Let's give States the freedom to protect their own people, as Connecticut has done. That is the reason I proposed an amendment that would restore the right of States to adopt such legislation, and make this legislation a floor rather than a ceiling that enables States to do more.

I thank my colleagues, Senators LEAHY and SANDERS, as well as Senator TESTER and others, who have championed this cause, and, most importantly, Senator MERKLEY, who has helped to lead this effort. I believe the concerns we have expressed are urgent and immediate. Even at this late hour, I urge my colleagues to reject this measure as it has been drafted now, and adopt these commonsense amendments that will improve it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I have been coming to the floor every week for quite some time talking about an epidemic that we all have to fight through, and that is the epidemic of opiates—drug abuse. This is prescription—legal—drug abuse. We have come to a crisis in our country. I think both Democrats and Republicans realize this. This is not a partisan issue. It doesn't pick sides. It doesn't choose whether you are rich or poor, what race you may be, what religion you may practice. It basically attacks everybody.

In 2014, 18,893 people died due to prescription opiate overdose. That is an average of 51 people every day. We are talking about legal prescription drugs. These are made by pharmaceutical companies that we depend on to make products needed for quality of life. They are also approved by the Food and Drug Administration. Basically, the Food and Drug Administration is responsible for making sure the products we consume are safe. Then, they are prescribed to us by the most trusted person next to our family member, which is our doctor.

So when we think about it, how could something that has been approved by so many reputable people and institutions do so much harm and then we not react to it? That is the hard thing I have to imagine. I can't say: You know what; I don't think it was anybody's intent, but it is what it is.

We have a full-blown epidemic. Over 2,000 people have died since 1999. We talk about Zika, and we talk about Ebola. We are concerned about all these horrific illnesses that can attack a human being, and we have one right in front of us that is a silent killer, and we are not doing anything about it.

Sixteen percent more people died in 2014 than died in 2013. We have to take action to stop the epidemic, and it can only happen right here in the halls of Congress in the Senate and with our counterparts on the other side of this great Capitol of ours.

Unfortunately, a major barrier those suffering opioid addicts face is insufficient access to substance abuse treatment. I spoke to my cousin, Michael Aloi, who is a Federal magistrate judge. He said: JOE, let me just tell you the sad scenario. I have to sentence many people for the wrong they have done and the crimes they have committed. I have never once had anyone stand and say: Judge, I'm sorry; you can't sentence them to a jail sentence because we have no more jails—no more jails.

He said: I have never been turned down. We have always found a jail cell or a bed to imprison somebody. We have never lacked for that. But so many times I have tried to place a person in treatment whom I know needed treatment. Their family wanted it, and they wanted to change their life. And guess what I have been told: I am sorry, but we have no place to put them.

If you are a parent, the only thing you can do—I know Nebraska is the same as West Virginia. Isn't it an awful situation where, in America, you have to hope that your child gets arrested and convicted, and maybe then they could be sentenced to drug court to maybe get a chance in life? It is a sad scenario in this great country of ours that we can't save this generation.

It is of epidemic proportion from this standpoint. I don't think there is a person who I know of in my State or anyone I have ever met in my travels in America who doesn't know someone—in their immediate family, extended family, or close friend—who has not been affected by drug abuse. It is of epidemic proportion.

I say it is a silent killer because we keep our mouths shut. We are afraid. If it is our child, we don't want anybody to know. It would be embarrassing. If it is our mother or father, if it is an aunt or uncle, brother or sister, we will take care of that. We don't want anybody to know about it. Guess what. We have a full-blown epidemic that is killing your brothers, your sisters, your children, your aunts and uncles and moms and dads, and we say: Why didn't we say something?

So this is what we are dealing with, and this is something we intend to fight.

I will give an example of how hard it is to get treatment. In 2014, in my beautiful State of West Virginia, 42,000 West Virginians—including 4,000 children—sought treatment for illegal drug abuse but failed to receive it. The largest long-term facility in West Virginia with more than 100 beds is the Recovery Point of Huntington, one of the most successful places we have. It is run by recovering addicts. Every one of them is a recovering addict. They know exactly every excuse, every type of diversion that you will give them. They have had everything thrown at them. They know it all. This group has been the best at having success ratios in putting people back into productive lives. They only have 100 beds, and they have a 4-month to 6-month waiting list—unbelievable.

In 2014, about 15,000 West Virginians received some form of drug or alcohol abuse treatment. That is 15,000 who received it. Guess what. There was another 60,000 who went untreated—60,000 with no treatment at all.

Based on my conversation with police departments, I would say that all of us—all 100 Senators in this room, Democrats and Republicans—can talk to their law enforcement, and I will assure you that they will tell you that at least 8 out of 10 of the calls they are called to for any type of disturbance, any type of criminal activity is caused by drugs. Almost 80 percent are drug driven. Then we say that we can't afford it so we don't find any money. We can't find the money to pay for treatment centers.

I have a bill that is called the LifeBOAT Act. It is bipartisan. We hope it is bipartisan. We are asking for all the help we can get. Here is really what it does. It is truly designated to fund treatment centers. What we are asking for is one penny—one penny—per milligram of every opiate product produced and distributed in America. One penny per milligram. That one penny will give us $1.5 to $2 billion a year. Can you believe that—$1.5 to $2 billion from one penny per milligram? Imagine the enormity of what we are consuming. When we think of a country that is less than 5 percent of the world population that consumes anywhere from 80 to 90 percent of all opioid products produced in the world, how can we become so addicted? How are we so pain intolerant that we have to have these powerful, addictive drugs? What happened to us?

With all that being said, we have to first of all treat addiction as an illness. I am as guilty as anybody in politics or in political life or making policy for any period of time—20 years or more. I am as guilty as they are, thinking, at first: If you are fooling with drugs, you are committing a crime; we will put you in jail. Guess what. We have filled the jails, and when they get out, they are no better off than when we put them in. They haven't been relieved of their addiction. They haven't been cured of their addiction. They haven't even been treated for their addiction. We just thought that by throwing them in a prison or in a jail cell, we would take care of it. We have come to our senses now and found out addiction is an illness. Any other illness you might have, you are going to find treatment for. There is treatment to take care of you if you are ill, whatever it may be. Sorry, but not for opiates, not for a drug addiction. We can't. We just don't have the money to do it.

We charge a fee for cigarettes. We know cigarettes are dangerous to you. It is not healthy for you. It will kill you. We know that. It is put on the packs when you buy any tobacco products, and you pay a tax or a fee. Call it anything you want to call it, you pay. Alcohol—when you buy alcohol, you pay a fee, a tax, or anything else that you want to put to that. But, by golly, if we talk about: Oh, my goodness, we need one penny per milligram to start providing treatment for people who are addicted so we can put them back into productive life—I am not voting for any taxes. I can't vote for tax increases. I am not voting for any of these things. Can't you vote for a treatment for your child, for your grandchild, for your neighbor? Can't you save a society that we are losing? Can't you see that 8 out of 10 of our crimes are committed by people who are drug-induced?

If you are concerned about the economy, if you are concerned about the well-being and welfare of this country, can't you do something responsible and not worry about going out and defending yourself—yes, I will be happy to tell you I voted for a penny. You want to call that a tax? I am pretty austere about that. When I was Governor, I always said I was very financially responsible, fiscally responsible, socially compassionate.

This is just common sense. You have to find a way to fund it. That is what we have asked for. So the LifeBOAT Act is something I am hoping every one of my colleagues will take a good, hard look at. And don't look at it as a tax or a fee; look at it as a treatment plan that helps get Americans straight again. Help us get it back into production.

We talked about the silent killer. This is a silent killer because no one talks about it. Guess what. Since I have been coming to the floor, people have been sending me letters. They said: Please, we want you to read our letter. I want you to know about my son, my child, my grandchild, my husband, my wife, my mother, my father.

I am going to read Stephanie Sowell's story. Stephanie put her name to this, and she wanted me to read this for you. She says:

> I applaud and thank you for your efforts at helping those with addiction.
>
> My son, Tommy Sowell, died of an accidental overdose of heroin mixed with Fentanyl and acetyl fentanyl on February 13, 2016, at the age of 24. I am quite sure he did not know the drug contained Fentanyl and acetyl fentanyl.
>
> He developed a hernia during 9th grade and had surgery, after which they prescribed OxyContin.

Knowing that it was addictive, knowing that it has been overprescribed and has caused many overdoses.

I now believe this is where the story of his addiction began. He did not want, nor choose, to be addicted. He held a high GPA throughout school and graduated from South Harrison High School. He willingly helped his dad in the hay field from a young age every year. He loved his family. He wanted and needed to work and be productive.

He wanted to go to college from a young age but the lure of the oil & gas field won out with its high pay. However, with those jobs beginning to close in WV around 2014–2016, he began to spiral down . . . with no job prospects to speak of here, but not wanting to leave WV and his family, he instead turned to more drugs to deal [with and] cope with feeling lost and unproductive.

His dad and I found him. He died alone, which makes me even sadder to know.

Tommy was a good boy, a wonderful son, and he lit up our world with laughter and joy. He was loving, respectful, kindhearted, and full of life and fun.

I know in my heart he would have overcome this and gone on to do wonderful things if he'd just had the chance. We are heartbroken and will be forever heartbroken. Saturday, June 11th, would have been his 25th birthday.

If this letter helps you in any way please feel free to use it. It would bring a bit of peace to us to know that his story will help others.

This is a hidden secret. This is basically a hidden killer we are talking about. When you have Stephanie and the parents and grandparents willing to speak up and say: Put a face with it. Put a boy or young girl coming out of a neighborhood, whom we had high hopes for and who was snuffed out—this is what they want us to share. This is what they are asking us to take up and do—provide the treatment that can help save the lives of their children and the lives of a generation of Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are on the floor this afternoon with the issue of GMO foods—genetically modified organisms—before us. I don't want to talk about GMO foods in that space; I want to talk about a more specific genetically engineered species.

I would like to speak this afternoon about genetically engineered salmon. I think it is important to acknowledge that this is separate from the larger GMO debate we have been engaged in on the floor. Genetically engineered animals are not crops. They are not something that grows in a field and stays stationary. A genetically engineered salmon is something that swims. It moves around. It is something entirely new. It is a new species—a new species designed specifically for human consumption.

This is the first time the FDA has ever signed off on a genetically engineered new species designed for human consumption—the first time. I happen to think the FDA signoff was wrong, and I am going to continue to object to that because this species that potentially will be introduced into our markets, into our homes, and quite possibly into our ecosystems, contrary to what any environmental assessment may claim, is new. This is unprecedented.

When we talk about a genetically engineered salmon—we have dubbed it a Frankenfish in Alaska because it is splicing DNA from one animal, an ocean pout, with DNA from another fish, a farmed fish, and inserting that into a Chinook salmon. We are doing a little bit of a science experiment here that concerns many of us.

Having grown up in the State of Alaska, I know fish. I know the significance of a strong, healthy fishery. It is our No. 1 employer throughout the State of Alaska. Not only do we look to the strength of our fisheries for strong economies and good jobs, it is critical and it is integral to those who live a subsistence lifestyle. It is so much a part of who we are as Alaskans. Alaskans identify themselves with their salmon. Right now, people in Alaska are not necessarily talking about what is going on here in Washington, DC. They are wondering when the next run of Pinks is coming in. They are wondering what is happening on the Yukon and the Kuskokwim with the runs up there. When is the red run going to come in in full tilt? When is the dip netting going to be starting? It is all about our fish.

We have been assured that if these genetically engineered salmon should be allowed out onto the market, that if this production moves forward, you don't need to worry, Alaska, about any escapement because we are going to make sure these don't get loose. Nice promise, but we know in this State that fish can get out of the pens. They escape from hatcheries. They can be accidentally released from where fish are grown. We take very seriously the issues that present themselves with the introduction of a new species that has the potential to wreak havoc, to do harm to our wild natural stocks.

Again, whether it is escapement or the promise of ''Don't worry, these fish are going to be sterile; you are not ever going to have to worry about them interbreeding, breeding with your wild stocks. You are going to be safe, Alaska. You are going to be OK, Alaska,'' the folks I represent back home look at this and say ''No, we don't believe we have the assurances. We don't believe we have the certainty. We don't believe we have the standards that are necessary to provide for the protection of our wild stocks.''

So I have made clear throughout the larger debate on GMOs that I have opposed this bill because contained within this broader debate of GMOs—we do nothing to make it clear that if genetically engineered salmon is to go forward as the FDA has said that it will, there needs to be clear and unequivocal labeling of this GE salmon. Contained within this broader bill, we do not have the clear requirement for labeling of GE salmon, while also preempting Alaska's labeling law.

What we have been told is ''Don't worry, if these genetically engineered salmon are out on the market, those who are marketing these salmon can voluntarily label them.'' Let me ask you, who do you think is really going to voluntarily place a label on something that says ''This is not the real thing. This is not your wild Alaska salmon; this is a genetically engineered species''?

The reality is, we will not see the labeling that I as an Alaskan who is putting fish on the dinner table for my family would require and would want. We have been trying to work through this with the chairman and ranking member of the committee, trying to provide for what we believe are very sensible, reasonable fixes, and yet we are at a place where those accommodations have simply not been made.

Let me assure you that Alaskans are very unified on this issue. We will not accept GE salmon or this Frankenfish being sold to us without clear labeling. Again, I for one am not going to feed my boys this fish. I use that term lightly because I am looking at it and this is not even like a fish. You are taking DNA from an ocean pout. What is an ocean pout? It is an eel. I usually am here with a big picture of an ugly eel. I figured you might be tired of looking at that picture by now, but apparently it is not getting through to people. When we talk about Frankenfish, this is no joke to Alaskans. It poses a serious threat to the livelihoods of our fishermen, and that is not something that I am willing to take a risk on, that I am willing to take a gamble on.

Our fisheries in the State of Alaska are world-renowned for their high quality and their sustainability. The Alaska seafood industry supports more than 63,000 direct jobs and contributes over $4.6 billion to our State's economy. Nearly one in seven Alaskans is employed in our commercial seafood industry. It is a major part of the seafood economy. Commercial fishermen around the State harvested more than 265 million salmon this past year, including the wild Chinook salmon, Sockeye, Coho, Chums, and Pinks. It is all coming on right here, right now. I was in Naknek on Friday. Everyone is waiting for the Sockeye to hit. It is an incredibly important part of our State's economy, but it is more than just the economic benefit—the dollars that come to our State, the jobs it has created—it is the good, healthy stuff. Wild Alaska salmon has tremendous health benefits. It is a lean protein source of omega-3, B–6, B–12, niacin. It is good stuff. It is naturally good stuff.

It is so good that there are over 1.5 million people who wrote in to the FDA and said: We oppose this genetically engineered salmon. They weighed in. What did the FDA do? They basically went the other way. They weren't listening. Many of the grocery stores

we frequent have said: You know what, if you are going to allow this out here, we are not going to sell this in our stores. They want to know that there is going to be a label on it. They want to know that they can tell their customers ''This is wild Alaska sustainable, the real thing; and this is not.'' A voluntary label does not cut it. Safeway, Kroger, Whole Foods, Trader Joe's, and Target all announced they are not going to sell it. Despite this immense opposition, in November of last year, the FDA approved AquaBounty Technologies' application for its GE AquAdvantage salmon.

I put ''salmon'' or ''fish'' in quotation marks because what we are doing is we are taking a transgenic Atlantic salmon egg, which has genes from this ocean pout, this eel, and combining it with the genes of a Chinook. The egg is meant to produce a fish that grows to full size in half the time as a normal Atlantic salmon. Again, they are ramping this up on steroids, if you will, to cause it to grow twice as fast.

Under the FDA application, these eggs will be produced in Canada, so it is not as though we are getting any American jobs there, and then the smolt—although I don't even really want to use the term ''smolt'' because only part of this fish is real salmon—they are then going to ship this to Panama, where they will be raised in pens. Again, there are no U.S. jobs there. The FDA made no mandatory labeling requirement; instead, they made it voluntary. This bill we have in front of us, the larger GMO bill, does not create a clear labeling mandate, either, and that is the concern I have. That is why I fought to secure mandatory labeling requirements both before the approval of AquaBounty's application and since its approval.

We have been making good headway on this issue over the time I have been here in Washington, but unfortunately the bill we have in front of us today will wipe out that work instead of using the legislative tools we have at our disposal to effectively and precisely amend this legislation in order to address the issue of GE salmon.

I have offered up an amendment. It has been sponsored by Senators SULLIVAN, CANTWELL, MURRAY, and MERKLEY. What it would do is require the FDA to create a new market name for GE salmon in order to remedy this flaw in the current bill. In other words, give the certainty to the consumer. If you are shopping in your grocery store, you will know whether what you buy for your family is the real thing or a genetically engineered fish.

The amendment is essentially the same language that was adopted by voice vote during the Agriculture appropriations markup earlier this year. It is substantially similar to language that was adopted by voice in each of the previous 2 years. We have had this before us. We have seen it. You have seen it. Yet it is not included right now.

For 3 years running, the Appropriations Committee has approved the labeling of GE salmon without debate. I think this amendment shouldn't be very controversial, but for some reason it apparently is. Apparently it has caused all kinds of issues, and I do not see why. I have offered multiple sensible solutions over the course of several months while this bill was working its way through the process, and I am here today to again push for consideration of what I believe is truly sensible and truly reasonable. It has been incorporated and adopted before. It makes sense for a host of different reasons, and it certainly makes sense for the people of Alaska.

I am here today, as we talk about the broader GMO debate, to make sure colleagues understand that my opposition here is to anything that would mistakenly allow genetically engineered salmon into anyone's homes mislabeled as salmon. I will continue to demand that the voices of Alaskans and those who care deeply about this are heard.

With that, I see other colleagues have joined me on the floor. I thank the Presiding Officer for his attention to this matter, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Indiana.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the bipartisan Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, also known as CARA, and the opioid abuse and heroin use epidemics. As I have said, I believe it will take all of us working together to address this public health crisis that is gripping Hoosier families and communities across Indiana and our country. We all have a role to play to address these epidemics—officials at the Federal, local, and State levels, as well as prescribers, pharmacists, law enforcement, first responders, and parents and families.

This bipartisan CARA legislation would provide States and local communities with important tools to prevent and treat drug addiction and support individuals in recovery. It includes several provisions adapted from my bipartisan legislation that would enhance prescribing practices and raise public awareness. We were also successful in getting a provision included that would encourage first responder units to connect individuals who receive naloxone with treatment and other necessary services. This bill includes programs that will make a difference and should be enacted into law. It is also critically important that we fund these initiatives. CARA is an important step, but make no mistake, there is work left to do to ensure that our communities have the resources and funding to implement many of these important programs. We have a chance to do something meaningful and bipartisan that will help save lives. For every family and community in Indiana and across the Nation who has been devastated by the opioid abuse and heroin use epidemics, we must get legislation to the President to be signed into law.

Mr. President, I also want to talk about another issue that is important to Hoosiers. Later today the Senate will vote in favor of final passage on a bill requiring the labeling of foods that contain genetically engineered materials. I have worked with colleagues for months on this issue. I know this is about much more than just words or symbols on a label; it is about ensuring we have confidence in the food we eat and feed our children. As a Hoosier, I also know this bill is about preserving a long and proud Indiana tradition of growing the food that feeds our communities and provides a safe and reliable food supply for the world.

The labeling legislation before us is the result of our working together as Republicans and Democrats to achieve our shared objectives to provide consumers with access to accurate information about the food we eat and to do so in a way that does not mislead consumers into thinking their food is unsafe. When this bill is enacted into law, for the first time ever consumers across our country will have access to the information they want, and it will be easy to find. That information will also be delivered in a way that is fair, objective, and based on sound science.

Today I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill for final passage, not because everyone got everything they wanted but because it is a good compromise that achieves our shared objectives. Labeling genetically engineered materials will be required so consumers everywhere will have access to the information. It will provide fair and objective information without stigmatizing foods that are completely safe, and it contains provisions based on an amendment that my good friend Senator CARPER from Delaware and I introduced, which will require clear and direct access to information on bioengineering through multiple methods of disclosure. Consumers, farmers, and food producers have been looking to the Senate for leadership. After months of discussion, we have found a sensible proposal that will bring the right information into our homes and to grocery stores in a responsible way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

TRUST ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, anybody who has been watching the news knows what has happened with the FBI investigation of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. I think that the FBI's press conference detailing the findings of the FBI's investigation has made it very clear that Secretary Clinton has proven she cannot be trusted in protecting this Nation's most sensitive secrets. That is the takeaway from the FBI Director's press conference just days ago. That is not opinion; that is the conclusion that can be derived and taken from the findings of a very intensive FBI investigation.

There were details in press reports earlier today which indicated that classified information had perhaps been handled in an extremely careless way by members of the military, and maybe others, who were punished; however, FBI Director James Comey said he did not recommend punishment in the case of Secretary Clinton's mishandling of classified information, but in the other cases, he pointed out that there had been adverse consequences. We saw the news reports today that talked about security and administrative sanctions on those who violated the policies and laws of handling classified information. That is why Senator JOHN CORNYN and I have introduced legislation to address this very serious abuse of handling and mishandling classified information.

The bill we have introduced is called the TRUST Act because it makes sure that there are consequences for people who handle our classified and most important secrets in an extremely careless manner. The TRUST Act provides consequences for anyone who exercises extreme carelessness in handling classified information. Any clearances that Secretary Clinton holds ought to be revoked because of her mishandling of these secrets, and she should be denied access to classified material unless and until she has a legal right to such access by becoming President-elect. In addition, those around the Secretary and the people to whom she emailed classified information—emails that were marked ''classified'' in some cases—ought to lose their security clearances as well.

Secretary Clinton has consistently misled the American people about her emails. Just look at the Associated Press report published yesterday. In a news conference in March of 2015, Secretary Clinton said: ''I did not email any classified material to anyone on my email. There is no classified material.'' That is not true.

In an NBC interview on July 16, Secretary Clinton said: ''I never received or sent any material that was marked classified.'' That is not true.

During a news conference in March of 2015, Secretary Clinton said: ''I responded right away and provided all of my emails that could possibly be work related'' to the State Department. That is not true.

In March of 2015, Secretary Clinton said: The server was ''guarded by the Secret Service, and there were no security breaches.'' As we can see through the FBI Director's statement, that most likely is also untrue.

Time and again, Secretary Clinton has not told the truth to the American people, and there should be consequences related to these actions, especially when her recklessness relates to the most sensitive classified information this country has.

Even President Bill Clinton noted the immense harm that results from dangerous actions like those outlined by the FBI Director. In Executive Order 12968, President Clinton said: ''The unauthorized disclosure of information classified in the national interest can cause irreparable damage to national security and loss of human life.''

Secretary Clinton is an intelligent person. She knew this information was classified, and some of it was even marked ''classified.'' The FBI Director himself has said that even if it is not marked ''classified,'' but you know it is classified, you should be aware of it. If you have the potential to carry forward and disclose classified information, then you shouldn't send it over an unsecured server, as Secretary Clinton did hundreds, if not thousands, of times.

The New York Times reported today that based on the words and comments, which you can parse from the FBI Director's statements just a couple of days ago, you can basically tell that Clinton's unsecured server was very likely hacked by foreign actors who ''were far too skilled to leave evidence of their work.'' That is why Secretary Clinton's security clearance ought to be revoked, and she should be denied access to classified material unless and until she has a legal right to such acts. That is also why those who acted with extreme carelessness around her—because they know better—should have their security clearances revoked. So they can't continue to perpetrate this kind of extreme recklessness, this kind of extreme carelessness, as identified by the Director of the FBI.

The Clintons are the great escape artists, the Houdinis of American politics. They push the law to the very edge, and just when they get caught or trapped, they pull back. It is a double standard the American people are sick and tired of dealing with, and I hope my colleagues will support the TRUST Act to protect the integrity of Americans and American classified information.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. President, I also rise to speak about the threat from North Korea and the role Congress has played in enacting tougher policies to counter the Kim Jong Un regime.

On January 6, 2016, North Korea conducted its fourth nuclear test, which is the third such test since President Obama has taken office.

On February 7, North Korea conducted a satellite launch, which is essentially a test of an intercontinental ballistic missile but just disguised as something else, but the launch was certainly to test a missile that would, in their words, be capable of reaching the U.S. mainland.

In response, on February 10, the Senate came together 96 to nothing to pass the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act, a bill I authored in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee along with Senator BOB MENENDEZ from New Jersey. Together, our legislation mandated—not simply authorized but mandated—sanctions against individuals who contribute to North Korea's nuclear program and proliferation activities, malicious cyber attacks, censorship of its citizens, and the regime's continued human rights abuses. The legislation imposed the first-ever mandatory sanctions on North Korea and the first-ever mandatory cyber sanctions as well.

This legislation was a recognition that this administration's policy of strategic patience has been a strategic failure. As the Washington Post editorial board stated on February 8, just 2 days before our bill passed on the Senate floor, ''President Obama's policy since 2009 of strategic patience has failed. The policy has mostly consisted of ignoring North Korea while mildly cajoling China to pressure the regime.''

I am pleased to see the administration is now shifting its failed policies by implementing key portions of the North Korea legislation that cracks down on the North Korean regime.

On June 1, the Treasury Department designated North Korea as a jurisdiction of ''primary money laundering concern'' under section 311 of the PATRIOT Act, which will further isolate North Korea from the international financial system.

Yesterday, Treasury took another important step by designating Kim Jong Un and a number of his top officials as human rights abusers. This designation is long overdue and came about only because Congress mandated it, along with a human rights report that was delivered to Congress yesterday.

We have known for years that this regime is one of the world's foremost abusers of human rights. The North Korean regime maintains a vast network of political prison camps, where as many as 200,000 men, women, and children are confined to atrocious living conditions and are tortured, maimed, and killed. I have spoken to defectors. I have had conversations with a defector from North Korea who served in the military there and who spoke to me of their torture in these prisons, of people who were put in jail because of their opposition to the Kim Jong Un regime, people who were tortured because of their defiance of Kim Jong Un's leadership.

On February 7, 2014, the United Nations Human Rights Commission released a groundbreaking report detailing North Korea's horrendous record on human rights. The Commission found that North Korea's actions constituted a ''crime against humanity.''

Now, we all are probably asking ourselves why it took so long for the administration to come to the same conclusion and then finally do something about it. Nonetheless, this week we finally are, but more remains to be done to send the strongest message we can to this regime, which poses a very serious threat to peace and stability throughout Asia, Eastern Asia, and the United States.

Last month, we learned that North Korea successfully tested a missile that is capable of reaching U.S. bases

in Japan and the U.S. territory of Guam. According to open sources, the DPRK currently fields an estimated 700 short-range ballistic missiles, 200 medium-range ballistic missiles, and 100 intermediate-range ballistic missiles.

To counter this threat, we need to proactively work with South Korea to immediately station the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense—or THAAD—in South Korea. The regime's nuclear stockpile is growing fast. Most recently, nuclear exports have reported that North Korea may currently have as many as 20 nuclear warheads and has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years.

Our military leaders have repeatedly stated that North Korea may have already developed the ability to miniaturize a nuclear warhead, to mount it onto their own intercontinental ballistic missile called the KN–08, and to ''shoot it at the homeland.''

Pyongyang is also quickly developing its cyber capabilities as another dangerous tool of intimidation—an asymmetric threat to the United States—as demonstrated by the attack on the South Korean financial and communication systems in March of 2013 or the Sony Pictures hacking incident in November of 2014.

According to a report that was released last year in 2015 by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, ''North Korea is emerging as a significant actor in cyberspace with both its military and clandestine organizations gaining the ability to conduct cyber operations.''

According to the Heritage Foundation, ''Contrary to perceptions of North Korea as a technically backward nation, the regime has a very robust and active cyber warfare capability.''

The Reconnaissance General Bureau, North Korea's intelligence agency, oversees 3,000 cyber warriors dedicated to attacking Pyongyang's enemies. Cyber experts have assessed that North Korea's electronic warfare capabilities were surpassed only by the United States and Russia.

Last month, South Korean authorities uncovered a massive North Korean cyber attack into more than 140,000 computers at 160 South Korean firms and government agencies. Reports indicate that more than 40,000 defense-related documents were stolen, including the blueprints for components of the F–15 fighter jet. Let me say that again. North Korea perpetrated a hack on South Korea that resulted in them obtaining the blueprints for the F–15 fighter jet.

Yet, in light of these gross violations, the administration still has not acted to impose sanctions on North Korean cyber criminals as required by the law that passed 96 to 0 by this Senate. In fact, the administration is now nearly 2 months late in producing a report required under the bill which would name and shame those violators—the perpetrators of these cyber attacks.

However, the crux of the success of the sanctions efforts rests with Beijing's compliance—with China. Nearly 90 percent of North Korea's trade is with China and, at least so far, we have seen only mixed evidence that Beijing is serious about changing its policies toward Pyongyang.

While the administration needs to pursue constant and vigorous diplomatic efforts with Beijing, it should also not hesitate to impose penalties on Chinese entities as appropriate, if they are found in violation of the sanctions this Congress has passed.

Finally, we also need to make sure we develop a strong trilateral alliance between South Korea and Japan, including enhanced defense and intelligence cooperation, to better deter the North Korean threat. We must never forget that more than 20 years ago, North Korea pledged to dismantle its nuclear program, and yet now we see a regime that has no respect for international agreements or international norms and is on the cusp of over 100 nuclear warheads. The United States should never again engage in negotiations with Pyongyang without imposing strict preconditions that North Korea take immediate steps to halt its nuclear program, to cease all military provocation, and to make credible steps to respecting the human rights of the people of North Korea.

If the United States does not pursue increased actions against North Korea now, we will face a much greater threat in the future, and these threats will be immensely consequential to the safety and well-being of the U.S. homeland.

Mr. President, I thank you, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we just celebrated Independence Day and rightfully so. It was a big break with the past, a big break with the whole history of the United States, up until July 4, 1776. Well, we have good news. There is another new dawn of independence which has arrived in the United States, and that independence is growing by the day.

By ''independence,'' I am talking about how we generate electricity in the United States. For 100 years, we were dependent upon oil, upon natural gas, upon coal as our principal source of electricity in our country, combined with nuclear generation, plus some hydropower. But now, over the last 10 years, we have seen a true American revolution which has broken out.

In 2015, in terms of new electrical generation in the United States, 8,600 new megawatts of wind—again, people ask: What is a megawatt? Well, when we think of a big coal-burning or natural gas-burning or electrical-generating facility, that 8,600 of new wind megawatts would be about 8 or 10 new electrical generating plants using coal in our country.

Last year: 7,500 new megawatts of solar in the United States. Seven to ten new coal-burning plants never had to be built because, instead, solar was used as the means of generating electricity in our country. And the importance of that is that all of those greenhouse gases that otherwise would have been emitted into the atmosphere from these new coal-burning facilities and these new gas-burning facilities in the United States will never happen because those plants never had to be built.

Let's go back to 2015. In 2015, there was 6,000 new megawatts of natural gas electrical generation capacity in the United States that was installed, and all other electrical-generating new capacity in 2015, including coal, was almost nonexistent, although there was some but a very small amount.

Now, let's go to this little bit of history that I think is important for Senators and for the American people to hear about. Let me give my colleagues an idea as to what the profile of electrical generation in America looked like in 2005. In 2005, 50 percent of all electrical generation in America came from coal, 20 percent came from nuclear, which is about the same as it is today; natural gas was 19 percent; hydropower, 5 percent, and that is about the same as today; oil, 3 percent, and that is pretty much down to zero in the United States today, but wind and solar combined were less than one-half of 1 percent of all electrical generation in the United States in 2005. We had gone through the entire energy history of the United States, and that was the best we could do—one-half of 1 percent wind and solar.

Again, the tax breaks weren't there for wind and solar. They were there for natural gas and coal and oil and nuclear, but they were not there for wind and solar. Then policies in America began to level the playing field so wind and solar could compete. So, now, by the time we reach 2015, coal is now down to only 33 percent of all electricity generated in the United States, natural gas is up from 19 percent, up to 33 percent from 2005. Again, natural gas emits half of the greenhouse gases that coal does when it is generating electricity in our country. Nuclear stays the same at about 20 percent, hydropower is still 5 or 6 percent, but here is the interesting thing. All of a sudden, solar plus wind is up to 6 percent of all electrical generation over the last 10 years. But the interesting story is how fast wind and solar are now being added to the total mix of electricity in our country.

Now let's go to 2016, this year. What is on the books for this year is 14,500 megawatts of solar, 9,000 new megawatts of wind, natural gas at about 8,800 megawatts, and nothing else coming in. There is no coal on the books planned for this year in the United States of America. You can see that solar and wind are on track to produce two to three times as much new electricity as natural gas, and there is no other competition.

This revolution is taking place at a very rapid rate in our country. In the year 2016, we now have 310,000 jobs in the solar industry, and we have 88,000 jobs in the wind industry. In other words, we have 400,000 people working in the wind and solar industry in the United States of America. It is on pace to have 600,000 people working in those two industries by the year 2020. We are down to 65,000 coal miners in America as this new set of technologies continues to expand, continues to lower in price, and we are seeing a dramatic change in this energy mix.

Let me add that the United States is not alone in this. Last year in 2015, across the whole planet, one-half of all new electrical generating capacity came from renewable energy—one-half for the whole planet in new electrical generation capacity.

Something else that is important for people to understand is that even as we make these incredible investments in the new energy technologies across the planet, for the last 2 years global energy-related carbon emissions actually stayed flat while the global economy grew. That defies conventional economic wisdom that there is a direct correlation between how much you pollute and how much you can generate in new gross domestic product. That has now been broken. It is an anomaly. Gross domestic product continues to go up, and emissions are flat. That means we are now on a pathway where, as more and more renewables, more hybrid automobiles, electric automobiles, and more new technologies come on line, we are going to see a decline in greenhouse gases even as the global economy continues to grow. How are we going to accomplish it? Well, we have to have tax policies on the books that give incentives to these new technologies.

You don't have to worry about the oil industry. They have been taken care of for 100 years. What we do have to look at, however, is the Koch brothers and others who have a business stake in oil, gas, and coal and continue to argue against giving the same kinds of tax breaks to the renewable energy industry that have always been given to the fossil fuel industry.

In fact, when we were debating last year whether or not we were going to have extensions of tax breaks for wind and solar, the Koch brothers wrote a letter to every Member of the House and Senate saying that would be destructive to the free market system. They forgot to write this letter with regard to subsidies for the oil industry, the coal industry, the natural gas industry, and the nuclear industry. All of a sudden, when there is a new technology that does not pollute and which they are not heavily invested in, they decide that the purity of this system requires that we not have tax breaks for the new energy technology. How do they handle that? They just make sure that they have all kinds of interests out there that try to then make the argument, an economic or climate argument, that those same kinds of tax breaks the other industries have always received are not justifiable, aren't needed for the solar and wind industry.

So this is an incredible revolution. Whereas in 2005 only 79 total new solar megawatts were installed in the country, this year 14,500 megawatts are going to be installed.

This is a delayed revolution. The regulatory policy, the tax policy did not in fact give a break to the new energy technology, but the truth is that we are now on a pathway to having a revolution where, by the year 2030, we could easily have 400,000 megawatts of wind and solar and other renewables installed in the United States. By the end of next year, we will have 150,000 megawatts. After 70 years, the nuclear industry has 100,000 megawatts.

Every time I use that term ''megawatts,'' I know that it can get confusing, but just understand the bottom line is that wind and solar are coming as new additions to the grid at an average of 1 to 1.5 percent to the total every single year. So by the year 2030, it could be between 25 percent and 30 percent of all electrical generation at the current peak at which it is being deployed in our country.

So that level playing field that we have been working hard to create and which we have to continue to work hard to create is making a huge difference. The Clean Power Plan which President Obama has propounded will drive it more. The 30 States that have renewable electricity standards as a goal in their States make a difference, but also the policies we create here for tax breaks for these new industries will make a huge difference toward meeting our goals.

From my perspective, we have a chance to have America with 100 percent renewable electricity by the year 2050 in our country. We have a chance to change the whole path of the planet in terms of how they look at these energy technologies.

No one had these small cell phones in their pockets in 1993—no one. They were big bricks that cost 50 cents a minute, but we began to have a revolution, and 7 or 8 years ago everyone decided to have one in their pocket. It was unimaginable to a preceding generation of Americans.

How about this: 800 million Africans who did not have wireless devices in the year 2000 now have them in their pockets. We can deploy wind and solar to Africa, Asia, South America, and all around the planet if we make the same kind of investment in developing these new technologies.

Recently, in Germany, for 1 day the whole country was renewable. In Portugal, for 4 days the entire country was generating renewable electricity. I believe that we can and should do 100 percent generation by the year 2050, and that is why I will be introducing a resolution in the Senate, expressing the sense of this body that the United States should commit to generating 100 percent of all of our electricity from renewables by the year 2050, and I urge my colleagues to support me in this effort. This will provide massive job creation, reduction in greenhouse gases, world leadership, and an ability to avoid the worst, most catastrophic consequences of climate change to our planet.

Last year was the warmest year ever recorded. This year is the warmest year ever recorded. It keeps getting more and more dangerous, but the answer, the solution, is within our grasp.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

SANCTUARY CITIES AND ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to begin by briefly commending the efforts of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY, for his work and leadership in crafting legislation that the Senate considered yesterday that would protect families from the dangers of so-called sanctuary cities.

Sanctuary cities are, frankly, not particularly appropriately named because these are cities that have made a conscious decision to refuse to cooperate with the lawful orders of Federal authorities, especially when it comes to removal of criminal illegal aliens. The bottom line is that the failure to cooperate with Federal law and Federal officials is a danger to the very communities that many of our colleagues who blocked this legislation claim they want to protect.

In other words, these so-called sanctuary city policies—they refuse to cooperate with the removal of people who demonstrate their untrustworthiness by committing crime after crime after crime. They are a threat to the entire community, including legal immigrants and native-born Americans.

Senator TOOMEY's legislation would have cut Federal funding to these cities and counties that refused to follow the rule of law and would empower local authorities to crack down on those who commit crimes on our soil.

Unfortunately, once again, our Democratic colleagues filibustered this commonsense proposal, in addition to another bill that would have helped protect our communities. It is beginning to appear they are making a habit out of blocking bills that this country needs.

Let me give another example. Just last week, our Democratic colleagues were faced with a choice. They had made the point over and over again that the Zika virus—which is being carried by a mosquito native to our southern parts of the United States—was at our Nation's doorstep. They said that in order to combat this threat, we need additional funding for mosquito eradication, developing clinical trials for a vaccine, and advising and informing and educating the public on what

to do to protect themselves. We know. We saw a picture on the Senate floor of the devastating impact this virus has on a woman who is pregnant and her child. Indeed, last week we had a picture of a child with microcephaly—the shrunken skull and brain—and a description of the tragic circumstances they will face in that child's short life.

We could avoid all of that if our Senate colleagues would just quit playing politics. They really had a choice: to protect pregnant women and their babies from the devastating impact of a birth defect caused by the Zika virus or to play partisan politics. What did they choose? Well, it is pretty obvious they chose to play partisan politics.

Every Senate Democrat voted for $1.1 billion in Zika funding. What did the joint conference committee in the House and Senate produce that they filibustered? Zika funding for $1.1 billion. In other words, they voted against the very amount of money that they had previously voted for.

They need to quit gambling with the health of Americans. That is what Senator REID, the Democratic leader, said when he urged us to fund the President's request for Zika funding. But then they abruptly did an about-face when presented with a bill at the same funding level that they themselves had previously voted on. So who is gambling now? Who is gambling now? Who is going to answer to the mother of a child born with a devastating birth defect and explain to them why they thought that politics was more important than actually coming up with prevention and coming up with a vaccine that actually would stop the threat of these dangerous and devastating birth defects?

If the Democrats in the Senate want to gamble on the future health of the next generation, I want no part of it. Zika poses a real and immediate threat to our country, particularly in places like Texas where I come from. Ignoring the devastating impact of this virus is irresponsible and heartless.

We will soon provide another opportunity for our Democratic colleagues to move forward with a bipartisan, bicameral funding bill that includes the needed resources to fight Zika here at home at the funding level that the Democrats in the Senate have previously supported. Our public health officials need to continue the good work they are doing to study the virus, contain it, and keep it from spreading here in the United States, and they need the financial resources to do it. It is just beyond comprehension why our Senate colleagues would continue to filibuster this important funding.

Saying that the bill lacks sufficient funding to fight the virus is just plain ridiculous. That is what they have said. According to reports from just yesterday, administration officials estimate that they still have nearly half a billion dollars of unspent Ebola funds that could be put to use for combating Zika.

So I would invite our Democratic colleagues to reconsider their previous decision to block this funding and consider the wide-ranging implications of their ''no'' vote from last week. I urge them to reconsider so we can get these funds into the hands of those who protect us and our children.

TRUST ACT

On another matter, Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on FBI Director Comey's announcement regarding Secretary Clinton's use of her personal email server. He called her and the staff who enabled her to use this private server to transmit classified information ''extremely careless.'' He made clear that their actions were egregious in the sense that they put classified information at risk that our Nation's enemies would love to have and use against us. In summary, he said they should have known better, which is pretty self-evident, and he said they put our country at risk.

Even more devastating, his announcement on Tuesday proved that Secretary Clinton had been lying to the American people about her server from day one. From Director Comey's investigation, it is clear now that she did send and receive classified information, some at the very highest levels of classification. It is clear now that her server didn't provide adequate security, leaving sensitive information vulnerable to our Nation's adversaries. It is evident now that she didn't give the authorities full access to all of her work-related emails. Director Comey said the FBI uncovered several thousand more that she hadn't turned over.

In a word, this is unacceptable. For somebody with so much experience in government—as First Lady, as a U.S. Senator, and then as Secretary of State—to gamble with our Nation's most important secrets is completely irresponsible. Unfortunately, it tends to reinforce the narrative Secretary Clinton herself has been responsible for writing, and that narrative is, when it comes to her activities, anything goes. The rules may apply to you and me, but they certainly don't apply to her. Unfortunately, she feels like she is above the law, and, as I said, the rules that apply to others don't apply to her. This is simply unacceptable.

As Director Comey noted, people who engage in what Secretary Clinton did—the mishandling of classified information—are often at least held accountable through some security or administrative sanction, and that is if they don't get fired or put in prison for their misconduct.

We have to do what we can here to hold her and her staff accountable. It is part of the oath we take to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States. No less than if we were an FBI agent or a Federal judge, as Senators we have to take that oath, and it is the right thing to do.

It is very important that we send a firm message that this sort of behavior is unacceptable, and hopefully we will deter others from taking the same risks to our Nation's national security and the lives of the men and women who serve in our intelligence services if we send a message that this is not acceptable and there will be a price to be paid.

In light of the FBI Director's announcement, I have introduced legislation with the junior Senator from Colorado, Mr. GARDNER, to do just that. This legislation is called the TRUST Act. It would revoke the security clearance of anyone found to have demonstrated extreme carelessness in the handling of classified information and would keep them from receiving a clearance in the future so they couldn't do this again. It would also clarify existing law so that everyone understands that extreme carelessness, which the FBI found in the case of Secretary Clinton and her staff, basically becomes the legal standard whether or not you think it constituted gross negligence.

There are many people whose legal opinion I respect, such as former Attorney General Michael Mukasey, who said that extreme carelessness and gross negligence are basically the same thing.

I heard Mayor Giuliani—former distinguished U.S. prosecutor, former third person in line at the Justice department—say there is plenty of evidence with which to prosecute somebody who has done the things and said the things Secretary Clinton and her staff have. But we understand that Director Comey has taken that off the table, and now Attorney General Lynch has said we are going to close the file. But the truth is, Secretary Clinton and her staff have proven that they are either unable or disinterested in keeping safe highly sensitive classified information, and they have gone so far as to cover up this scandal at every step along the way. I think that should mean at minimum that they forfeit the privilege of having a security clearance so at least they cannot do this again.

Yesterday, Director Comey made clear that Secretary Clinton and her staff should have known better. That seems self-evident with somebody with long experience in the Federal Government—from First Lady, to U.S. Senator, to Secretary of State. With the highest level of security clearance in the Federal Government, she should have known better.

She was reckless and careless in the way she handled this classified information. Add to that the frightening implications of this sensitive information getting into the hands of our adversaries, such as the Russians or Chinese intelligence agencies, and any reasonable person would come to one conclusion: They have to be held accountable and there has to be some penalty for putting our Nation's security at risk.

I will continue to call on the Department of Justice to be open and transparent. Director Comey said that he

thought that the circumstances of this case, while they didn't rise to the level sufficient for indictment, that transparency was very important. That is why he made the really unprecedented announcement that he did, which frankly far exceeded his authority as the investigative agency, where he said no reasonable prosecutor would have sought an indictment in this case.

But I hope the Justice Department responds to the letter which I sent on today's date wherein I asked him to release any unclassified information as it relates to this scandal. The American taxpayers deserve to see all of the investigation—which cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars—especially in light of the fact that there will be no criminal prosecution, according to Director Comey's recommendation and according to the decision of the Justice Department to close the case yesterday.

I urge Secretary Clinton to ask the Justice Department to release the FBI reports and any transcript of her 3½-hour long interview as well because I think the American people deserve it. I suspect what we would find is that Secretary Clinton's lawyers said: No matter what you have done before, don't lie to the FBI in that 3½-hour interview, because that lawyer and Secretary Clinton would know that no matter what you have done or haven't done before, if you actually lie to an FBI agent, that is an indictable and prosecutable crime in and of itself. So I have reasonable confidence that she did finally come clean and tell the truth to the FBI in that interview. Now, the only right thing to do, in the interests of the sort of transparency Director Comey talked about—since there can be no prosecution and no indictment, the only right thing to do in the interests of transparency and public accountability is for that transcript of the 3½-hour-long interview to be released to the American people so they can judge for themselves. I believe the American people deserve at least that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter of July 7 to the Honorable Loretta Lynch.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 7, 2016.

Hon. LORETTA LYNCH,
Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL LYNCH: On July 5, 2016, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) announced in a lengthy press conference that the FBI was officially recommending that "no charges are appropriate" in the investigation of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's use of a personal email system during her time as Secretary of State. The Director made this recommendation even though the FBI found that "there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information," including evidence that "Secretary Clinton or her colleagues . . . were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information." In doing so, the Director specifically pointed to seven e-mail chains concerning Top Secret information, some of which apparently "bore markings indicating the presence of classified information." These conclusions, among others, directly contradict many of the public statements that former-Secretary Clinton and her supporters have made in defense of her unprecedented conduct. Nevertheless, yesterday you accepted his recommendation and, in a terse, two-sentence statement, announced that "the thorough, year-long investigation" was now closed and that "no charges [would] be brought against any individuals within the scope of the investigation."

The Director's lengthy public statement was "unusual," as he noted, but he asserted that "the American people deserve . . . details in a case of intense public interest," and that "given the importance of the matter, . . . unusual transparency is in order." His public statement, he said, was an effort to "assure the American people . . . that this investigation was done competently, honestly, and independently. No outside influence of any kind was brought to bear." In contrast, your public announcement contained no similar disclosures or otherwise provided the American people with much needed transparency and information about that investigation.

For more than a year, I also have noted that this case was incredibly important and highly unusual and that the American people deserved a fair and impartial investigation. That's why I called for you to appoint a Special Counsel in this matter. The need for a Special Counsel, the appointment of which would give the American people greater transparency and assurance of independence, was underscored after you decided to meet privately with Secretary Clinton's husband just days before the Director's public announcement and the conclusion of that investigation. I will continue to press for this appointment because I believe it is the best and most appropriate way for the American people to have faith in the administration of justice in this case.

In the meantime, and because the Director and I both agree about the importance of this matter and the need for unusual transparency, I call on the Department of Justice to immediately release the FBI's report and any transcript of the FBI's three-and-a-half hour interview of former-Secretary Clinton on July 2. As you know, such interview reports often become public when a criminal investigation results in a criminal prosecution. And the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure require the Department of Justice to provide an interview report directly to a criminal defendant. Of course, here you have declined to appoint a Special Counsel and the FBI has decided that "no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case," so the American people will not enjoy the same transparency that they have come to expect from their own government. But as the Director said, "only facts matter," and the American people deserve the facts underlying former-Secretary Clinton's FBI interview to evaluate the Department of Justice's conclusions and the public statements that former-Secretary Clinton and her supporters have made regarding her use of a personal email system and her egregious handling of classified information.

Sincerely,

JOHN CORNYN,
United States Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, "judicial emergency" is an official term that refers to a vacancy in our court system for a court that carries a heavy caseload or a vacancy that has remained open for an extended period of time.

In the United States, we now have dozens of judicial emergencies. Why are there so many judicial emergencies? Why are there so many vacancies in courts that have heavy caseloads? Why are there so many long-term vacancies? Well, the reason is simple. When it comes to confirming judges, Senate Republicans simply refuse to do their jobs. Their view seems to be very simple. If government isn't working for them or their rich friends or their rightwing allies, then they will simply refuse to let it work for anyone.

Yesterday the Senate confirmed one judge, Brian Martinotti, to sit on the district court in New Jersey—one judge, one noncontroversial nominee for a noncontroversial job who had been waiting for a vote for over a year. The Republicans who control the Senate seem to think that is reasonable. It is not.

Sixteen district court judges have been investigated, gone through hearings, been voted out of committee, and are pending on the Senate floor right now. One circuit court nominee is also on this list for a vacancy that has remained vacant for more than 6 years. Fourteen States have judges on this list. About half of these nominees have been sitting for nearly a year or more.

These courts do an enormous amount of work. Their work is not political. Democratic and Republican Senators have worked with the President to select these nominees to fill vacancies on these courts, and those nominees deserve votes. Right now, there is no indication that they are going to get votes. And in a few days, the Republicans who control the Senate are planning to pack up their things and shut down the Senate for most of the rest of the year. This is ridiculous. No other workers in America get to walk off the job before the job is done, and the same should be true for the U.S. Congress. We shouldn't leave until we do our work.

The Senate can act right now to confirm these 17 nominations, all of whom have bipartisan support.

Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 597, 598, 599, and 600; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the

RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the Senator knows, we have a process for considering district judges. It is the prerogative of the majority to set those votes. Frankly, in light of the process we do have, as the Senator knows, this is not the appropriate process.

But I do agree with her on one thing: that the Senate ought to do its job. One of the things we could do, which has received broad bipartisan, bicameral support, is to fund the efforts to combat the Zika virus, which creates the devastating birth defects we talked about a moment ago. While I object to this request, there are things we ought to be able to do before we break.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, we do not have a process that is working.

The Nation faces a judicial vacancy crisis. Ten percent of the district court judgeships in this country are empty. We face nearly twice as many judicial emergencies as President Bush faced in 2008 or President Clinton faced in 2000. Cases are piling up, and courts are starved for help. The Supreme Court of the United States sits paralyzed, unable to deal with some of its most challenging cases. But the majority whip is going to pack up and go home, leaving 18 judgeships vacant because—well, that is the process?

This isn't a game. There is no scoreboard. You don't get to ignore a national crisis because you care more about scoring political points than keeping government functioning.

President Obama's job is to nominate judges to fill vacancies, and the Republicans' job here is to lead us to confirm those judges to fill those vacancies. Do your job.

So if you won't confirm all of the pending judicial nominees who have been voted out of committee and are currently waiting on the Senate floor, then before you leave town for months, let's at least confirm the 13 judges on that list who were nominated last year to fill district court vacancies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following 13 nominations: Calendar Nos. 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, and 573; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I am not mistaken, we are trying to deal with a biotechnology issue when it comes to our agriculture supply, which was voted out of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and I know the Senator from Kansas, the distinguished chairman of the committee, would like to get to it but for the diversions caused by these sorts of requests which the Senator knows will be objected to.

If the Senator is really concerned about doing our job and taking care of our Nation's business, then she ought to join me in voting for the $1.1 billion in funding for the Zika virus, which is a national health care emergency, and certainly the pictures I have had here previously demonstrate the consequences of a failure to deal with this Zika virus. Unfortunately, this baby has suffered a devastating birth defect known as microcephaly—literally a shrunken skull and brain—and is condemned to an uncertain future in life, not to mention the consequences on the family.

I would implore the Senator from Massachusetts, let's get to work doing this, which I believe the Senator has already voted for the $1.1 billion in funding. Yet when we brought this up, all we got were objections and stonewalling from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Frankly, I don't understand it. It is a terrible mistake, and I don't want one baby in America to suffer this sort of birth defect because we dithered and did not do our duty when it came to providing adequate funding to combat the Zika virus.

This is something we should take care of before we break on July 15. We can fight about judges any other time, but this is a true public health emergency. And how Senators can come down here and try to hijack the floor to talk about something else when we are ignoring the very work before us in dealing with this biotechnology agriculture issue or dealing with something even more pressing, such as avoiding birth defects and these sorts of devastating consequences as a result of this Zika virus, I do not understand.

I do not understand the Senator's priorities, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, this has been going on now for a year and a half. The Republicans have delayed and delayed and delayed and delayed until we face dozens of judicial emergencies. There is always an excuse not to take up even noncontroversial appointments.

We can't get the 17 who were voted out of committee and are currently pending on the floor, we can't get the 13 who were nominated in 2015 so how about this deal. There are four district court nominees who have been waiting around for a year or more. They are from Tennessee, New Jersey, New York, and California.

When President Reagan was in office, almost no uncontroversial nominees took longer than 100 days to confirm. Let us at least give these four nominees who have been waiting nearly a year or more for their vote. The Senate can do this, it can do it quickly, and we will be done. There is bipartisan support for every one of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following four nominations: Calendar Nos. 359, 362, 363, and 364; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we can have the debate about judges, but I think we ought to first take care of the business before us that the Senate voted to proceed to, which is to deal with the legislation to avoid the State-by-State requirement for labeling our food products, which has been agreed to by the Senator from Michigan, the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, together with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kansas.

We ought to be taking care of that, and we also ought to be taking care of this. This is urgent. How people can think we need to deal with these lists of judges and sort of hijack the agenda and distract us from our work on preventing these sort of birth defects is, frankly, a misplacement of priorities.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, it would take no time to confirm these judges. These are all people who have been examined by the committee, who have passed out of committee, who are pending on the floor, and who have bipartisan support. These are judges from Tennessee, New Jersey, New York, California, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Hawaii, Utah, Massachusetts, Maryland, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Louisiana, and Indiana. Fourteen States will be left without vital judges because of the Republican blockade.

At a certain point, reasonable people have to ask: Why are Republicans actually doing this? Is it so that if Donald

Trump is elected President, he will be able to nominate more judges? What in this world has Donald Trump ever said or done that makes the majority whip so enthusiastic about his judicial appointments? Is it Trump's enlightened views on the judiciary? Donald Trump is a guy who just a few weeks ago racebaited a Federal judge—attacked a judge who spent years defending America from the terrors of murderers and drug traffickers. Trump attacked him simply because the judge refuses to bend the law to suit Trump's personal financial interests.

And where do you think Donald Trump got the idea he can attack the integrity of Federal judges with impunity? He got it from you—from the Republicans in the Senate and their decision to turn scores of highly qualified, nonpartisan judicial appointees into political footballs.

Talk is cheap. If Republicans really do disagree with Donald Trump's approach to judges, then do something about it. Confirm these highly qualified noncontroversial judges. Do it now before shutting off the lights and leaving town.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to address the issue just raised by the Senator from Massachusetts and responded to by the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Massachusetts carefully avoided mentioning the obvious. This is the same Republican majority that will not fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court. For the first moment in the history of the United States—in the history of the United States—we have a Presidential nominee sent to fill the vacancy of the late Justice Scalia, and the Republicans in the Senate refuse to give him a hearing or a vote. That has never—underline the word ''never''—happened in the history of the United States of America. When we say do your job, it starts at the highest Court and goes straight down to every Federal court in America.

I sit on the Judiciary Committee, and what I think is particularly galling, troubling, and worrisome is that each one of these nominees has been carefully vetted by the Department of Justice, by the FBI, by Republican staffers—everyone imaginable—culling through every aspect of their life to see if they are truly worthy of being a lifetime appointee to the Federal bench, and they all passed the test. They were all voted out of committee, and they all languish on the floor of the Senate for the very reason the Senator mentioned.

The Senator from Texas and many others are lying awake at night praying for the moment when President Donald Trump can pick Federal judges in America. Unless Judge Judy is coming out of retirement, I have no idea where he is going to turn to find judicial talent, but I will tell you, we have judicial talent, approved by Democrats and Republicans, languishing on this calendar at great personal expense.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for raising this issue.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. President, I would like to also comment on the Zika virus and the threat to the United States. You bet it is serious. We have seen the photographs that have been displayed here of the children who are born with serious birth defects because of the Zika virus.

It is so serious the President of the United States notified this Senate in February—February of this year—to act immediately on providing $1.9 billion—$1.9 billion—to protect as many people as possible from the spread of this virus and the terrible effects it has. The President asked for $1.9 billion not only to deal with the mosquitoes and the infection but also to develop a vaccine so we can liberate America from the concern of this virus showing up next year and the year after.

So there was a $1.9 billion request in February. To date—to date—the Republican leadership in the House and Senate have failed to produce the $1.9 billion that was suggested by the President.

We had a compromise number of $1.1 billion that was approved by the Senate with a strong bipartisan vote almost a month ago. I think there were 87 Senators who voted for it because we all understand it is a public health emergency. Well, in our bicameral system, the bill then went over to the House of Representatives. What happened next tells the story of what is wrong with the Republican-controlled Senate today. They took our bipartisan bill for $1.1 billion to fight the Zika virus, they put it in a conference committee, they held a meeting but didn't invite any Democrats, and they then came up with a bill that provided $1.1 billion, but listen to how they did it.

They took money away from fighting the Ebola virus in Africa, which we feared several years ago would spread to the United States and still is a threat to Africa and to many other people. They took the public health money to fight the Ebola virus and said: We will transfer it over, and you can fight the Zika virus.

Apparently, the Republicans believe we can only fight one public health challenge at a time. We don't have time for Ebola. We are going to move to Zika. The Centers for Disease Control—the preeminent agency in the world when it comes to fighting public health disasters—has warned us don't do this. We are still worried about the spread of Ebola and the danger of it.

But they didn't stop with that. They didn't stop with taking the Ebola money and putting it into the Zika virus. They then turned around and larded the bill up with every political ornament they could think of that would captivate the hearts of the rightwing. Listen to what they included in the bill. They included a provision that cut $500 million from the Veterans' Administration to process veterans' claims.

Have you heard of that issue? I sure have back in Illinois. Our veterans wait way too long to get the disability payments they deserve for having served our country. The Republicans cut $500 million from that effort, but they weren't finished. They then turned around and said: We want to make an exemption in the Clean Water Act so certain chemicals can be sprayed around water supplies. What has that got to do with this and why do we need to do it at this moment? It is one thing they have been longing for. The third thing they turned around and did, after they cut the money from the VA and after they made this provision to change what the EPA can regulate and, as I mentioned earlier, took the money out of Ebola—they then moved on to say: We know that women across America will be concerned about family planning because of the threat of the Zika virus so they put language in the bill prohibiting Planned Parenthood from providing family planning to those who are concerned about the spread of the Zika virus. They just can't stay away from Planned Parenthood, and they included it.

And while you might think that was enough to make this the most controversial political bill to move from the House, they had one more trick up their sleeve—a provision to allow the display of Confederate flags in our veterans cemeteries—Confederate flags. Why?

Why would you take an important bill dealing with a public health crisis and lard it up with all of these miserable provisions that just excite the hearts of some political rightwingers? They did it because they were hoping we would stop the funding for the Zika virus. It is stopped now waiting for a clean bill. They know the President will never sign this bill as written.

If we would go back to the original bipartisan bill passed in the Senate, we would certainly get approval for it. That is why, I answer the Senator from Texas, we wait for the day when we can get back to bipartisanship on this important public health threat.

I see there are others seeking the floor. The last point I will make is that we are going to vote in a short period of time on this GMO legislation. I have a lengthy statement that I will put in the RECORD about my position, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New England Journal of Medicine. This is an August 20, 2015, article from the New England Journal of Medicine entitled ''GMOs, Herbicides, and Public Health.'' It makes the point very directly that there has been no credible scientific evidence that GMO foods pose any danger to consumers who consume them. But there is a credible concern about the use of chemicals in the

production of these GMO products and how they are being larded on these fields, creating real concern about the ultimate impact on public health by these agricultural chemicals and the runoff.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GMOs, HERBICIDES, AND PUBLIC HEALTH

(By Philip J. Landrigan, M.D., and Charles Benbrook, Ph.D.)

Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are not high on most physicians' worry lists. If we think at all about biotechnology, most of us probably focus on direct threats to human health, such as prospects for converting pathogens to biologic weapons or the implications of new technologies for editing the human germline. But while those debates simmer, the application of biotechnology to agriculture has been rapid and aggressive. The vast majority of the corn and soybeans grown in the United States are now genetically engineered. Foods produced from GM crops have become ubiquitous. And unlike regulatory bodies in 64 other countries, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) does not require labeling of GM foods.

Two recent developments are dramatically changing the GMO landscape. First, there have been sharp increases in the amounts and numbers of chemical herbicides applied to GM crops, and still further increases—the largest in a generation—are scheduled to occur in the next few years. Second, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has classified glyphosate, the herbicide most widely used on GM crops, as a ''probable human carcinogen'' and classified a second herbicide, 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D), as a ''possible human carcinogen.''

The application of genetic engineering to agriculture builds on the ancient practice of selective breeding. But unlike traditional selective breeding, genetic engineering vastly expands the range of traits that can be moved into plants and enables breeders to import DNA from virtually anywhere in the biosphere. Depending on the traits selected, genetically engineered crops can increase yields, thrive when irrigated with salty water, or produce fruits and vegetables resistant to mold and rot.

The National Academy of Sciences has twice reviewed the safety of GM crops—in 2000 and 2004. Those reviews, which focused almost entirely on the genetic aspects of biotechnology, concluded that GM crops pose no unique hazards to human health. They noted that genetic transformation has the potential to produce unanticipated allergens or toxins and might alter the nutritional quality of food. Both reports recommended development of new risk-assessment tools and postmarketing surveillance. Those recommendations have largely gone unheeded.

Herbicide resistance is the main characteristic that the biotechnology industry has chosen to introduce into plants. Corn and soybeans with genetically engineered tolerance to glyphosate (Roundup) were first introduced in the mid-1990s. These ''Round-up-Read ''crops now account for more than 90% of the corn and soybeans planted in the United States. Their advantage, especially in the first years after introduction, is that they greatly simplify weed management. Farmers can spray herbicide both before and during the growing season, leaving their crops unharmed.

But widespread adoption of herbicide-resistant crops has led to overreliance on herbicides and, in particular, on glyphosate. In the United States, glyphosate use has increased by a factor of more than 250—from 0.4 million kg in 1974 to 113 million kg in 2014. Global use has increased by a factor of more than 10. Not surprisingly, glyphosate-resistant weeds have emerged and are found today on nearly 100 million acres in 36 states. Fields must now be treated with multiple herbicides, including 2,4-D, a component of the Agent Orange defoliant used in the Vietnam War.

The first of the two developments that raise fresh concerns about the safety of GM crops is a 2014 decision by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to approve Enlist Duo, a new combination herbicide comprising glyphosate plus 2,4-D. Enlist Duo was formulated to combat herbicide resistance. It will be marketed in tandem with newly approved seeds genetically engineered to resist glyphosate, 2,4-D, and multiple other herbicides. The EPA anticipates that a 3-to-7-fold increase in 2,4-D use will result.

In our view, the science and the risk assessment supporting the Enlist Duo decision are flawed. The science consisted solely of toxicologic studies commissioned by the herbicide manufacturers in the 1980s and 1990s and never published, not an uncommon practice in U.S. pesticide regulation. These studies predated current knowledge of low-dose, endocrine-mediated, and epigenetic effects and were not designed to detect them. The risk assessment gave little consideration to potential health effects in infants and children, thus contravening federal pesticide law. It failed to consider ecologic impact, such as effects on the monarch butterfly and other pollinators. It considered only pure glyphosate, despite studies showing that formulated glyphosate that contains surfactants and adjuvants is more toxic than the pure compound.

The second new development is the determination by the IARC in 2015 that glyphosate is a ''probable human carcinogen'' and 2,4-D a ''possible human carcinogen.'' These classifications were based on comprehensive assessments of the toxicologic and epidemiologic literature that linked both herbicides to dose-related increases in malignant tumors at multiple anatomical sites in animals and linked glyphosate to an increased incidence of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in humans.

These developments suggest that GM foods and the herbicides applied to them may pose hazards to human health that were not examined in previous assessments. We believe that the time has therefore come to thoroughly reconsider all aspects of the safety of plant biotechnology. The National Academy of Sciences has convened a new committee to reassess the social, economic, environmental, and human health effects of GM crops. This development is welcome, but the committee's report is not expected until at least 2016.

In the meantime, we offer two recommendations. First, we believe the EPA should delay implementation of its decision to permit use of Enlist Duo. This decision was made in haste. It was based on poorly designed and outdated studies and on an incomplete assessment of human exposure and environmental effects. It would have benefited from deeper consideration of independently funded studies published in the peer-reviewed literature. And it preceded the recent IARC determinations on glyphosate and 2,4-D. Second, the National Toxicology Program should urgently assess the toxicology of pure glyphosate, formulated glyphosate, and mixtures of glyphosate and other herbicides.

Finally, we believe the time has come to revisit the United States' reluctance to label GM foods. Labeling will deliver multiple benefits. It is essential for tracking emergence of novel food allergies and assessing effects of chemical herbicides applied to GM crops. It would respect the wishes of a growing number of consumers who insist they have a right to know what foods they are buying and how they were produced. And the argument that there is nothing new about genetic rearrangement misses the point that GM crops are now the agricultural products most heavily treated with herbicides and that two of these herbicides may pose risks of cancer. We hope, in light of this new information, that the FDA will reconsider labeling of GM foods and couple it with adequately funded, long-term postmarketing surveillance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Campbell Soup Company.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Campbell Soup Company, July 6, 2016]

CAMPBELL ANNOUNCES SUPPORT FOR MANDATORY GMO LABELING

CAMDEN, N.J.—(BUSINESS WIRE)—Jan. 7, 2016—Campbell Soup Company (NYSE: CPB) today announced its support for the enactment of federal legislation to establish a single mandatory labeling standard for foods derived from genetically modified organisms (GMOs).

This Smart News Release features multimedia. View the full release here: http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20160107006458/en/.

Campbell believes it is necessary for the federal government to provide a national standard for labeling requirements to better inform consumers about this issue. The company will advocate for federal legislation that would require all foods and beverages regulated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to be clearly and simply labeled for GMOs. Campbell is also supportive of a national standard for non-GMO claims made on food packaging.

As a result of its decision to support mandatory national GMO labeling, Campbell will withdraw from all efforts led by coalitions and groups opposing such measures.

The company continues to oppose a patchwork of state-by-state labeling laws, which it believes are incomplete, impractical and create unnecessary confusion for consumers.

Campbell is optimistic a federal solution can be established in a reasonable amount of time if all the interested stakeholders cooperate. However, if that is not the case, Campbell is prepared to label all of its U.S. products for the presence of ingredients that were derived from GMOs, not just those required by pending legislation in Vermont. The company would seek guidance from the FDA and approval by USDA.

Campbell continues to recognize that GMOs are safe, as the science indicates that foods derived from crops grown using genetically modified seeds are not nutritionally different from other foods. The company also believes technology will play a crucial role in feeding the world.

Campbell has been engaged in the conversation about GMO labeling for several years and has taken action to provide consumers with more information about how its products are made, including the presence of GMOs, through efforts like its website www.whatsinmyfood.com. With 92 percent of Americans supporting the labeling of GMO foods, Campbell believes now is the time for the federal government to act quickly to implement a federal solution.

More information about the rationale behind Campbell's decision can be found on Campbell's newsroom.

CAMPBELL'S—WHY WE SUPPORT MANDATORY NATIONAL GMO LABELING

(By Campbell Team)

Today the New York Times (http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/08/business/a-new-fact-on-the-foodlabel.html) wrote about Campbell's decision to support mandatory national labeling of products that may contain genetically modified organisms (GMOs).

Campbell's President and CEO Denise Morrison shared the message below with our employees about the reasons behind our decision.

TAKING A MAJOR STEP FORWARD AS WE LIVE OUR PURPOSE

At Campbell, we are unleashing the power of our Purpose, Real food that matters for life's moments. Our Purpose calls for us to acknowledge that consumers appreciate what goes into our food, and why—so they can feel good about the choices they make, for themselves and their loved ones.

Today, consistent with our Purpose, we announced our support for mandatory national labeling of products that may contain genetically modified organisms (GMO) and proposed that the federal government provide a national standard for non-GMO claims made on food packaging.

We are operating with a ''Consumer First'' mindset. We put the consumer at the center of everything we do. That's how we've built trust for nearly 150 years. We have always believed that consumers have the right to know what's in their food. GMO has evolved to be a top consumer food issue reaching a critical mass of 92% of consumers in favor of putting it on the label.

In addition, we have declared our intention to set the standard for transparency in the food industry. We have been openly discussing our ingredients, including those derived from GMO crops, through our WhatsinmyFood.com website. We are supporting digital disclosure through the Grocery Manufacturers Association's (GMA) SmartLabel™ program. We have announced the removal of artificial colors and flavors from our products. However, our support of mandatory federal GMO labeling sets a new bar for transparency.

There is currently no federal regulation requiring labeling that informs consumers about the presence of GMOs in their food. In the absence of federal action, many states—from California to Maine—have attempted to address this issue. Campbell has opposed this state-by-state patchwork approach, and has worked with GMA to defeat several state ballot initiatives. Put simply, although we believe that consumers have the right to know what's in their food, we also believe that a state-by-state piecemeal approach is incomplete, impractical and costly to implement for food makers. More importantly, it's confusing to consumers.

Most recently, Vermont passed legislation that will require food companies including Campbell to label products regulated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that may contain ingredients made from GMO crops. However, this legislation does not include products with meat or poultry, because they are regulated by United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Under Vermont law, SpaghettiO's original variety, guided by the FDA, will be labeled for the presence of GMOs, but SpaghettiO's meatballs, guided by the USDA, will not. Yet these two varieties sit next to each other on a store shelf, which is bound to create consumer confusion.

Campbell has been actively involved in trying to resolve this issue since 2011. We've worked with GMA, legislators and regulators to forge a national voluntary solution. We've engaged a variety of stakeholders, from lawmakers to activists. I've personally made multiple trips to Capitol Hill to meet with elected officials. Despite these efforts, Congress has not been able to resolve this issue. We now believe that proposing a mandatory national solution is necessary. Printing a clear and simple statement on the label is the best solution for consumers and for Campbell.

I want to stress that we're in no way disputing the science behind GMOs or their safety. The overwhelming weight of scientific evidence indicates that GMOs are safe and that foods derived from crops using genetically modified seeds are not nutritionally different from other foods. In America, many farmers who grow canola, corn, soybean and sugar beets choose to use genetically modified seeds and have done so for nearly twenty years. More than 90% of these four crops in America are currently grown using GMO seeds. It takes an average of thirteen years to get a GMO seed approved by the government for safety. Ingredients derived from these crops are in many of our products. We also believe that GMOs and other technologies will play a crucial role in feeding the world.

We will continue to be a member of GMA and will participate in food industry initiatives that align with our Purpose and business goals. However, as a result of the change in our position on GMO labeling, Campbell is withdrawing from all efforts led by groups opposing mandatory GMO labeling legislation, including those led by GMA.

The New York Times reported on our decision, and we issued a press release. I encourage you to read both. We recognize that this announcement may spark discussion. It's difficult to predict the exact nature of the ensuing commentary, but I suspect it will be a mixed bag. What I do know is that our decision was guided by our Purpose; rooted in our consumer-first mindset; and driven by our commitment to transparency—to be open and honest about our food. I truly believe it is the right thing to do for consumers and for our business.

Best,

DENISE MORRISON,
President and CEO.

Mr. DURBIN. Campbell Soup Company has decided they are going to face this issue squarely, honestly, and waste no time. It is a company that I trust. I can't imagine how many cans of Campbell's soup we have consumed in my household throughout my life.

They said: It is time to be honest with consumers. We will tell them. We will tell them pointblank on the label so they can read whether or not there are GMO products contained in the soup. Then they can make the decision as to whether they want to buy it.

I wish that were the outcome of this entire debate, but it is not.

The third point I want to make is it is mindless for us to allow individual States like Vermont to decide the labeling standards for national companies. It makes no sense. We cannot allow it to occur.

The last point I will make is this: One of the provisions in this bill I think is embarrassing, and it is a provision which I cannot support. We give three options to food companies when it comes to labeling for GMOs. First, declare right on the label, just as Campbell Soup Company does, if GMO products are included. Second, use a symbol created by the Department of Agriculture which we can educate the public on that can really signal as to whether this product has GMO products. The third is the one that troubles me—something called a YRL or URL. I may have that designation wrong, but it is that kind of scrambled screen you see that you can't read but some computers can read. What these food companies want to do is not tell you as a consumer whether the food has GMOs or not. As you go through the grocery store, they want you to hold your cell phone up to that box of macaroni and cheese to see if it has GMO in it or not by reading all that is written on your cell phone. That is a bad joke.

I just went shopping with my two 4½-year-old grandkids. I cannot imagine walking through that store, trying to keep them from raiding different displays, and using my cell phone on box after box of macaroni and cheese. That, to me, is the ''secret decoder ring'' approach to this, and I think it is an embarrassment to consumers to ask them to go through that. So I will be voting in opposition to the GMO bill when it comes before us later in the day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer and I are fairly new to this Chamber. I know Senate rules prevent me from engaging anyone who happens to be in the gallery, so I will not do that. But I have to admit, watching what has gone on here for the last 15 or 20 minutes, I can't help but think at least one or two are saying: What on Earth is going on down on that Senate floor? We have heard arguments embedded in arguments.

The issue we have before us today is on the biotechnology labeling vote. We have heard about judges. Look, everybody says we are in gridlock here. There are obviously instances where we disagree. Let's set those aside and address legislation where we do agree we have pressing issues, and we have two of those before the Senate today.

The one immediately before us is on biotechnology labeling, and I am going to get to that in a minute. The other has to do with funding Zika. It has to do with trying to understand why some 38 of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted for $1.1 billion in Zika funding, and now it is back before us. It is one vote away from going to the President's desk, and now they are all voting against it. Collectively, the Members who voted for the $1.1 billion and now vote against it represent States that have 671 Zika cases reported to date. It looks as if we are going to be here a little bit tonight, and I will get into the details and share the roll call vote, but today I want to talk about biotechnology.

I want to start by thanking Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW for the work they did in reaching a bipartisan solution to this controversial issue. We voted on cloture yesterday, and we had a majority of over 60—65 to be exact—

Members vote. What cloture means is to get on the bill. Now we are on the bill. What does this bill do?

What it is trying to do is avoid the confusion and the cost when a State implements a law that becomes de facto Federal law of the land and increases the cost of food prices to consumers. This is what we are proposing to avoid in the language we have before us that I hope we vote on and I hope we focus on. This is only one choice of one State—the State of Vermont. There are several dozen States that plan to have their own variance, and I will talk about the absurd exemptions and exceptions later on.

The bottom line: Complexity creates cost—cost to the American consumer. In Vermont alone, the Vermont law will increase the annual cost of food per family—in Vermont alone—by about $2,000 a year. There are people struggling to pay for the food they have right now. There are people trying to decide, do they pay to heat their home or eat? Now we are talking about raising food costs, for some of the poorest people, by $2,000 a year.

Complexity equates to cost. This provides clarity. I am going to talk a little bit about that, but I do appreciate Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW for getting those of us who are willing to work together, who are willing to say to people at either end of the spectrum: Guys, we are going to come up with a compromise and solve this problem. We have that opportunity before us now, and I hope we will get to an affirmative vote later today.

As I said earlier, the state-by-state patchwork is unsustainable. Right now, we are talking about what Vermont decided to do. What about California? What about my State of North Carolina and all the other ones? Some people say: Well, you are preempting State law. When a State law affects interstate commerce across the Nation—because if I am a Campbell Soup Company or a Kellogg's or a small mom-and-pop shop trying to distribute in Vermont—if I don't get the labeling exactly right, I could be subject to millions of dollars of fines just because I have a jar or a can or a box on a shelf that isn't consistent with their labels.

I live in Charlotte, NC. Charlotte is right on the border of North Carolina and South Carolina. If you have a truck carrying cans of Campbell's soup, it has to be labeled one way in North Carolina and another in South Carolina. Does that make sense? It adds cost. It doesn't add value. That is why we are trying to prevent this patchwork of laws that could go on the books.

I want to talk a little bit about biotechnology for a minute because Senator DURBIN said something that I think is very important. I sit on the Agriculture Committee. I asked all the heads of the FDA, the EPA, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture the same question in the same committee hearing several months ago. I said: Do you have any scientific data whatsoever—let's go to the FDA first, Food and Drug Administration—that would suggest that food containing biotechnology represent any threat to health? The FDA leader, appointed by the Obama administration, said: None whatsoever. Then I moved to the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency. I asked precisely the same question. I got precisely the same answer. Then I went to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I asked precisely the same question and got precisely the same answer.

When we walk the halls here, people say: THOM, I know. I know they are safe. But for some reason we have lost the argument. Ladies and gentlemen, the reason we can't lose the argument on agricultural biotech—what some people call GMO—is that our Nation and our world's food supply rely on it. Over ninety percent of all corn grown in Iowa is grown as a result of biotech—not some sort of Frankencorn, but corn that is heat resistant, corn that is moisture resistant, fungus resistant.

If we were to roll back 30 or 40 years of progress in agriculture biotech and take it out of our food supply chain, we could literally be in a position where people will starve—maybe not in the United States but all the nations we export to—because we simply cannot produce the world's food supply if we go back 10, 20, or 30 years. So it is a very important part of our food supply, it is a safe food, it is an environmentally sound food, and it is one that we just have to understand.

Having said that, I firmly believe that everybody has the right to know what is in their food. That is why I love the compromise bill that Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW have before us today. It is pretty simple. Again, I know I can't interact with the gallery, so I will not. But my guess is that most of the people in the gallery over the age of about 12 have a smartphone. One or two may have flip phones—and there is an alternative that I will talk about—but most probably have smartphones. As a matter of fact, 207 million people in the United States have smartphones. I know Senator DURBIN is not familiar with it, but many of them come with what is called a QR code reader. I will give those watching from home a chance to actually scan it while hearing me talk live.

I remember—I think it was President Bush back in the 1990s who went through a shopping line and was astounded because he saw a bar code reader. He said: Wow, that is new technology. It had been around for a while. Guess what, folks. QR codes have been around a while. As a matter of fact, yesterday when the distinguished gentleman from Oregon spoke, he had a QR code up on the screen. I said: Heck, I want to see what that is. So I clicked on the QR code on the Campbell's can. It brought up on Wikipedia the history of the New York Yankees. But it proves the point that you can go directly from that QR code to the Internet and get the information you need in real time.

What is the other advantage of QR codes? You can board an airplane with them, you can get information about your fuel, you can get medical services. It is everywhere. It is ubiquitous. It is prevalent. Everywhere you go, you see them. When I go to the store, because my wife is pretty strict on how much money I can spend, I will scan a QR code to see if I can find a comparative shop, and maybe I need to go down the street to buy that same product. In other words, it is an integral part of our lives. For somebody to say it is new, weird, different, hard to use—it only takes one button, one click on your phone, to actually get to the rich information on the Internet. That is what this bill is about.

So what if that QR code is on the product—a can of soup, a bag of flour, or any product you buy in the grocery store that is subject to this law. You go to your phone, you hit QR code reader which is on your smartphone, and it would immediately bring you to a website. This is what this proposed law requires. It immediately brings you to a website, in the cases I have done it, in 2 or 3 seconds. The minute you get to the site, you get all kinds of information. You get nutritional information, caloric value, and all kinds of things you need to know about what is in your food. Right on the page you can click down, and you can see whether it has any agriculture biotech content. Then you can even draw down further and find out what that means. It is in this bill. It can be done. Small businesses use this. Political people use this. Everybody uses this as a way to rapidly get to the Internet.

I don't know about you all, but I think this Internet thing is going to take off. I think it is going to be here for a while. So I think we are going to be increasingly comfortable with this sort of way to get the richest information available on the food we are going to eat. For those who say this is some sort of weird code or outdated, I don't know about you all, but that is not the world I live in. I think it is a very effective way to get it.

Let's assume you are a small business and you don't have the ability to create a QR code. Frankly, I would tell that small business to do it because that creates a competitive advantage. That makes you look as big as Campbell Soup Company and lets you compete. It is easy to put up a website. Most of us have them or know how to get them up pretty easily. I can put one up in 2 or 3 hours and then have a QR code to go to it. But let's assume they don't want to do it. It is a mom-and-pop shop, and they just don't like QR code readers. You can have a 1–800 number if you satisfy certain thresholds: For more product information, call this number. And they have a statutory obligation to disclose to you the

contents of the food and whether or not it has any agriculture biotech products in it. If you don't want to do a 1–800 number, you can also do a simple Web address. Key in thomscornerstore.com, or whatever, and get to the same information.

The fact is, this bill does that. It fully discloses and creates a statutory requirement that says the food manufacturer must disclose the content of their food, the nutritional information, biotech content, et cetera.

It is mandatory. There were disagreements on our side because we had Members on our side of the aisle who said they didn't like ''mandatory.'' We decided in the interest of compromise to accept the mandatory requirement. It takes 2 years before the rules are made and about 3 years before most businesses will have to be fully phased in. Quite honestly, most manufacturers are going to do it because they understand, as I do, the advantage of quick access to having a consumer get to their Web presence, and there are other things they can do once they get there.

We know that the QR code, the URLs, and the 1–800 numbers work. We know that everybody has the right to know what is in their food. This law mandates that this happens. It eliminates the absurd exceptions and exemptions. For anybody who wants to do this, I know this code works. If you are at home right now and you see this code, you should be able to take your QR code scanner and go up to your TV, like I did yesterday, and go to this website and see in real time what I just demonstrated on the prior slide.

Why do we need to do this? Why do we need a Federal consistent framework for doing this? Why is it the Federal Government's responsibility to get involved in this? Going back to the first slide, I don't want families in Vermont to pay an additional $2,000 a year for their food. I don't want families in North Carolina to pay an additional $1,100 a year for the same food they bought last year only because of these state mandated labeling requirements.

Let me give you a couple of examples of what I am talking about in the Vermont law. Imagine if this were multiplied by 2-dozen or 3-dozen other States. Frozen pepperoni pizza is exempt from the Vermont law. Frozen cheese pizza has to be labeled. Vegetable beef soup is exempt from the Vermont law. Vegetable soup has to be labeled. Multiply that by dozens and dozens of other States. Think about all of these absurd exceptions and exemptions that can occur if we have 50 statehouses trying to create a patchwork of laws.

For an American family, the Vermont law will add an additional cost of about $1,200 a year to the grocery bill. Imagine if we had 24 or 36 different States that we had to interpret, the cost would go up. The food is no more nutritious. It just costs more. That is why we need a Federal standard.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle and a handful on this side of the aisle, folks, this is just common sense. Anybody should be able to figure this out on 8 hours of sleep. This is not a difficult decision. We need to solve this problem now. Then we need to get on to Zika, which I will come back and talk about a little bit later on, and then we can get to all the other myriad of things we need to get done here.

When I came here in January of last year, I was accustomed to getting things done in the North Carolina House. This is an opportunity to get something done that makes sense, that removes the threat of raising food costs and not producing one iota of positive difference in health outcomes. I hope my friends on both sides of the aisle recognize that this is an opportunity where we can prove to the people in this gallery and the people in this Nation that we can actually get things done.

This is a compromise. This is something my friends on the right do not necessarily like and I know some of my friends on the left don't like, but it is right. It is necessary now so we can protect the people who don't know that, if this bill doesn't get passed, they are going to be paying more for food for no more value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am not supportive of the bill we will be voting on shortly relative to the labeling of GMOs, but I do admit the Senator is right in that this was an example of a group of Democrats and Republicans working on a solution that may end up getting the support of a supermajority of this body. That is the difference between what happened on the process of developing a GMO bill and the process of developing our response to the Zika epidemic.

Everybody knows what happened here. We had a bipartisan compromise that passed the Senate. It went to a conference committee. Democrats were shut out of the conference committee. I am a member of that conference committee. There was no negotiation between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans on the conference committee threw out the bipartisan compromise that was negotiated here in the Senate in order to address the concerns of very conservative Members of the House Republican caucus, and the bill got loaded up with all of the things that Senator DURBIN mentioned. At the top of the list was a ban on funding for Planned Parenthood, which Republicans on the conference committee knew would poison the well. They knew that by putting in a ban on funding for Planned Parenthood, they would make it impossible to pass the Zika supplemental request.

We don't need to engage in hyperbole or histrionics. That is what happened. What happened is the Republicans decided to put a bill on the floor of the Senate that couldn't pass, knowing exactly what could pass because weeks earlier we had formed a compromise that was thrown out the window. It is a little unpleasant to be lectured to about why Democrats are unwilling to support the Zika bill that is in front of us because Republicans know exactly why we can't support it. It is because the compromise that we all worked on got thrown out and all sorts of political poison pills got added to it that everyone in the conference knew would mean it wouldn't pass the Senate.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I want to talk about another public health crisis that is confronting this country, and that is the overdose crisis that is plaguing every single State that we hail from. Here is the picture of overdoses in my State over the course of the last 4 years. It is a harrowing chart in that, if you go back to 2012, we had just under 400 drug overdose deaths that year. We are on pace in 2016 to more than double that number. Our projected number of overdose deaths is 832.

If you look deeper into this chart, it is fentanyl and heroin that are driving these numbers. In fact, our cocaine overdoses have remained relatively stable. It is fentanyl and heroin that are skyrocketing. You can put this chart up for almost every other State in the country and see the same phenomenon. Here it is broken down by town. There is almost no town in Connecticut that hasn't been visited by this epidemic. This small town here is one that you probably know. That is New Haven, CT. On June 23, a few weeks ago, city officials in New Haven declared a public health emergency after 17 individuals overdosed and 3 people died from fentanyl in less than 24 hours. Some of the patients needed as many as five doses of Narcan to revive them. The public health authorities and law enforcement in the city effectively ran out of Narcan overnight because of this batch of straight, pure fentanyl that killed 3 people and sent 17 others to the hospital. That is just one night in one town.

Two years ago, the United States Congress authorized $4 billion in emergency funding to combat the Ebola virus—$4 billion for a virus that had less than 10 confirmed cases in the United States. In Connecticut, we are going to have 830 people die from opioid overdose this year. We are a small State. We represent 1 percent of the Nation's population. We are going to have 830 people die from overdoses this year, and this Congress hasn't appropriated one dime of emergency funding.

You can't help but think there is a double standard here—that perhaps the reason we are not allocating emergency funding for this epidemic, which is killing dozens of people every week in my State, is because of the nature of the epidemic. It is rooted in addiction, and we still have a stigma about addiction in which we blame the addict.

Marvin and Laura Beninson came into my office, and they told me the

story of their beautiful, bright young daughter Victoria, who began slurring her words at Easter dinner. Victoria was a wonderful young woman. They knew something was wrong that Easter. When she left the house, they went into her room, and they found needles and little packets of a substance, and they said: Thus began our battle with heroin addiction.

This is the father talking now. He said:

> My daughter has been through detox and six treatment centers. She has stolen and hocked all of my wife's jewelry while we were on vacation, stolen $3,000 to 4,000 from my oldest daughter's bank account while she was in the Army, written thousands of dollars of bad checks from her friend's check book and been arrested for shop lifting.
>
> The truth is that addiction is a disease just like cancer and there is no choice once you have it. It certainly was our daughter's choice to take heroin but it wasn't her choice to become addicted.

Addiction is a disease, and it can be treated medically, just like every other disease. There may be an element of choice in taking that first dose, but after that there is a medical solution. Yet, for some reason, we allocate $4 billion to combat Ebola and not a dime to combat the epidemic of opioid abuse.

The funding that we are asking for—and my colleague Senator SHAHEEN put a vote before this body to appropriate $600 million in emergency funding—would go to SAMHSA for treatment. It would go to education programs, to prescription drug monitoring programs, and $230 million of it would go to justice assistance grants to make sure we are catching the bad guys who are selling this kind of Fentanyl that is killing people in New Haven.

Every day that we wait, this epidemic becomes worse and more people perish. We need to come together and appropriate emergency funding to take on this epidemic. We need to do it soon, but we need to do other things as well. Deeply buried into our Medicaid reimbursement laws is a discriminatory prohibition on Medicaid funding being used for long-term substance abuse and mental health treatment beds. The Presiding Officer and I are trying to repeal this provision as it relates to the treatment of people with mental illness, but it also relates to people who are struggling with substance abuse.

Medicaid dollars cannot be used for long-term treatment beds for individuals with substance abuse and mental illness. It is one of the few instances in our reimbursement policy at the Federal level in which we specifically prohibit reimbursement for a treatment that has been prescribed by a medical professional. Again, this seems rooted in this decades-old stigma about people with mental illness and substance abuse—that they should just get over it, they should just cure themselves, and they should make a different choice. So there is not a need for these long-term beds.

The second thing we need to do, in addition to appropriating emergency funding to take care of this immediate crisis, is to repeal the prohibition on Medicaid dollars going to long-term treatment beds. Not everybody needs long-term treatment but many do. Many are comorbid with a substance abuse disorder and a mental illness. Yet you get kicked out of many treatment centers within a handful of days. This is a discriminatory provision in our law, and it is leading in parts of this epidemic because once they show up in the emergency room, there is no place to put them.

Third, we need to build on what the administration announced recently and pass the TREAT Act. The TREAT Act would allow for more patients to get prescription naloxone—buprenorphine—for treatment of their addiction. It is an effective drug, but as of now doctors can only see a relative handful of patients before they hit a statutory cap. We have examples in Connecticut of individuals traveling on 12 buses for 12 hours to find a prescriber who still had room under the cap in order to prescribe buprenorphine.

The lengths you have to go to get medical treatment for addiction are more evidence of this discriminatory treatment and this stigma that remains in the law. There is no cap when it comes to the number of patients a cancer doctor or an orthopedic surgeon can have, but there is a cap on the number of patients addiction doctors can have.

We have to pass the TREAT Act as well. These addictions can be treated.

I sat down with a group of former heroin users, individuals in recovery, in Bristol, CT, back in March. I spent an entire day in March living the life of the epidemic. I visited emergency rooms, first responders, and people in recovery.

Greg told me his story. He injured his back in his line of work as an arborist. He works with trees, and he injured his back. He was prescribed prescription painkillers for his herniated disk. You have heard this story before. He got hooked on the prescription painkillers and continued to see doctors so he could get as many prescriptions as possible—until he ran out. When he couldn't get any more prescription drugs, he turned to heroin and became an addict. He looked and looked and looked for treatment but couldn't find it. Finally, he ran into Courtney Labonte, who runs a Web site called ctsuboxone.com. She found a treatment provider who could get him on medication therapy. Today he is in recovery and doing better. He has made the decision to change his life, and he has the resources to do it. There are millions of people who can tell that story as well, but not enough.

Without this funding and the repeal of the discriminatory Medicaid rule and without passage of the TREAT Act, we are denying medical treatment to the thousands of people in my State—including the 800 people who will die this year from overdosing—who are grappling with addiction. I hope that before we break, we will find the courage and common sense to pass these measures and at least get some emergency funding appropriated.

I thank the body for its time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

REMEMBERING ELIE WIESEL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the life of a cherished friend and a champion of freedom in Auschwitz, Elie Wiesel. In Auschwitz and Buchenwald, Elie traveled far beyond the limits of human suffering, descending deep into an abyss of agony and pain that surpassed the torment of hell itself. Yet Elie survived this hell, and he lived to tell his story.

Through his solemn witness, he worked tirelessly to ensure that the world would never forget the horrors of the Holocaust. With Elie's passing, we have lost a true hero and a luminary of Holocaust literature. Now that Elie is gone, we must remember—now more than ever—his solemn charge to all mankind: Never forget. Never forget the Holocaust that it may never happen again.

Elie was the living conscience of a generation. He knew perhaps better than anyone the depths of human depravity. Having suffered as few ever have, he spoke on matters of human nature with a moral authority unmatched by his contemporaries.

I was blessed to know Elie and even more fortunate to call him a friend. I first met Elie when I was asked to serve with him on the board of trustees for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. Elie's warmth was immediate, his spirit contagious. That he remained compassionate and kind even after the atrocities of Auschwitz is a testimony to his character and the resiliency of his spirit.

I remember speaking with Elie when he came to watch Prime Minister Netanyahu address a joint session of Congress. I surprised Elie that day when I showed him my mezuzah, which I have worn around my neck every day for 40 years. I carry this mezuzah as a symbol of my respect and love for the Jewish people and the nation of Israel. The mezuzah represents the Lord's watchful presence in our lives. Elie was delighted that I, a gentile, would wear this religious symbol. I wanted to show Elie my mezuzah as if to say: I am still listening; I am still remembering; I am still fighting the incessant tides of anti-Semitism that threaten Jews across the globe.

Through his writing, Elie gave a voice to the millions of Jews whose voices had been stifled and silenced during the genocide. Of course, Elie's account is but one story; there are 6 million more. Although we can never begin to fathom the suffering of each individual Holocaust victim, Elie used the power of his pen to make their suffering more tangible to all of us.

''Night'' was the foundation for Elie's other works. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to read Elie's somber account of life in a Nazi death camp. One of Elie's most poignant verses stays with me to this day:

Never shall I forget that night, the first night in camp, that turned my life into one long night seven times sealed.
Never shall I forget that smoke.
Never shall I forget the small faces of the children whose bodies I saw transformed into smoke under a silent sky.
Never shall I forget those flames that consumed my faith forever.
Never shall I forget the nocturnal silence that deprived me for all eternity of the desire to live.
Never shall I forget those moments that murdered my God and my soul and turned my dreams to ashes.
Never shall I forget those things, even were I condemned to live as long as God Himself.
Never.

How did Elie ever find hope after witnessing such unspeakable atrocities? He found hope in the promise of a Jewish nation. He found hope in the belief that Israel matters, that Israel is both a state and a state of being. Although many disagreed with his view, Elie remained steadfast in his support for Israel. After being recognized for the Nobel Peace Prize, Elie pleaded before world leaders who had grown apathetic in their own support. He said:

If you could remember what I remembered, you would understand Israel is the only nation in the world whose existence is threatened. Should Israel lose but one war, it would mean her end, and ours as well. But I have faith. . . . Without it no action would be possible. And action is the only remedy to indifference, the most insidious danger of all.

Elie warned us that neutrality only helps the oppressor, never the victim. He also taught us that we must take sides. Perhaps most importantly, Elie told us to never forget. There is a quiet elegance and fierce determination in this plea. Oftentimes, people try to put a positive spin on this by saying ''always remember,'' but Elie eschewed this more uplifting phrase because he wasn't concerned with helping people feel better about the Holocaust, he was concerned with helping them understand the true horror of the genocide to ensure that it would never happen again. He wanted all who listened, all who read, and all who prayed to understand that hate is a virus and it is a virus that spreads quickly. For Elie, it was not enough to merely remember those who died; he wanted us to never forget how they suffered.

Today we can honor Elie Wiesel and his legacy by remembering always his humble plea: Never forget.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT SYLVESTER BRUCE CLINE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, the men and women who wear our uniform are selfless heroes who embody the American spirit, courage, honor, and patriotism. They are defenders of our freedom.

I am here to honor and pay my respects to one of America's finest: Arkansas Army National Guard SGT Sylvester Bruce Cline.

Sergeant Cline graduated from Humphrey High School, where he was a basketball standout. He continued his education at Arkansas Baptist College and the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.

In 2002, Sergeant Cline enlisted in the Arkansas National Guard. In more than a decade of service, he demonstrated his dedication, perseverance, and commitment to excellence in defense of our country. Sergeant Cline was a veteran of a combat deployment to Iraq with the 39th Infantry Brigade in 2008. For his service, he was awarded the Iraq Campaign Medal, a Global War on Terror Service Medal, as well as other awards and decorations. Sergeant Cline served in the Arkansas Army National Guard's Company A, 39th Brigade Support Battalion, 39th Infantry Brigade Combat Team. His mom called him ''Mr. Mom'' for his devotion to his children and entire family, which truly was his greatest passion.

On June 14, 2015, Sergeant Cline died during an annual training exercise with his unit at Fort Chaffee, AK.

I ask my colleagues to keep his family—his children, mother and father, sisters, brother, extended family, and friends—in their thoughts and prayers during these difficult times, and I humbly offer my appreciation and gratitude for his service to the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

POSTPARTUM DEPRESSION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments this afternoon to shed some light and speak about the issue of postpartum depression. As a physician himself, the Presiding Officer is aware of the reality many new, young mothers face when they deal with issues relating to postpartum depression, but I think what is perhaps unknown is the incidence of postpartum depression here in the United States. The fact is that one in seven mothers nationwide will suffer from postpartum depression. In my State of Alaska, the numbers are even more troubling. In Alaska, one in three new mothers will deal with the difficulty of postpartum depression.

About a month ago—it has been a little bit more than that by now—I sat down with a local Anchorage reporter who was working on a series looking at the impacts of postpartum depression. I will just call it PPD. She put together a four-part televised series that focused on seven very strong, very passionate women from the Anchorage community who came forward to share their stories. It was an interesting interview because the reporter wanted to ask me about some legislation I have been involved with here in the Senate. But it gave me an opportunity to reflect back on the time when I was a new mother with a beautiful, handsome little boy and the responsibilities of being a mom literally overnight. Coming from a family of six, you figure you know how to deal with children, but until you walk out of that hospital and you have that responsibility, it is not something you come prepared for or with a guidebook for. It is kind of trial by error every day.

I recalled the reality of the responsibilities I faced as a new mother. I recalled some of the angst and concern I had about whether I was doing things right. Here I was supposed to be happy and joyous and excited about this beautiful bundle of baby boy I had and instead I was tired and fatigued and stressed. I was stressed. Was I doing everything right? I wasn't sure.

While I did not deal or suffer the anxiety that comes with postpartum depression, as a new mother filled with just my own level of concern, I did feel the symptoms that I think many women feel and share. Yet you don't want to talk about it because you are supposed to be excited and happy and not in a state that is described as anything less than joyful. So I think, unfortunately, many women don't share their concerns, don't express their feelings. Instead, they deal with it and sometimes deal with it in ways that can be tragic.

So I have been inspired. I have been very encouraged by the stories I have shared with and heard from women and other advocates who are fighting to raise awareness of the issue of PPD.

Today I wish to share the story of one woman who lost her daughter to postpartum depression. I met this woman shortly after I had filmed this interview. She works in Anchorage as well as Wasilla as a child and adolescent psychiatrist. She has been absolutely passionate about providing care and support to children and adolescents in an effort to reduce and prevent suicide. So this is her life's work. She began to advocate for PPD after her own daughter, Brittany, suffered and ultimately lost her life to PPD. Brittany was 25 years old.

Brittany was a beautiful, passionate, lively, bright young woman. She was born close to here, in Fairfax, VA, in 1989. She excelled in school. She graduated with an International Baccalaureate degree at 16 from Mount Vernon High School. She loved animals. She dreamt of being a sports veterinarian one day. She continued to

excel academically while taking preveterinarian courses through the University of Pittsburgh and later online through North Carolina State University.

One of Brittany's big goals was to race in the Iditarod, one of my favorite sporting events—certainly my favorite Alaskan event. She owned, she raced, and she showed several Siberian huskies. She worked as a dog handler for Karen Ramstead. She was part of Karen's preparation for the Iditarod. So she was into her dogs. She was into really her life. But as much as she loved the Iditarod, as much as she loved what she was doing, she considered motherhood to be her greatest achievement.

But, very sadly, she began to struggle with PPD after the complicated delivery that resulted in her newborn son spending a week in the neonatal intensive care unit. She dealt with some very powerful emotions, some very violent emotions. She sought treatment from her physicians for her PPD, but she was in a situation where her cries were unanswered because she was dealing with physicians who were unable or perhaps ill-equipped to help her.

It was about the time of her son's first birthday when Brittany lost her battle with PPD. As sad and as tragic as that was for all in Brittany's family, it was another woman outside the family—another woman musher—who really moved forward in working for and advocating for Brittany. It was DeeDee Janrowe who raced the Iditarod in Brittany's honor. She took forward that cause, that crusade.

Again, Brittany was a bright, motivated, loving young woman who was struck down early in life because she didn't have access to the treatment she needed. Unfortunately, her story is just one of many. PPD impacts women in every race, every income, and all backgrounds.

All too often, women who have PPD feel helpless. They feel overwhelmed. They are certainly confused. They feel like they haven't done something right. They haven't properly bonded with their baby or they are ill-prepared, ill-equipped for parenthood. They just can't understand or figure out what may have gone wrong. The assumption out there is you have this beautiful baby, you should be joyful; why aren't you? And so because that expectation is different than what you are feeling, there is a hesitation to bring it up. There is a hesitation to speak about it.

Again, I will repeat our statistics. Across the country, one in seven mothers will suffer from PPD and in Alaska, one in three women, twice the national average. There are some nonprofit organizations that are seeking to raise awareness and to help women connect with treatment for PPD, but often they are located in the populous areas of the State, but think about my State, which is so extraordinarily rural, where most of our communities are not connected by roads. What about the women who are unable to receive a proper screening, diagnosis, or treatment early on?

Raising awareness of this issue is something we are trying to do. That is why I have been supporting legislation like the Bringing Postpartum Depression Out of the Shadows Act. I wish to thank the occupant of the chair, Senator CASSIDY, along with Senators ALEXANDER, MURRAY, and MURPHY, for including PPD in the Mental Health Reform Act. I cosponsored both pieces of legislation because I think we need to do more to ensure we are ensuring proper screening and treatment for PPD. I want to support the efforts to improve culturally competent programs that will help educate physicians, especially our primary care providers, on the proper detection and treatment. We recognize this will not only benefit the women who are suffering but also improve the health and the well-being of their children and their families as a whole.

With so many moms across my State and across the Nation who are facing postpartum depression, I think it is important, it is worthwhile that we do what we can to raise the issue, raise the awareness, put it at the forefront, openly discuss it, educate, and help improve our understanding of this illness. I thank the Chair for the opportunity to raise this issue before the body today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I return to the floor now for the 47th week for the 47th edition of the ''Waste of the Week.'' I highlight documented examples of waste, fraud, and abuse of hard-earned taxpayers' dollars that come to the Federal Government and that the public has every right to expect us to spend wisely, effectively, and efficiently.

Nonpartisan agencies like the Government Accountability Office and inspectors general are the watchdogs that examine how various agencies spend money and then report areas where they think expenditure doesn't live up to the promises that have been made, in terms of what it would accomplish, or question whether it ever should have been provided in the first place.

Some of the examples I have provided over these 47 weeks have been labeled simply as ridiculous. I raised those because it grabs the attention of the American public, saying: How in the world could the Federal Government allow something like that to happen with my tax dollars? I get up every Monday morning and go to work and I work hard for those dollars and I have a mortgage to pay and I have bills to pay. I have gasoline I have to put in my car to get to work and back. Then I hear something on the floor of the U.S. Senate, from the Senator from Indiana, that is a documented expenditure that falls clearly within the category of simply a ridiculous decision—waste, fraud, or abuse.

So whether it has been Federal grants to perform massages on rabbits—yes, massages on rabbits—to see whether a massage makes them feel better after a strenuous workout, I think any one of us could basically say you don't need to spend several hundred thousand dollars to prove that is something that works, or whether it is solar-fried burgers—I think 7,000 or so—that fly over a mirrored number of acres in a desert in California that are reflecting sunlight to a boiler, which has not proved to be cost-effective, and in the meantime it creates so much heat it has caused the cables that are necessary to produce the heat to be fried and also birds that fly over this solar field. I am surprised the environmentalists are not on top of that. Then there are the gambling monkeys, to see whether the monkeys were willing to take a greater risk and continue gambling if they had a reward for it—like, in their case, for food. I could have proven that with my dog that will eat anything I put in front of him, no matter how much I put down there.

We are talking about several hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars. Those are ludicrous. They are designed to catch people's attention so they will pay more attention to some of the examples of egregious wastes of money, designed for, perhaps, a good motive or the right purpose, but exposed, it is something that falls within that category of waste.

In one of my very first ''Waste of the Week'' speeches, I talked about the issue of double dipping in Social Security disability funds and unemployment insurance. To receive clearance to receive Social Security and disability payments, you have to prove you can't work; you are disabled, you can't work. But to receive unemployment insurance, you have to be working and then be told you can no longer keep your job, and in that interim period of time until you get a new job, we are going to pay you insurance benefits. What the General Accounting Office found out was that people were getting checks for doing both. Look, you can do one or the other but not both. That was no small change. That was $6 billion. I think it is $5.7 billion of documented waste every year.

Well, here we are at No. 47, and I would like to highlight yet another serious and very concerning example of waste: improper payments of taxpayer money through Medicare. All of us agree Medicare is an important program for millions of Americans, and we need to do what we can to preserve these important health care benefits for those who depend on them and need them, but an essential part of preserving these benefits is protecting Medicare from waste, fraud, and abuse. Throughout its history, we have read, and it has been determined by inspectors general and by the Government

Accountability Office, Medicare has been plagued by improper payments which are payments that are not justified can occur because of fraud or bureaucratic mismanagement. These improper payments not only threaten the solvency of Medicare, they leave millions of seniors vulnerable because when these improper payments are the result of fraud and abuse, they can jeopardize the health and well-being of Medicare beneficiaries for this reason: The reason is, Medicare is going broke. It is careening toward insolvency.

The Medicare trustees have said we are only 12 short years away from insolvency under Medicare Part A. When you determine waste, fraud, and abuse, on a year-after-year-after-year basis in the billions and tens of billions of dollars, these are dollars not available to keep that program solvent. That is going to have a devastating effect on the ability for us to provide the Medicare services people of a certain age need.

How many taxpayers' dollars am I talking about today? Well, in fiscal year 2015 alone, just in that year, the last year where the audits have been done, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, or CMS, which administers Medicare, improperly paid out $59 billion for health services—in one single year, $59 billion of improper payments, representing nearly 10 percent of the total amount Medicare spent that year.

As I said, just last month the Medicare trustees said Medicare Part A would be insolvent by 2028. Think about how much that 1 year of $59 billion can do to help keep the program solvent. All of this is why it is all the more necessary for Congress, the administration, and the health care agencies to work in unison to solve this crisis of Medicare solvency.

There is a group known as the Medicare Fraud Strike Force, and I commend whoever put that idea in play. It needs to be advanced significantly, but the idea with the strike force was it could root out the bad actors and bring them to justice. As an example, recently the strike force uncovered a ring of over 300 people—from physicians and pharmacists to nurses and government officials—who have allegedly conspired to defraud Medicare out of $900 million.

How did they do it? Well, some of the examples in this fraud ring include the billing of Medicare for procedures the providers claim took place after the patient passed away. They were submitting Medicare claims for dead patients and receiving significant payments. Other providers billed Medicare for home health care, which is reserved for bedridden seniors, for services that were not even provided to the patients in need. It was fraud, in terms of people submitting many bills to CMS and receiving payments when the services were not provided.

In Detroit, a so-called medical clinic billed Medicare for tens of millions of dollars, when in fact the clinic was determined to be a front for a narcotics diversion scheme. The clinic operators and recruiters targeted poor drug addicts who needed help and offered those addicts narcotics so clinics could then bill for Medicare services that were not provided. This was tens of millions of dollars. These are just examples of what the IGs found in terms of looking at Medicare payments. That is why I continue to come down every week to urge my colleagues in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and the administration to take the necessary steps to tighten the screws on bad actors in Medicare, in agencies across the realm of this government, not only because they are gambling with the health of some of America's most vulnerable patients but also because we have such precious little time to work to save this program from insolvency.

Our goal should be—in fact, it must be—to protect seniors, to promote good government practices, and achieve real savings by addressing these issues now.

With that, I am adding another major amount of waste, fraud, and abuse for an ever-growing total. This week it is $59 billion for Medicare improper payments, bringing the total all the way to $234-plus billion in waste, fraud, and abuse of hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

We wonder why the public has lost confidence and faith in their elected representatives and their institutions of government, when we see this kind of bureaucratic mess, when we see this kind of waste of hard-earned tax dollars, the fraud that is involved that is not detected and the abuse and terrible decision making by people who, respectfully, work for government agencies but don't exercise the kind of judgment the American taxpayer expects from them in terms of dealing with the money they send to Washington.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Florida.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont, who is next, for yielding me just a couple minutes.

I want to be brief and to the point. Congress is 1 week away from recessing before the conventions. We have yet to appropriate significant funds to fight Zika. At this point, quite frankly, I don't care whose fault it is anymore—Republicans or Democrats. This whole partisan argument that is going on around this issue is inexcusable.

Every single day now we have massive numbers of Zika cases being reported in my home State. Every day new records are being set. Just today a new case was found in a county that hadn't had a case yet. Forty-five out of fifty States in this country now have a Zika case. We have yet to see a local transmission, but it is coming, and I don't know, for the life of me, how anyone in this Chamber can go back home a week from now and say: We are going to be on recess for 6 weeks, in the peak of the summer, in the peak of mosquito season, in the peak of travel season, and we have appropriated nothing for the Zika virus. This makes no sense to me.

Do you want to know why Congress's approval rating is at 1, 2, or 3 percent, if that? It is because on an issue of public health we cannot find a way forward. My hope is that in the days to come, we will have an understanding that allows us to move forward. I am not just talking to the Senate, I am also talking to the House. Let's appropriate money and move forward and deal with this issue appropriately, with the urgency it deserves, or everyone is going to have to answer to their constituents as to why this public health crisis has blossomed and bloomed and we did nothing about it.

I truly hope, in the hours and days leading up to our recess, we will find a rapid and quick way forward so we can address this and fix it and give our people the help they need in the short term and ultimately move toward the money we need to research for a vaccine so this issue can be prevented and this disease can be prevented from spreading in the future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in very strong opposition to the Roberts-Stabenow bill concerning the labeling of genetically modified organisms, GMOs, and to discuss an amendment of mine that I hope will get to the floor as soon as possible.

The simple truth is, people have the right to know what is in the food they eat, and when parents go to the store and purchase food, they have the right to know what is in the food their kids are going to be eating. That is why 64 countries all over the world, including the European Union, Japan, Australia, Brazil, Russia, and China, require labeling of foods containing genetically modified organisms, GMOs. That is why my own State of Vermont, Maine, Connecticut, and Alaska have adopted laws to label foods containing GMOs. That is why the major environmental groups in this country, including the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the League of Conservation Voters, the Environmental Working Group, Center for Food Safety, Food & Water Watch, and others have all come out in opposition to the Roberts-Stabenow bill.

It is no secret my own State of Vermont has led the way in requiring companies to label their products. Last Friday, Vermont became the first State in the Nation to require GMO labeling, and several other States have undertaken similar efforts. Passage of Vermont's law was a triumph for consumers, for ordinary Americans, over the powerful interests of companies like Monsanto and other multinational food industry corporations.

Unfortunately, the victory in Vermont appears to be a hollow victory. The major agribusiness and biotech companies disagree with the right of consumers to know what is in their food, and not only do they disagree, they have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in lobbying and in campaign contributions to overturn the GMO right-to-know legislation that States have already passed and that other States are on the verge of passing. They have also spent many millions more to pass Federal legislation like what we are considering today, which would deny States the right to go forward in this area.

Let's be clear. This is just another shameful example of how big-money interests are using their influence to enact policies that are contrary to what the vast majority of the American people want and what they support. These companies are spending millions and tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to make certain that their interests prevail against what ordinary Americans feel very strongly about.

The Grocery Manufacturers Association, which sued and lost in trying to stop Vermont's law, has 34 lobbyists working on this issue alone. They spent $8.5 million lobbying in 2015. In 2016, the Grocery Manufacturers Association has already spent $1.5 million in total lobbying. Monsanto has spent $2 million in 2016 lobbying Congress. The Environmental Working Group has calculated that food and biotech companies and trade associations have spent nearly $200 million to oppose State GMO labeling initiatives like Vermont's legislation. When combined with Washington lobbying expenditures that note GMO labeling as a purpose, the total amount spent by labeling opponents is close to $400 million—$400 million in order to prevent the people of our country knowing what is in the food they eat.

This particular piece of corporate-backed legislation we are considering right now will create a confusing, misleading, and unenforceable national standard for labeling GMOs. This bill will preempt my State's law—the law in the State of Vermont—roll back the progress we have made, and is a huge setback to consumers' right to know what is in their food.

I would say to my Republican colleagues who so often tell us about the need to get the Federal Government out of the lives of the people, who talk about States' rights, what this legislation does is preempt a law passed in the State of Vermont, which thousands of our people were involved in passing, which the State legislature held numerous hearings on, where the State law was sued and yet was sustained by a court.

We have gone through all of that in the State of Vermont. We have Maine passing similar legislation, Connecticut passing legislation, Alaska passing legislation. Yet many of my friends who are great States' righters, who know how important the role of States is, are prepared to overturn all of the work done in these four States.

What is specifically bad above and beyond the preemption aspects of this legislation? Instead of a uniform labeling standard like Vermont's law, the language in this bill allows text symbols or an electronic QR code to be used. This is intentionally confusing to consumers, and the information may be entirely inaccessible if the consumer does not have access to the Internet. The QR code is not required to have text next to it to make it clear that the code provides additional information about GMOs. It can merely say ''Scan here for more food information.'' That makes no sense. People may not even know to scan it to learn more about GMOs specifically.

You can imagine how ridiculous this will be in the real world. A mom goes to a store with two kids who are running around, and she is supposed to take out her cell phone and scan a label in a store that may or may not have a good Internet connection. This is not an effort to provide information; this is an effort to deny information to consumers.

Reading information right on the label takes a matter of seconds. Why would we require families and shoppers to take considerable time when under Vermont's law they only need a moment to look at a label? Right now we have labels that tell us the amount of calories and give us other information on what is in a product. We look at it and we make a judgment as to whether this is a product we wish to purchase, and that is clearly what should be the case with products that contain GMOs.

There is also an argument to be made that this bill is discriminatory in its impact. Putting the onus on the consumer, making it necessary for that consumer to have a smartphone and Internet access, prohibits those without that access. Not everybody in America owns a cell phone. Many low-income people and working people do not own a cell phone.

Yesterday's New York Times noted in an editorial that ''the biggest problem with the Senate bill is that—instead of requiring a simple label, as the Vermont law does—it would allow food companies to put the information in electronic codes that consumers would have to scan with smartphones or at scanners installed by grocery stores.'' According to the New York Times, ''The only reason to do this would be to make the information less accessible to the public.''

Less accessible to the public. The New York Times has it exactly right.

Further, this bill allows the U.S. Department of Agriculture to rule on what percentage of GMO material is present in a particular food before it gets labeled, in contrast to Vermont's and the European Union's standards, both of which require products with more than nine-tenths of 1 percent GMO to be labeled.

The Roberts-Stabenow bill also contains a huge loophole in the labeling requirement, stating that there is no labeling requirement for GMO foods that could have occurred ''through conventional breeding or found in nature.'' Essentially, if the genetic engineering done by a company could have occurred in nature, there is no requirement to label it, which would prevent GMO corn, beet sugar, and soy oils from being labeled. The FDA has confirmed this loophole, stating that as the language is currently written, ''many of the foods from [genetically engineered] sources will not be subject'' to labeling requirements.

Under this bill, consumers will be left in the dark for at least another 2 years, maybe longer. Once USDA has published its regulations, there is no mandatory timeline for companies to comply. In other words, we are pushing this issue further and further into the future.

Perhaps the real giveaway as to why this is not a serious piece of legislation is that, most shockingly, this bill imposes no Federal penalties whatsoever for violating the so-called labeling requirement, making the law essentially meaningless. In other words, you have a confusing law that will not be utilized by most people, but then on top of all of that, if a company does not obey the law, there is no penalty whatsoever. So that will give a great incentive for companies to continue to do nothing.

In other words, this bill is weak, it is full of loopholes, and it has no requirement to comply.

In addition to the bill's many flaws, the bill most significantly is not necessary. In fact, many large companies, such as Campbell's, Frito-Lay, Kellogg's, and ConAgra, have begun to label their products nationally in anticipation of Vermont's law. For example, here is a label that appears on M&Ms. Everybody knows M&Ms. They are manufactured by Mars, one of the major candy companies in the world. Here it is, five words: ''partially produced with genetic engineering.'' That is it. It is right here on the label. This is what you will see if you pick up a package of M&Ms today. It is out there. It is on the label. People can make their determination as to whether they want to buy the product. Other major companies are already doing that. Campbell's is doing it, Frito-Lay is doing it, Kellogg's is doing it, and ConAgra is doing it. In other words, many of the major companies are already complying with the law. We do not need to go beyond that. Guess what. These companies that began to label these products did it and the sky didn't fall. I guess people are still buying M&Ms, other candies, and the other products manufactured by these companies.

In addition to a consumer's right to know, it is important to note that when we talk about GMOs, it is not just the question of the manipulation

of genetic material, it is about the chemicals necessary to make these crops productive.

The Environmental Working Group has exposed that GMOs have not decreased pesticide and herbicide use as promised. In fact, the use of toxic chemicals to grow food has only increased. Herbicide use has increased exponentially and glyphosate use specifically has increased by 3,000 percent since the 1990s.

In the State of Vermont, Monsanto, Dow, and Syngenta promised our farmers that GMO corn would allow them to reduce the amount of chemicals needed for their crop production. Instead, herbicide and chemical fertilizer use on Vermont dairy farms has almost doubled from 2002 to 2012 just to keep up with the need for more pesticides and herbicides to get enough corn to feed the dairy cows.

This is troubling not only because it is extremely expensive for farmers to keep up with the seed and pesticide needs, it is also very dangerous because eight of the active ingredients in use have been linked to birth defects, developmental defects, and contaminated drinking water.

In addition to these concerns, I also want to appeal to my colleagues who have come to the Senate floor to speak in support of States' rights. As I said earlier, make no mistake about it—this is significantly a States' rights issue, and this bill is an assault on States' rights. This bill would preempt Vermont's laws, Connecticut's laws, and Maine's laws.

According to the Center for Food Safety, this bill would preempt more than 100 State and municipal food and seed laws. The center notes specifically that Virginia's seed law allows farmers to have the critical information they need to make informed choices about which seed is the most appropriate for them to purchase and plant.

I will name just a few of the other State laws that would be preempted. It would override Alaska's labeling law, which requires that genetically engineered fish be labeled. The Roberts-Stabenow bill would also preempt a Florida statute that requires a permit for the release of exotic organisms and includes genetically modified organisms. The Roberts-Stabenow bill would preempt a Michigan statute that created an invasive species advisory council. It would preempt a Missouri statute that authorizes the State entomologist to determine whether something is not only a plant pest but also whether the pest is of such a harmful nature that its introduction to or dissemination within the State should be prevented. It would also preempt a South Carolina regulation that defines plant pests.

In other words, I find it interesting that this legislation has the support of the vast majority of Republicans who day after day tell us how they want to get the Federal Government out of people's lives, but this legislation preempts dozens of State laws all over this country that were passed by State legislatures and signed by the Governors of those States. These are just a few of the laws; there are dozens more that would be nullified under the Roberts-Stabenow bill.

The amendment I intend to offer, which I hope my colleagues will all support, would make Vermont's law the national standard. For those who have argued that companies would be unable to comply with a 50–State patchwork of GMO regulation, my amendment would alleviate that concern.

Specifically, Vermont's law—unlike the bill before the Senate—enjoyed a full hearing and amendment process. It was much discussed in the Vermont State Legislature. Vermont's law was years in the making, and legislators heard hours of testimony from dozens of stakeholders, including organic farmers and environmental organizations. The Roberts-Stabenow language has had none of this scrutiny and was brought to the floor by a procedural means without one hearing or one committee markup.

Unlike the Roberts-Stabenow bill, Vermont's law requires clear, on-package labeling instead of allowing a confusing QR code. Under Vermont's law and this amendment, consumers can glance quickly at a product and be able to determine the GMO contents with no need of a smartphone or Internet connection.

Once again, and very importantly, many major food companies are already complying with Vermont's law. Pick up a package of M&Ms, and there it is right now on the label, five words: ''partially produced with genetic engineering.'' Mars, which manufactures M&Ms, has done it, and it is not a problem. Other companies are already doing the same thing.

What makes sense is to build on what Vermont has done, not come up with an unenforceable, confusing, weak piece of legislation paid for by the large food corporations in this country.

This amendment making Vermont the national standard will also prevent the gaping loopholes in the Roberts-Stabenow language that will prevent labeling of the most common GMO foods. Unlike the Roberts-Stabenow language, this amendment defines ''food'' and ''genetic engineering'' in a way that would require labeling of foods derived from GMOs, such as starches, oils made from GMOs, sugar derived from GMO sugar beets, or high-fructose corn syrup. None of these types of products will require labeling under the Roberts-Stabenow language.

Also, my amendment sets a specific percentage of GMOs in food to trigger the labeling requirement—nine-tenths of 1 percent, which is consistent with Vermont's law and European Union standards. Under the Roberts-Stabenow language, this determination will be left up to the USDA, which could require 10 percent before labeling or 51 percent. We just don't know at this point.

My amendment also contains a legitimate enforcement provision consistent with Vermont's law. My amendment sets consistent penalties for improper labeling and provides for consumers to be able to sue to ensure enforcement.

The issue of labeling of our food is not controversial. It is something the American people want. It is something that common sense dictates. The overwhelming majority of Americans favor GMO labeling, nearly 9 out of 10.

People have a right to know what is in the food they eat. Instead, the needs of consumers, the needs of the American people have been completely disregarded in this legislation at the behest of major corporate interests and campaign donors. Congress must stand up to the demands of Monsanto and other multinational food industry corporations and reject the Roberts-Stabenow piece of legislation.

My amendment would provide a meaningful alternative to the confusing and ineffective measure we are considering, and I ask that colleagues support my amendment.

With that, I reserve——

Mr. LEAHY. Before the Senator yields the floor, he talked about what Vermont did. Isn't it a fact that the Senate didn't hold one single hearing or have one single witness come before they set this bill; is that correct?

Mr. SANDERS. My colleague from Vermont is absolutely correct. In Vermont, there was a lot of discussion, and there were a number of hearings, but not here in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. LEAHY. In fact, the Vermont Legislature, is it not a fact, had at least 50 hearings with at least 130 witnesses?

Mr. SANDERS. My colleague from Vermont makes a very, very important point. In Vermont, this issue was seriously discussed. Over 50 hearings were held, with different points of view and objections being raised.

I would ask my colleague, just to confirm with me: How many hearings on this important and controversial bill were held here in the Senate?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would answer my friend and colleague from Vermont—especially, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I am well aware of this—that there was not one single hearing, not one single witness.

Unlike Vermont, with 50 hearings and 130 witnesses who expressed every single view, over 2 years of time and debate, we didn't have 2 minutes of debate and discussion. Vermont did 2 years.

Mr. SANDERS. So here is what we have. I thank my friend from Vermont for raising this issue. On the one hand, we have a State—the State of Vermont—which addressed this issue in a serious way, listening to all points of view, having the legislature go over this in a thorough manner. Then, here

we have the Senate, after many, many millions of dollars in lobbying efforts and campaign contributions, overriding the work of the State of Vermont and not having one hearing—not one hearing with consumers, environmental groups, farm organizations—and rushing it through in the last week or two before we adjourn for summer break.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for raising that enormously important issue.

With that, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today as the Senate considers legislation on an issue that is critically important to our Nation's food supply. From our producers in the fields to our families purchasing food in the aisles of the grocery stores, without the Senate action we are considering today, this country will be hit with a wrecking ball that will disrupt the entire food chain. We need to act now to pass our amendment to S. 764.

This is a bipartisan—a bipartisan—approach that provides a permanent solution to the patchwork of biotechnology labeling laws that will wreak havoc on the flow of interstate commerce of agriculture and food products in our Nation's marketplace. That is what this is exactly about—the marketplace. It is not about safety. It is not about health or nutrition. It is about marketing. Science has proven again and again that the use of agriculture biotechnology is 100-percent safe.

The Senator from North Carolina, Mr. TILLIS, provided on the floor just a moment ago that, in fact, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry last year heard from the three Federal agencies tasked with regulating agriculture biotechnology—the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Food and Drug Administration. Their work is based on sound science and is the gold standard for our policymaking, including this policy we are debating today—one of the most important food and agriculture decisions in recent decades. Many people say this issue is the biggest issue for agriculture in 20 years. I agree.

At our hearing, the Federal Government expert witnesses highlighted the steps their agencies have already taken to ensure that agriculture biotechnology is safe—safe for other plants, safe for the environment, and safe for our food supply. It was clear that our regulatory system ensures biotechnology crops are among the most tested in the history of agriculture. At the conclusion of the hearing, virtually all of the members of the Agriculture Committee were in agreement. Not one disagreed. Thus, it is clear that what we are facing today is not a safety or a health issue, despite claims by a couple of my colleagues on the Senate Floor. It is a market issue.

This is really a conversation about a few States dictating to every State the way food moves from farmers to consumers. This patchwork approach of mandates adds costs to national food prices. In fact, requiring changes in the production or on-package labeling of most of the Nation's food supply for a single State would impact citizens in each of our home States.

A recent study on the impact of an on-package label estimates that the cost to consumers could total as much as $82 billion annually—$82 billion—approximately $1,050 per hard-working American family. Let me repeat that. That is $1,050 per hardworking American family. Now is not the time for Congress to make food more expensive for anybody to eat or produce—not the consumer and certainly not the farmer.

Today's farmers are being asked to produce more safe and affordable food to meet the growing demands at home and around a very troubled and hungry world. At the same time, they are facing increased challenges to production, including limited land and water resources, uncertain weather patterns, and pest and disease issues.

Agricultural biotechnology has become a valuable tool in ensuring the success of the American farmer in meeting the challenge of increasing yield in a more efficient, safe, and responsible manner. In fact, thanks to modern agriculture technology, we have seen a 48-percent increase in corn yields. That is good for the farmer, that is good for the consumer, and that is good for a troubled and hungry world. There has been a 36-percent increase in soybean yields in the last 20 years. That is the value of agricultural biotechnology.

Now, I have also heard—and I do understand the concern—from some of my colleagues about consumers and available information about our food. Some consumers want to know more about ingredients. This is a good thing. Consumers should take an interest in their food, where it comes from, and the farmers and ranchers that produce their food.

This legislation puts forward policies that will help consumers find information—almost guaranteed. It does so without jeopardizing the technology upon which our farmers rely. More importantly, the legislation before us provides an immediate and comprehensive solution to the unworkable State-by-State patchwork of labeling laws. State consumer protection laws and anything beyond the wrecking ball that we see related to biotechnology labeling mandates are codified as exempt from preemption. We ensure that the solution to the State patchwork—one thing we can all agree upon—is effective.

The amendment focuses on human food that may or may not be bioengineered. We do not set up any new offices at the Department of Agriculture, and we minimize any impact on other agencies. Instead, we direct the Secretary to establish a uniform national disclosure standard through rulemaking. It sets national uniformity that allows for the free flow of interstate commerce, a power granted to Congress in the U.S. Constitution.

Let me point this out. The commerce clause in article I, section 8, clause No. 3, provides that ''the Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes.'' But note ''among the several states''—more than several States today.

This labeling uniformity is based on science and allows the value chain—from farmer to processor to shipper to retailer to consumer—to continue as the free market intended. To accomplish national uniformity, we crafted a mandatory disclosure requirement. We are talking about mandatory disclosure, not just labeling. The Senate bipartisan agreement is mandatory disclosure with several options—text on package, a symbol, or an electronic link to a Web site that Senator TILLIS so aptly demonstrated. The legislation is clear that the link cannot include any text on the package that could be used to denigrate biotechnology. It will simply say: ''Scan here for more food information.''

We also allow for Web sites or telephone numbers to satisfy the requirement for small food manufacturers, and we completely exempt very small food manufacturers and restaurants from having to comply.

The disclosure requirement applies to food subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act labeling requirements as well as some meat and poultry products. We do not include alcohol, as those items are subject to labeling requirements under a different authority at the U.S. Treasury. In this respect, alcohol is similar to other food that is labeled under a different authority than the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The scope of this agreement includes human food, not animal feed. The language prohibits the Secretary from considering any food product derived from an animal to be bioengineered based only upon the animal eating bioengineered feed.

It is important, as with any Federal legislation on this topic, for Congress to consider scientific fact and unintended consequences. We include a safety statement. The agreement ensures that the regulations will treat bioengineered food the same as its nonbioengineered counterpart. We agree that these products have been found safe through the Federal regulatory review process.

I want to emphasize this, and I want my colleagues to understand this. This legislation has the support of more than 1,000 organizations—large and small—representing the entire food chain, and that number continues to grow every day. Never before in the history of the Senate Agriculture Committee—and, I would venture of any

committee—have we seen such a coalition of constituents all united behind such an effort. Their message is clear: It is time for us to act. It is time for us to provide certainty in the marketplace. It is time for us to pass this amendment.

I appreciate the bipartisan support of those on the committee who joined me by voting to approve our committee bill, those who supported a solution in March, and those who voted to consider this agreement. We have again made significant changes to address the concerns of the ranking member and others. Now, we all must carry this across the finish line. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan approach and protect the safest, most abundant, and affordable food supply in the world.

Now, I want to say something else. I want to talk about the men and women whom the Agriculture Committee represents and whom everyone on the Agriculture Committee should champion and protect. I am going to describe that person to my colleagues on the floor, with reverence to Paul Harvey.

And on the 8th day, God looked down on his planned paradise and said, ''I need a caretaker.'' So God made a farmer.

God said, ''I need somebody willing to get up before dawn, milk cows, work all day in the fields, milk cows again, eat supper and then go to town and stay past midnight at a meeting of the school board.'' So God made a farmer.

''I need somebody with arms strong enough to rustle a calf and yet gentle enough to deliver his own grandchild. Somebody to call hogs, tame cantankerous machinery, come home hungry, have to wait on lunch until his wife's done feeding visiting ladies and then tell the ladies to be sure and come back real soon—and mean it.'' So God made a farmer.

God said, ''I need somebody willing to sit up all night with a newborn colt. And watch it die. Then dry his eyes and say, 'Maybe next year.' I need somebody who can shape an ax handle from a persimmon sprout, shoe a horse with a hunk of car tire, who can make harness out of haywire, feed sacks and shoe scraps. And who, planting time and harvest season, will finish his forty-hour week by Tuesday noon, then, pain'n from 'tractor back,' put in another seventy-two hours.'' So God made a farmer.

God had to have somebody willing to ride the ruts at double speed to get the hay in ahead of the rain clouds and yet stop in midfield and race to help when he sees the first smoke from a neighbor's place. So God made a farmer.

God said, ''I need somebody strong enough to clear trees and heave bails, yet gentle enough to tame lambs and wean pigs and tend the pink-combed pullets, who will stop his mower for an hour to splint the broken leg of a meadow lark. It had to be somebody who'd plow deep and straight and not cut corners. Somebody to seed, weed, feed, breed and rake and disc and plow and plant and tie the fleece and strain the milk and replenish the self-feeder and finish a hard week's work with a five-mile drive to church.''

''Somebody who'd bale a family together with the soft strong bonds of sharing, who would laugh and then sigh, and then reply, with smiling eyes, when his son says he wants to spend his life 'doing what dad does.' '' So God made a farmer.

It is our responsibility to protect that farmer, and to protect what he does to feed this Nation and a troubled world with the best quality food at the lowest price in the history of the world. So let us protect that farmer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am pleased that it looks like we are going to be voting this afternoon on a measure that would, for the first time, give American families access to GMO information about the food they buy.

As my colleague from Kansas prepares to leave the Chamber, I just want to express my thanks to him, to his staff, to Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan and her staff, and a lot of others, including members of my own staff, and the administration—especially Tom Vilsack, the Secretary of Agriculture—for the work that they and many others have done to bring us to this point in this important debate.

I was with the Aspen Institute seminar visit to Tanzania about a year ago. We got into a discussion with a lot of young African leaders and scholars, and a number of Democratic and Republican House Members and Senate Members.

The debate ended up going into an area I never expected it to go. We ended up talking about drought in Africa. We ended up talking about what is going on with climate change that exacerbates their problems with raising crops. We talked about how it might be possible for them to use genetically modified seeds to better endure and survive drought and to enable them to maybe raise some crops that would be healthier for their constituents. We ended up in an interesting debate on sound science with respect to sea level rise and climate change.

The message from our Democrats who happened to be present at that seminar was this: Our Republican friends should be guided by sound science when it comes to climate change and sea level rise. Delaware is the lowest lying State in the country. We are especially mindful of this issue.

Republicans, after we had reminded them of the need to rely on good science with respect to climate change and sea level rise, had this rejoinder for us Democrats. They said: Well, maybe if we were to agree to that, you guys—Democrats present—should agree to be guided by good science with respect to genetically modified organisms.

As it turns out, close to 98 or 99 percent of scientists around the world believe that climate change is real, sea level rise is real, and we human beings are directly contributing to that. I am told that 98 or 99 percent of the scientists on the other side of the issue with respect to genetically modified organisms have concluded—again, we have had recently, just in the last several weeks, additional confirmation of this—that most of the scientists in the world who follow this think we ought to be guided by sound science with respect to genetically modified organisms, and that food is safe for us to eat.

I don't know if this is the home stretch yet. I hope, as we come down on the debate on this important issue of genetically modified organisms and the safety of our food, that we will keep in mind the debate that took place almost a year ago on the other side of the world.

I have said to my colleagues around here any number of times that people ask me what is one of the proudest things that I have done in my life. I have discussed this issue. I don't know if the Presiding Officer remembers it. I am proudest of all of raising two—actually, three—boys who are now all grown up and off into the world on their own. My wife and I wanted to make sure they grew up healthy, sound, and strong. They had nutritious food to eat. As Governor of Delaware and chairman of the National Governors Association, I felt we did well, and I want to make sure that kids—not just my own kids but young people all over the world—and not so young people have the benefit of eating healthy and nutritious food.

I understand the calls from parents who want to know more about the food they are putting on their tables in this country and other countries as well. I believe the Stabenow-Roberts compromise for GMO labeling will help all consumers make more informed choices no matter where they live in America.

Part of our job in Congress is to ensure that our Federal regulations set forth a reasonable framework for American businesses, too, so they can grow and thrive. A week ago, our country's first human labeling law took effect in one State, Vermont, but that law regulates only food being sold within that State's lines.

Again, I call myself a recovering Governor, but as a former Governor, I know a patchwork approach to regulations that apply to interstate commerce is very problematic. Businesses want and need certain predictability. For food businesses, large and small, waiting for each State to produce its own labeling laws, its own rules, would create a haphazard and totally unmanageable regulatory landscape.

I believe it is absolutely critical that we act on the Federal level to create labeling requirements that give consumers the information they need and deserve without creating a logistical nightmare that would stifle American businesses. The question is, Can we have both or are they mutually exclusive of one another? I think we can have both.

Under the Stabenow-Roberts compromise, in the next 2 years, all foods that contain GMOs will be labeled with a QR code that sends consumers directly to the producer's Web site and outlines clear information about what is in the product that consumers are about to buy or considering buying. That means consumers in the dozens of

States that haven't yet acted to require GMO labeling will have better information about their food, no matter where they buy it.

Sometimes a little common sense goes a long way, and this is a commonsense solution to an issue our constituents asked us to address. Not only am I pleased by the agreement that we have reached, but I am also pleased by the way that we got here. My wife says I am an eternal optimist—maybe too optimistic some days, but I hope the bipartisan work we have done to get here, led by Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS, reminds our constituents that they, too, can be optimistic about the ability of Congress to get things done.

This comes on the heels of the bipartisan work done on the Toxic Substances Control Act, where Democrats and Republicans worked together with the administration to pass one of the best environmental laws that we have done maybe in decades in this country.

Finally, I would like to address some of the critics of this compromise who assert that we didn't go far enough to protect Americans from GMOs. We talk often about the overwhelming scientific data that proves our climate is changing at a troubling rate and that humans are the primary drivers of that. On GMOs, the scientific data is also overwhelming.

I mentioned earlier in my remarks that at a seminar at the African institute in Tanzania last year, both the Democrats and the Republicans exchanged ideas that both of us should be guided by sound science on GMOs or sea level rise climate change.

More recently, in May of this year, the National Academy of Sciences released an independent report that determined genetically engineered crops are just as safe to eat as conventional crops. I will say it again. In May of this year, the National Academy of Sciences released an independent report that determined genetically engineered crops are just as safe to eat as conventional crops.

More recently, more than 100 Nobel laureates sent a letter to Greenpeace, the United Nations, and governments around the world. What did the 100 Nobel laureates have to say? They urged all the folks that they wrote to end opposition to GMOs.

I think our Federal Government should take a reasonable, principled, and science-based approach to addressing the issue of GMO labeling. That is exactly what this bipartisan bill seeks to do. I believe that is what it does.

I thank our colleagues, Senators ROBERTS and STABENOW, and their staff for working so hard with ours and others to achieve a compromise that I think is a win for consumers, companies, and farmers. It shows the country that Congress can work together across the aisle to get things done.

Mr. President, I want to change gears here for a moment if I could.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the Senator yield prior to his statement on another subject?

Mr. CARPER. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Senator. This has been a long process—well over a year. We had the committee hearing within the Agriculture Committee months ago with the EPA, FDA, and many witnesses declaring that agricultural biotechnology is safe. Note I changed the name because GMO has become a pejorative. It is hard to fix that, but that is what it is—agricultural biotechnology. We went to work and passed a bill, 14 to 6. Then we tried to change the bill so that the minority could possibly vote for it. Unfortunately, we were not able to get the required number of votes for cloture.

Back then, it would have been very appropriate, it seems to me, for anybody interested to bring their amendment to the floor. Senator MERKLEY is here. We offered—at least through staff—he tells me he didn't get the message, but I was for all amendments at that particular time. We didn't even get cloture.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTS. I do not have the time. The Senator from Delaware has yielded to me. I will finish my statement in just a minute, if I can.

Here we are with the July 1 deadline having been met, and here we are with the Vermont labeling law becoming, in effect, the national law. I know there are some for that. There was one Senator from the other side of the aisle, and that was the Senator from Delaware, who went to work to get a reasonable bill. This is a well-crafted compromise. If it is a well-crafted compromise between the ranking member and the chairman with appropriate people like the Senator himself working hard to get support for that, we should go ahead and get this done. I appreciate the willingness of the Senator to work in a bipartisan fashion, and I thank him again.

Mr. CARPER. Reclaiming my time—boy, I am glad I yielded. Thank you so much for those words and for the opportunity to participate in this process.

ISIS

Mr. President, I want to change gears to talk about another battle going on in another part of the world, and it is a battle to degrade and destroy ISIS. Recently on the Senate floor, I heard a couple of our colleagues in the majority, I believe, claim that the President, the current administration, is not doing enough to fight ISIS. However, I say to my friends—and they are my friends, they know that—that the majority are forgetting some of the key facts, and I just want to revisit that.

The truth is, they are taking the fight to ISIS, and we are making serious progress in the battle to degrade and destroy them. As I like to say, it is not time to spike the football. We are not in the end zone. Maybe we are in the red zone, but progress is being made. I want to talk a little bit about that today.

I want to start by directing my attention to this map. For folks who are trying to figure out what this map says, it says that this is Iraq, a big part of this area here is Iraq. Right down here is Iraq. Right here is Baghdad. That is Syria over here. We have Turkey up here, and Iran is over here on the other side of Iraq.

A couple of years ago, these folks in ISIS decided they were going to establish their own caliphate, if you will, a country. That would be a theocracy guided by their perverted view of Islam, not the view held by most Muslims in the world.

Islam is one of the great religions of the world. The more I learn about it, I am struck by the similarities between the faiths. I am Protestant. I am not sure what our Presiding Officer is, but we are here and are people of different faiths. Whatever your faith happens to be, almost any faith in the world—I don't care if you are Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist; even Confucius used to embody and embrace the Golden Rule to treat other people the way you want to be treated. There is a section in the New Testament, Matthew 25, where we read about the least of us: When I was hungry, did you feed me? When I was thirsty, did you give me a drink? When I was naked, did you clothe me? When I was a stranger in your land, did you take me in? When I was sick and in prison, did you come and see me? There is a passage in the Koran that is actually very similar to what we have in the Bible, the New Testament.

Nonetheless, the folks who have this perverted view of Islam launched an effort about 2 years ago in this area that we see here—I am going to call this a salmon-colored area, and the area that is more of a green color is the area that ISIS seized control of 2 years ago, and there are other pockets around these two countries, Syria and Iraq. That is what they took over—rolled right over the Iraqis. A lot of the Iraqi military units fled and left, and the leaders did too.

We had a fight on our hands. The bad guys got within 20, 25 miles of Baghdad, and they got no further. The President of our country has helped lead the way to put together a 60-nation coalition. Some are Arab; some are Protestant or Catholic—mixed religions. A lot of different religions represent the coalition. Some are democracies; some are not. Some have a King or a Queen. It is an interesting group and a diverse group. But 60-some nations were put together.

I mentioned before that I spent a fair number of years of my life as a naval flight officer, 5 years in a hot war in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam war and another 18 years beyond that right up until the end of the Cold War. I had the opportunity to participate in

missions that involved U.S. naval assets aircraft like the P–3 aircraft, which I was a flight crew member of. I worked with submarines, U.S. naval submarines with the U.S. naval ships, and it is not always easy to do that. Communications are difficult. Conditions are difficult. When we tried to introduce and work with units from other branches of other countries' military units, other naval units, it was even more difficult.

Imagine trying to put together a coalition and 60 different nations speaking different languages with different modes of operation, different aircraft, different ships, different artillery and trying to get us all to pull in the same direction to take on this battle. It has taken a while.

You know what is happening now? Here is what has happened. The land that ISIS took over 2 years ago has been cut by almost half—47 percent, almost half. While the area of Syria controlled by ISIS is a lot smaller than the land in Iraq, 20 percent of that land has been recaptured from ISIS.

Last year, Iraqi counterterrorism forces, backed by U.S. air support, scored key victories in Ramadi to the west of Baghdad, 30, 40 miles to the west of Baghdad. And then a place called Tikrit—we remember Tikrit because it is the birthplace where Saddam Hussein grew up. In the last couple of weeks, there was some more good news. Fallujah, which is right here—these three cities, Fallujah, Ramadi, and Tikrit, make up what is called the Sunni Triangle. It is where a lot of Sunnis in Iraq live. It was once controlled by ISIS, and they have now fallen to the alliance, our forces.

As we speak, Kurdish, Iraqi, Syrian democratic forces backed by U.S. Special Forces are training and making preparations to retake other key ISIS strongholds. Here is Baghdad. You go to the north, northwest, up here next to the areas controlled by the Kurds, which are part of Iraq but controlled by the Kurds, and over here—almost due west from Mosul, over here to Raqqa, which is the spiritual capital of ISIS. Those are where the fights are headed next.

For weeks American airpower has conducted scores of airstrikes on these two ISIS strongholds, Mosul and Raqqa, in order to clear the way for our Iraqi and Syrian partners on the ground. We are using F–15 and F–16 aircraft—in some cases, carrier-based and out of the Persian Gulf. We are using drones and A–10s. We are using B–52s, which are being staged in a variety of places, including Qatar and as far away as a couple of thousand miles, I am told, to conduct precision strikes all over the planet to target ISIS.

All in all, the United States and our allies have taken about 25,000 ISIS fighters off the battlefield and killed more than 120 key ISIS leaders since the beginning of this conflict. Recent reports indicate that coalition allied forces kill an ISIS leader every 3 days on average. Last week, coalition airstrikes killed the ISIS deputy minister of war and ISIL military commander in Mosul.

We haven't done it by ourselves. We have done this with a lot of partners. As I said earlier there are 60 in all. Our President, his administration, and our military folks have built an anti-ISIS coalition that consists of 60 countries, including some you expect to hear, such as the United Kingdom, Canada, France, and Germany, but, frankly, a lot you would not expect to hear about. The coalition also consists of some of Iraq's and Syria's Arab neighbors, such as Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Jordan, and Egypt, just for starters. As a result of these partnerships, we have not only taken territory away from ISIS, but we have also cut off its main sources of supplies, its reinforcements, and its funding.

In recent weeks, anti-ISIS forces have surrounded a place called Manbij, Syria, which is up here, just north of Raqqa, and cut off the route through Turkey that ISIS previously used to smuggle oil, money, and move fighters. As of June 29, less than a month ago—maybe a couple of weeks ago—about 300 airstrikes against the Islamic State's oil network in Iraq and Syria conducted over the last 2 years have cut the terrorist group's oil revenues by at least half. It is estimated that ISIS now collects about $15 million each month, down from $30 million and $42 million each month at its peak. Cash reserves held by ISIS have also been hit hard. Over the past year, coalition airstrikes have destroyed $500 million and $800 million in ISIS funds—cold cash. Our partnership has helped to keep ISIS from getting reinforcement from outside of Iraq and Syria too.

The flow of foreign recruits has been dramatically reduced from a high of about 2,000 a month in 2014—coming from all around the world to joining the ISIS team—to 200 a month in June. It went from 2,000 to 200 over the course of the last year. About a year or so ago in the United States, we had 10 Americans per month leave the United States to join the ISIS folks. Last month there was about one—one per month. This has happened because people all around—and certainly people in the United States—are learning the truth about ISIS. They don't want any part of it.

In cyber space, over 125,000 pro-ISIS Twitter handles have been taken offline. For every pro-ISIS Twitter handle, there are now six anti-ISIS handles challenging ISIS's twisted ideology and criticizing its actions. That is a real game changer.

At home, the FBI is cracking down on recruits as well. Over the past 2 years, the FBI has arrested nearly 100 individuals on ISIS-related charges.

Just because we have made clear progress on these fronts, it does not mean there is not more work to be done, because there is. There is a lot more work that needs to be done, and it is not going to be done by us. It is a shared partnership and the United States helps in a lot of ways, but this is not our responsibility alone.

The recent ISIS-related attacks in Turkey, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Bangladesh show that ISIS still has the ability to mobilize its followers to carry out attacks on soft targets. The terror attack in Orlando last month serves as a reminder that disturbed and mentally imbalanced young Americans are susceptible to the twisted propaganda of ISIS.

In November, before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, renowned counterterrorism expert Peter Bergen told the committee that ''every American who's been killed by a jihadi terrorist in this country since 9/11 has been killed by an American citizen or resident.'' Think about that. Every person who has been killed by a jihadi terrorist in this country—in America—since 9/11 has been killed by an American citizen or legal resident. Think about it. The threat doesn't come from Syrian refugees or those who travel here as tourists or on the visa waiver programs. The greatest threat to our country now comes from within—from American citizens and legal residents.

When these young Americans carry out attacks in ISIS's name, much like the Orlando killer appears to have done, they help to project the image that ISIS is all-powerful and ever present.

We need to do a better job of countering ISIS's narrative here in the United States. Right now, ISIS portrays a winner's message, or at least they sought to, even though the results on the battlefield are beginning to show otherwise.

We need to make sure the truth is told about ISIS and all the defeats they are beginning to absorb. They are cowards, not heroes. They are oppressors and killers of Muslims. They imprison and enslave women. They are not protectors of Islam.

As we help the Sunni Arab world free itself from the horror and oppression of ISIS, we must also ensure that the truth about ISIS gets out in order to undermine ISIS's recruitment propaganda. Congress can strengthen our ability to fight the ISIS narrative by empowering the Department of Homeland Security to build partnerships here at home.

The Senate Homeland Security Committee passed legislation that I had worked on, along with others, that empowers the Department of Homeland Security to build partnerships with the Muslim community here and with faith leaders, civic groups, and other nonprofits. These partnerships will help to develop local solutions for countering ISIS messages and to stop the recruitment of young Americans.

I will say in conclusion that the battle to defeat ISIS is far from over, but I think we are on the right track. We

need to make it clear every day that ISIS is not the winning team they present themselves to be. They might have been 2 years ago, maybe even a year ago, but not today. In fact, they are well on their way to becoming a losing team, and if we keep working hard and pulling together in the same direction with our coalition partners, they will be a losing team. All of us, Democrats and Republicans, have a role to play in making that clear to all Americans, especially those who are susceptible to ISIS's silent song. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will keep that in mind as we go forward.

I hope we can also work together without the partisanship of this election cycle to come up with constructive ways to help enhance the ability of this administration and our military men and women to join with the other 60 or so nations to finally defeat ISIS.

With that, as I look around the floor, I believe one of my colleagues from Oklahoma is poised to address us, and I will yield for the Senator.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this has been a week really dealing with a lot of national security issues, both security here in our country and security around the world. It is a moment when we turn around and look at what is happening internationally. We think about ISIS and terrorism being confined to Syria and Iraq, and we face it here. We lose track that there are countries around the world dealing with this threat as well. What do we do about this, and where does it go from here?

Let me recount the past couple of days. On Wednesday, two suicide bombers carried out an attack in Yemen. On Tuesday, an Indonesian suicide bomber, believed to be a supporter of the Islamic State, attacked a city there, killing himself and wounding a police officer and other security personnel. On Monday, there were three separate attacks in Saudi Arabia. On Sunday, there was a massive bomb explosion carried out in Baghdad that killed over 250 people—one bomb. Later that same day, there was another one, also in Iraq, that killed five people. On Friday of last week, in Bangladesh, our Nation watched in horror as gunmen stormed a restaurant in the diplomatic zone and killed 20. They took those long-term hostages, pledging their allegiance to ISIS.

We forgot what else happened on Friday. Those things happened around the world, but on Friday of last week, many people may not know that the FBI picked up a man named Mohamed Jalloh in Virginia. He was plotting to carry out a Fort Hood-style attack. He is a Virginia National Guardsman who purchased weapons. He had self-radicalized after watching Anwar al-Awlaki's videos. He pledged to ISIS and planned to carry out a large-scale attack in Virginia. The FBI learned about it and intercepted him before he could actually carry out his attack.

This is a week about national security. There is a lot going on around the world, and we face a lot of threats.

This week has also concluded the security issue of the United States dealing with drug policy. Behind the scenes, in the Senate, there is a long-term argument that is happening right now about whether we are going to have a drug war or a political war. We have a bill that deals with opioids. We are trying to help local law enforcement engage in this opioid conference, but our Democratic colleagues have held that bill up and won't allow it to move through the conference process. While we should be dealing with the fast-moving opioid crisis, we are actually dealing with the gridlock in the Senate.

This is a bill that already overwhelmingly passed in a bipartisan method when it came through originally. It has only been strengthened since that time, and it now goes to conference. We want to be able to finish the conference report so we can continue to fight the drug war here in the United States, but instead we can't fight the drug war because of the political war going on behind the scenes. It is a national security issue.

This is a national security issue. This week we dealt with immigration policy and what should be the simplest, most baseline area of immigration: Should individuals that have been convicted of a felony—even a violent felony—be deported out of the United States if they are here illegally? The argument from the other side of the aisle is this: We should not force communities to deport individuals who have been convicted of violent felonies.

This week a year ago, specifically July 1, 2015, a young lady named Kate Steinle was walking down a pier in San Francisco with her dad. A gentleman walked up to her with a gun and shot and killed her on the pier. There was no connection or altercation. He just walked up and shot her. This man, who was in the country illegally, had already been convicted of seven felonies and had been deported five times.

The San Francisco Police Department was forced to release him and did not give him to the Federal authorities because San Francisco is a sanctuary city. They believe that even if you have been convicted of violent felonies before—if you are in the United States illegally—you should not be turned over to Federal authorities.

This body had a debate on that. This body's debate was this: Do we agree that there should be places in the United States where violent, multicount felons should be kept and protected in communities here even though they are here illegally? Republicans overwhelmingly voted that sanctuary cities should lose some of our Federal support. There should be an incentive to say that if someone in your community is a violent felon—these are rapists, individuals who have been convicted of domestic violence, individuals who have been convicted of DUI. Not every person in the country who is here illegally is a violent felon, but for those who are, can't we find the common ground to say that those individuals should be convicted and deported? This body apparently doesn't believe that.

What should have been the most baseline argument about our domestic and national security can't get through this body because we can't agree on the simplest things. It is not all immigration policy. This is just: Should you deport people convicted of a violent felony? Should there be communities in the country where violent felons are protected and kept in the United States even if they are here illegally? If we can't agree on that simple policy, how in the world are we going to agree on any immigration policy?

It has been a week about national security but also the threat of ISIS and the movement of terrorism around the world. We have gridlock here—dealing with basic immigration policy and national security, basic drug policy, and dealing with an opioid conference. It has also been a week dealing with national security in a very unusual way. It can be spun politically, but it is really a national security issue.

The Director of the FBI completed an investigation over a holiday weekend and interviewed former Secretary of State Clinton on the Saturday of the Fourth of July weekend. He then came out after the day of the Fourth of July and said there is a lot of evidence of breaking the rules, there is a lot of evidence of being sloppy and careless, there is a lot of evidence of what he called extremely careless handling of sensitive, highly classified information, but would not recommend a prosecution.

Now, why do I bring this up in a national security conversation? Because it does connect to our national security. It is not just a political issue.

The first calls that I received after that statement came out from Director Comey were from people who have classified clearances. They work in the intelligence community, they work in the U.S. military, they work on our military installations, they are contractors, and they have gone through the extensive process of getting clearance. Those individuals started contacting me with one statement; that is, if I had done what the Secretary of State did—which is to take classified information out of the government computer, move it to my home computer, store it at home—I would have been fired and I would have lost my security clearance. In fact, I had an individual contact me who worked at one of my military installations and who recounted to me a story from just last year. Someone who worked at that particular installation had brought their

phone into work and had plugged it into the government computer so they could listen to music. That person was roundly fired because it put secure information at risk.

This is a national security issue. It is the issue of what is the standard for how we are going to protect our Nation's secrets and whether there is a standard anymore. In a day when we face threats from around the world, in a day when we face threats from all over different regions and from Americans even here who are being self-radicalized, we should at least have the standard that classified information means classified information, and any individual, regardless of their last name, would be held to account. No one in America is above the law—at least that is what we used to say.

The challenge we face now as a nation, with all of the threats, with all of the issues that we face, is, will we just argue about political things here and will political people get special favors, or will we take seriously the national security threats we face from terrorism abroad, from terrorists who are planning attacks here in the United States, from the opioid and heroin crisis we face, the immigration crisis we face? Will we take these things seriously?

I would call this body out to say we cannot continue to just do politics here and not work toward resolutions on things that matter to the American people in the most basic things we face. This is a time we should continue to do the right thing. The American people need to not only see their government working, they need to know their government is actually doing something to protect the Nation—our borders, the drug wars, our national secrets, and our security dealing with radical Islamic terrorism from around the world. Let's confront these issues, not just debate them. Let's deal with them, and let's resolve them. Let's remind the American people that we can get things done to fulfill our basic constitutional responsibility and that we can carry out the law, regardless of a person's last name.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

WORKING TOGETHER IN THE SENATE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, let me pick up from where the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma ended. This Senate and the House are capable of doing some awfully good bipartisan work that helps the American people, and we do a lot of it.

The Senator from Louisiana—the Presiding Officer today—has been working with the Senator from Connecticut, a Democrat. They have different political persuasions, and they have us very close to passing a very important mental health bill in the Senate—one that passed the House yesterday. They have worked hard on that. We are going to get that done this year. I would like to do it next week, but if not, we should be able to do it in September.

Earlier today, I went to the National Education Association annual convention, where there were 10,000 teachers from all over the country, and they gave the Friend of the NEA Award to Senator MURRAY of Washington State and to me. Thirty years ago, when I was Governor of Tennessee, I would have gotten the ''public enemy of the NEA'' award. But what they like and what teachers and Governors and chief State school officers and parents like was that last year we came together and fixed No Child Left Behind. We stopped Washington from telling schools so much about what to do and restored that responsibility where it ought to be—with teachers and parents and Governors and legislators. We have been thanked for that because it affects 50 million children and 3½ million teachers and 100,000 public schools. We did our job.

So there is mental health, there is fixing No Child Left Behind, and we are working on something called 21st century cures. The House of Representatives has passed it. Again, the Senator from Louisiana has been working on an important part of it having to do with electronic medical records as an example. This has the opportunity to be by far the most important legislation we pass this year, and we will pass it because it is part of Speaker RYAN's agenda; the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, wants to pass it; and the President of the United States is interested in it because of his focus on precision medicine and the Vice President's focus on Cancer Moonshot. There is funding for the BRAIN Initiative, which has to do with Alzheimer's. These are breathtaking discoveries which we are on the verge of in America and which would affect millions of people—research for that and then moving them through the regulatory and investment process and into the medicine cabinets.

I saw a Forbes poll the other day that showed that 82 percent of the American people would like for Congress to do more on biomedical research. They agree on that. We are doing that.

So there are three things: fixing No Child Left Behind, mental health, and 21st century cures. Then we get to opioids and we get to Zika. So what has happened here? This reminds me of the Hatfields and the McCoys in the mountains of Kentucky and Tennessee. They fought so long, they forgot what they were fighting about. They just killed each other because that is what their grandfathers did.

We have two issues here of intense interest to the American people, and we are on the verge of a significant step to help. The first is Zika. The Zika virus is terrifying young women in our country. They are postponing their pregnancies. They are afraid to have babies. They are afraid their babies will be born with deformities because we have found that if women have the Zika virus, some women have babies who have deformities when they are born. There will be a vaccine for that by 2018, perhaps. That is part of the 21st century cures initiative I was just talking about—more money for the National Institutes of Health to speed that along. But between now and then, we need to take every step we need to take to help keep the Zika virus from infecting as many people as we can.

This is a very simple disease. It is carried by a mosquito, and if a mosquito bites you, you get the Zika virus. For many people, it makes no difference, but for pregnant women, it could be a problem. It is July, and the mosquitoes are out, and it is time to eradicate the mosquitoes. The Centers for Disease Control asked us for money, and so we passed $1.1 billion here, money for Zika. We are ready to pass $1.1 billion. Because of a small provision the House of Representatives put in that has to do with who is a Medicaid provider in Puerto Rico—there are many Medicaid providers in Puerto Rico who can go about this business in July and August and September to deal with trying to keep the mosquitoes away. Our friends on the other side of the aisle won't let us pass the bill.

Now, let's stop and think about this. This is the Hatfields and McCoys at its worst. This is not the same spirit we had when fixing No Child Left Behind. It is not the same spirit we had working with the President and Speaker RYAN and Senator MCCONNELL on 21st century cures. It is not the same spirit Senator MURPHY and Senator CASSIDY have shown in taking grave differences over mental health and putting them in in a way that we will get some advances on that this year. There is no excuse whatsoever for delaying the spending of $1.1 billion to help pregnant women and other families avoid the Zika virus this summer. We don't need mosquito control in the winter; we need it in the summer. And we need to pass it now because we leave and go away on our recess and come back in September.

There may be a provision in the bill that some of us would have written a different way. Maybe some of us would like some more money. But the provision that is offensive to some people is a very small provision. There are Medicaid providers all over Puerto Rico who can deal with this part of the money, and there is no excuse for not approving the $1.1 billion that we are ready to spend for Zika, period, and it is wrong for the Democrats to block that. It is wrong as it can be, and it is not in the right spirit.

I think I have a reputation here for trying to get results. I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Please stop and think about this. This is the Hatfields and McCoys example that the American people really don't like. We are on the verge of doing something that would help a lot of Americans, especially young women, and we ought to do it. We ought to do it today or next week, and we surely

should not go home without having done it.

The other thing we are on the verge of doing well is helping deal with opioids. Again, we are in a Hatfields-and-McCoys situation, apparently. I hope we avoid it, but we may be, and I would like to avoid that as well. We have talked a lot about the opioids abuse. I know what happens in Tennessee. Opioid overdose is killing more people every year than car wrecks or gunshots—car wrecks or gunshots. I had a roundtable in Knoxville several months ago. It was filled with people—judges, parents, doctors, hospital managers. Everybody is overwhelmed with this. They want some help in doing it. We can't fix it from here, but we can support those on the frontlines, and we are doing it. We are making some changes.

We have come back to Secretary Burwell and the President and said: Change the provision on the pain management survey that hospitals are telling us encourage doctors to overprescribe opioids. Well, at first they didn't listen, but to the President's credit and to Secretary Burwell's credit, they did it; they listened and they did it at the urging of Congress.

They have increased the level of prescriptions that treatment doctors can prescribe. That was something Senator PAUL, Senator MARKEY, and Democrats and Republicans in the House wanted to do. We might do more of it, but that was the TREAT Act.

Then we came up with a bipartisan opioid bill in the Senate and in the House. It has contributions from half the Democrats and many of the Republicans. In the House, it passed 400 to 1. In the Senate, it passed 94 to 1. Pardon me, it was 400 to 5 in the House and 94 to 1 here. It has more than 200 groups across the country who say opioid abuse is an epidemic and a crisis, so let's fix it. So we have taken a substantial step to fix it.

Yesterday we approved a merger of what the House did and the Senate did, and both will come to the House and next week to the Senate for approval.

One would think that something that had passed the Senate 94 to 1, when it comes back for approval, would pass again 94 to 1. One would think that something as urgent as dealing with opioid drug abuse—an epidemic, as I said, that is killing more people every year in my State than gunshots, killing more people every year in my State than car wrecks—one would think we would want to do something about it, particularly when we have worked hard and we have a very good package. Two hundred of the advocacy groups in this country who work on opioid abuse like what we have done.

So what is the problem? Well, our friends on the other side say you need to fund it. We are funding it, and they helped fund it. Over the last 3 years, count the last two Congresses where the money was already appropriated, in other words, it is there to spend; count the amount of money the Senate Appropriations Committee has approved, we have increased funding for opioids already by 542 percent. For those working on their math, that is five times more than we were doing 2½ years ago. Then the House of Representatives came along today and said: We want to go even further than that. That is in the regular appropriations process. That is how we do our business here.

For example, last year, as I mentioned, we fixed No Child Left Behind. The President called it a Christmas miracle. Everybody is happy about it. It doesn't spend a penny. It reformed the education law. We spend the money in the appropriations process.

Every year we pass a Defense authorization bill. It reforms everything that has to do with keeping us safe in the country, but we don't spend a penny. That is in the appropriations process.

We have an energy bill we are going to conference on. It doesn't spend a penny. That is in the appropriations process.

So we are spending money on opioids. We are spending money on opioids. A five times increase over 2½ years, in addition to policy that 200 groups support and that passed the Senate 94 to 1. Now, some say there should be more. I agree. I would like to spend even more for opioids. I would like to see a more significant amount of money for State grants to help with opioids because that is where the bottom line is, but there are a lot of discussions going on about doing that. There is some discussion about doing that in the 21st century cures bill, perhaps. We talked about it and even voted on it last year. Republicans put through a bill in our so-called reconciliation process in which all but five Republicans in the Senate and House voted for $750 million each year for 2 years for opioids. That is $750 million each year for opioids. That is $1.5 billion the Republicans voted for. The President vetoed it because it also repealed ObamaCare. We thought we were getting two good things—repeal ObamaCare and support opioids. Of course, the President disagreed with that. This isn't all on Democrats or Republicans because we have also voted for more money for opioids.

But let's get out of this Hatfields-and-McCoys posture in this last week or 10 days before the convention starts when we are dealing with the lives of so many Americans. Every Senator who talked yesterday at the conference report had some story of someone from his or her State who had died from an opioid abuse—several from one family in several cases. Everyone has that story. Then how can we dare go home next week without having passed a policy that everyone who understands the subject says will help, in terms of prevention and State grants and treatment and a variety of other things, and when we have increased funding by five times over 2½ years—how can we dare go home without having passed that?

Can we continue to talk about even more funding? Yes, I am ready to do that. I would like to do it. I would like to find a way to do it, but that doesn't mean we stop doing what we can do now. So I am on the floor today—and let me just remind my friends on the other side of the aisle, this opioids conference is not a Republican bill. It is filled with Democratic priorities.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE is the lead sponsor, the Senator from Rhode Island. He is passionate about it. There are 44 Democratic Senators who voted for his version of it. Senator WARREN is the lead sponsor for the Reducing Unused Medication Act. It is in the package. Senator DURBIN led an amendment regarding the opioid action plan at the FDA that is included. Senator SHAHEEN and nine other Democratic Senators led the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reauthorization which is included. Congressman SARBANES has a bill on expanding access through cold prescribing. Senator CASEY introduced a plan of safe care improvement that was included. Senators BROWN, KING, and MANCHIN are cosponsors of a Healthy Babies Act that was included. Senators BROWN, KING, CASEY, and FEINSTEIN were coauthors in another provision. We all put this together. We all care about it. The people we work for all need our help. We should pass it. We should pass it.

To come up with a lame excuse that we are not funding it when, in fact, we are—five times more over 2½ years—that is not the kind of thing that will gain respect for the U.S. Senate.

I am here today as someone who spends most of his time trying to get results in this body, and often achieves results. I do that only because of relationships with Democratic Members as well as Republican Members. I told the National Education Association today to give PATTY MURRAY a big hand for being the friend of the NEA on fixing No Child Left Behind because it would not have happened without her.

I would say that when we pass the opioids conference, give a big hand to Senators DURBIN and SHAHEEN and Congressman SARBANES and especially Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator CASEY, and Senator WARREN because they all made major contributions to this, they voted for the funding over the last 2 years, and I am sure they will this year, which will go up at least five times—five times.

So let's put the Hatfields and McCoys back in Kentucky and Tennessee. Let's say young women all over the country are terrified by the Zika virus. Let's spend $1.1 billion or make it available for the Centers for Disease Control now to help. Let's take this opioids conference report we are on the verge of passing that we are all for, and let's do it and go home. And let's add to the fixing No Child Left Behind, the 21st century cures progress, the mental health progress, our work on opioids abuse, and our work on Zika. That

would be what the American people would expect of us, and I hope that by the end of next week, we find a way to do it.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from West Virginia.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. President, for recognizing me, and I want to thank the chairman of the HELP Committee, the Senator from Tennessee, who has in the Senate made a very passionate argument on why we should be passing the bill that contains the Zika funding but also for the opioid and heroin abuse overdose issue that we have in this country.

He did mention the Hatfields and McCoys more than a few times in reference to Tennessee and Kentucky, and I will throw West Virginia in there because we have a good history of Hatfields and McCoys. We understand a feud, and I don't like to see a feud over these issues either. This is about health care, women and babies, and these are families who are torn apart by this scourge of opioid and heroin abuse.

I would like to talk about the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, known as CARA, and strongly urge my colleagues to lay down the feud and have common sense. I am going to talk about why this is so very important.

This is a comprehensive step forward. It has been worked on for years. This is not a fly-by-night bill. This is a very comprehensive bill, a national response to the drug epidemic that we see like a fire rushing across America. It expands prevention and education efforts and promotes resources for treatment and recovery. I say often there is no one solution to this problem. There is a spectrum of solutions, and CARA addresses a spectrum of solutions. It helps law enforcement respond, provides resources for treatment, alternatives to incarceration. I know many Senators have been to see and visit drug court programs that have had successful graduations. They have gotten people back on their feet. They operate in West Virginia and many other States.

I was very pleased to see many elements of the Senate-passed bill included in the final conference report. Members on both sides of the aisle and the Senator from Tennessee talked about many of those Members who have worked hard to create the realities of those living with and impacted by addiction. The bill is just a commonsense response so let's have a commonsense vote in response to the commonsense bill.

For me, my personal passion has been the ability to craft several provisions that are included in this conference bill, one that would provide for safer, more effective pain management services to our veterans. Too many of our veterans are having opioid abuse and opioid overdoses in conjunction with care at the VA.

Another provision from Senator KAINE from Virginia would coprescribe naloxone, a drug that would reverse the effects of opioid overdose with prescription opioids. Another provision would increase access to important followup services. Again, it is another bipartisan amendment to prevent overprescribing. There is also a provision that would improve acute pain-prescribing practices. You have acute pain which is different than having constant pain. What are the prescribing protocols for that? We have too many stories of addiction that started with patients taking painkillers after suffering a minor injury or a minor surgery. Also, there are provisions that would allow doctors to partially fill certain opioid prescriptions. Senator WARREN from Massachusetts and I worked together on this. This helps to limit the availability of unused painkillers.

Lastly, a provision I worked on with my colleague from West Virginia on the House side, Congressman JENKINS, would protect babies who are born exposed to opioids during pregnancy and get them the specialized care they need. We see it in Lily's Place in Huntington, and we need to have this across the country.

In March, we stood together and passed this bill 94 to 1, with broad bipartisan support. CARA has had broad bipartisan support in the House as well, but not one single Democrat signed the conference report. What changed? What happened? I don't know. Out of the blue, after they had already voted for this, they demanded a new mandatory funding—which means a different type of funding out of the Appropriations Committee was not added to this bill in conference. Some apparently believe that without this funding, CARA is not worth passing. I strongly disagree for the reasons I am going to line out. This is not the view of the over 200 treatment organizations that are in favor of this conference report—groups such as the Addiction Policy Forum, the American Psychological Association, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Addiction and Treatment Providers. These groups are calling for quick action on this conference report. They wrote a letter stating ''the report is truly a comprehensive response to the opioid epidemic which includes critical policy changes and new resources.''

The letter continues, ''As you know, 129 Americans die each day as a result of a drug overdose and this epidemic affects the public health and safety in every community across the country,'' not to mention the devastation, and I have seen it in my own communities, to families all across this Nation. ''This bill is the critical response we need.''

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, we all worked hard to ensure our States have the resources they need to win this fight, and I will not stop in this fight. The appropriations bills we have passed in committee provide substantial new resources. Under these bills, total funding to address heroin and opioid abuse will more than double the 2015 levels.

You can see on this chart that in 2015 it was $220 million. In 2016, we had a 46-percent increase to $321 million. In the bill that came out of the Senate Appropriations Committee that had bipartisan support, there was a 46-percent increase to $470 million. Those are significant resources that can help and will help in the treatment and gets money to our providers and to States for block grants.

Let's look at HHS discretionary appropriations that we passed in the appropriations bill that passed bipartisan. In 2015, we appropriated $41 million. In 2016, we increased that funding to $136 million, a 237-percent increase. This problem has been escalating across our country, and you can see it reflected in the dollars we are spending; in 2017, $262 million, which is a 93-percent increase. These are significant. It goes to problems that help with research, treatment, and community health centers. This is a very significant rise.

Our last chart shows what is in the conference report we are now considering. It goes out of the Senate at 78 million more dollars. The conference report comes back with $181 million, a 132-percent increase. Again, the urgency of what we are seeing is reflected in the real dollars we are willing to spend, so don't listen to the argument that no money is being spent. It couldn't be further from the truth. This is what has been decided and agreed upon in the Appropriations Committee in a bipartisan way to deal with this very difficult problem.

I think that 94 Members of this body already voted for this $78 million. Why in the world would we continue this feud that has been created and is bubbling up in a political fashion and turn our backs on a 132-percent increase in this conference report?

As I have shared on the floor several times before, this problem is particularly hard-hitting in the State of West Virginia, the State I represent. Unfortunately, West Virginia leads the Nation in drug-related overdose deaths—more than twice the national average. I mentioned that 129 Americans die every day. That means there are people dying in West Virginia in larger numbers per capita than in any other State in the Union. It also means we shouldn't be taking the time for partisan politics and delay the passage of a much needed piece of legislation.

I say this all the time because I believe it to be true. I hope it is not. I believe we are in danger of losing an entire generation to this scourge if we don't act with force, together, and make sure that we not only fund our programs but that we do the comprehensive approach to it that we see in this CARA bill.

I was on the floor yesterday talking about how we had witnessed Senate Democrats playing politics with critical funding for Zika, and now we are seeing a repeat. I hope we do not go through the same scenario. Let's not play political games with a veteran depending on the VA's ability to help them treat their opioid addiction or the newborn born dependent on opioids or the addict who is willing to seek treatment and needs the help CARA will provide. They do not deserve to be held hostage to a political situation.

I will proudly support the passage of the CARA conference report, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, one of the great privileges I have serving in the U.S. Senate is standing up every day on behalf of Montana agriculture. In fact, across the great State of Montana, signs of our State's strong agricultural heritage are at virtually every turn, from wheat and sugar beet fields, to grazing cattle and sheep. It is truly impossible to miss the expansiveness of our State's No. 1 economic driver, and that is agriculture.

Agriculture is more than just an economic driver of our State, it is a way of life for thousands of Montana families. It provides for a safe, reliable, and affordable food supply not only for our Nation but for the world. It supports tens of thousands of jobs throughout the State. Let me say that again. It supports tens of thousands of jobs in the State of Montana.

Over the past several weeks and months, I have heard directly from stakeholders in Montana—from the Montana Farm Bureau, the Montana Grain Growers Association, the Montana Sugar Beet Growers, the Montana Retailers Association, the Montana Chamber of Commerce, as well as researchers at Montana State University, my alma mater, a land-grant university. All demonstrated how their livelihoods would be negatively impacted if a single State on the east coast could be allowed to have such wide-raging impacts on jobs in Montana, as well as the price we pay at the grocery store.

I believe that a State like Vermont and the junior Senator from Vermont should not dictate the laws that govern our food and affect the prices Montanans pay at the checkout line.

Defenders of Vermont's fringe law and the ideology behind it ignore hardships on agricultural jobs. They ignore hardships on family incomes. They ignore scientific consensus. They ignore the existing transparency tools and the new ones created by this bipartisan compromise legislation.

Montanans were clear that Congress needed to act. While this bill is by no means perfect, its passage is important to prevent increased costs for businesses and higher prices at the checkout stands for families.

I have to say that I am outraged that the defenders of Vermont's law ignore these hardships. In eastern Montana, sugar beets are grown using biotech, and they are an economic driver for the State, and they are the source of thousands of jobs. The sugar beet industry contributes about $70 million a year to the Montana economy, as well as sugar factories in Billings and Sidney.

As Shane Strecker, the director of the Southern Montana Sugar Beet Growers, put it, ''Without biotechnology, the hundreds of jobs Montana's sugar beet industry supports would not exist.''

Make no mistake—this Vermont law is an attack on Montana's way of life, it is an attack on Montana's farm and ranch operations, and I am not going to stand for it. I will stand up for Montana and continue to fight to ensure that Montana's agricultural products are not unfairly and arbitrarily discriminated against. As always, I am proud to stand with Montana farmers, to stand with Montana ranchers, to stand with Montana agriculture, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

WYOMING'S BUDGET

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the tough situation my home State of Wyoming finds itself in and to urge my colleagues to take a page from Wyoming's book.

Last week, Wyoming's Governor proposed cutting $248 million from the State budget because Wyoming has seen a reduction in revenue. To my friends from urban States, $248 million might not sound like a lot of money, but that amounts to 8 percent of Wyoming's budget.

The downturn in energy development—particularly coal—reduced Wyoming's revenue last January, when the legislature met, and they had to make cuts. Then new figures came out after the legislature was over requiring the Governor to make cuts to meet the new level of revenue that there is, which is requiring him to make additional cuts of 8 percent.

Around here, we don't make cuts; we reduce the amount of increase a program gets and we call that a cut.

The Governor had a very clever way of prioritizing. He asked every agency to give him a list of the things they are doing and suggest where they would take a 1-percent cut, a 5-percent cut, and a 10-percent cut. Then all he had to do was compare the lists. If it wound up on all three lists, it wasn't that important. If it was only on the 1-percent list, maybe there was some value to that program.

That is the chart Wyoming is using to make their 8 percent cuts. That doesn't leave easy cuts for the Governor to make, but the Governor—while he acknowledged that he didn't like to cut, he did what he is supposed to do, and that is to lead the State.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has failed to do the same. We all agreed to the Budget Control Act in 2011, which called for average annual cuts that wound up—the one time we have done it—being 7 percent to 9 percent. But you have to remember that is from an increased baseline, not a total cut, and it happened in the fourth quarter of the year because we didn't get the spending bills done in time, which is the norm around here. But if you have to take a 2-percent cut in the last quarter of the year, you are making an 8-percent cut of the money that you have left. That is not far off from what Wyoming faces, and we have a lot more money and a lot more programs to work with to find those cuts at the Federal level. In fact, we have 260 programs that I keep talking about that have expired that we spend $293.5 billion on. I talked about that enough a year ago that we got that down to $256 billion, but now we are spending $310 billion on expired programs.

Wyoming's annual budget is $1.5 billion, compared to the Federal discretionary budget—those are the program we get to make decisions on—of $1,100 billion. Wyoming has about 8,500 State employees, compared to about 2.7 million Federal civilian employees. If Wyoming can find a way to cut its budget, the Federal Government should be able to do the same. But instead of leading the way, people in this body and the House and the administration acted like the sky was falling after they agreed to the Budget Control Act. As a result, while Wyoming stays on firm financial footing, the United States has gone from owing $14 trillion—that is $14,000 billion—in 2014 to owing $19 trillion—$19,000 billion—today, and we are on track to owe $29 billion by 2026.

Here is where one of the difficulties comes in. We are at $19 trillion and on our way to $20 trillion. If you were paying 1 percent interest on $20 trillion, that would be $200 billion a year. We are actually paying a little bit more than that already, but the norm for the Federal Government is 5 percent. If that $200 billion in interest becomes five times that amount, it becomes $1,000 billion in interest. I just mentioned that we only get to make decisions on $1,100 billion—actually, it is $1,070 billion. So if interest rates increase and we pay $1,000 billion in interest, we would have $70 billion left to fund the military, education, commerce, roads, everything that the Federal Government does right now.

We have to reverse that course and address the Federal Government's insatiable appetite for spending, which is leading to America's mammoth national debt. I have several ideas on how we can make reasonable but real progress on our debt.

First, we need to take a page from Wyoming's playbook. My home State has acknowledged how much money it has and is making targeted cuts to live within its means.

Unlike the Federal Government, they aren't trying to make the cuts hurt politically so they can get pressure from people to spend more and more. Let me explain. When we had the government shutdown because the spending bills weren't done a few years ago, the Administration shut down the national parks, which, incidentally, raise money for the Federal Government.

In Jackson Hole where the Tetons are, the federal government actually put up barriers so that people couldn't use the parking lot to take pictures. They also put up signs that said you can't park along the road. I had to ask the Park Service where they got the money to put up the barriers and I had to ask them why they put up the barriers to begin with.

They said: Well, we didn't want people putting their garbage there because there would be nobody to pick up the garbage.

I said: That is easy. Remove the garbage cans. There is no cost to that, and nobody will have to pick up any garbage.

But that's not the way the Federal Government does things. They don't look for the easy solution; they look for the most painful one. They even barricaded off the World War II Memorial here during the 2013 shutdown.

We furloughed a bunch of people during that time, but when they came back to work, we paid them for the time they were off. It really cost a lot to try to save a little bit of money and not get our work done on time.

We should learn to cut the worst first, not the best first, because if you cut the best, you have people complaining and they get the money reinstituted.

Governor Mead is making smart cuts. He is proposing smaller cuts for the department of corrections because that agency already saw its budget cut severely in March. The Department of Family Services faces a smaller cut because it serves as the State's safety net. And the Public Defender's Office isn't expected to see any cuts because they are already strapped for resources.

The Federal Government should be doing the same thing and cutting the worst first. I would argue that we should focus on identifying and eliminating the wasteful spending that occurs here in DC before we look to important programs and services in our home States, but this isn't something we should guess at. Like Wyoming, we should require all government departments and agencies to list what they do best and what they do worst, although I have never seen anyone admit to anything they do worst. So I would suggest we do the prioritization system like Wyoming went through where every agency has to list all the programs they do and suggest which ones they would cut at 1 percent, which ones they would cut at 5 percent, and which ones they would cut at 10 percent. That way we could tell which programs agencies felt were really the most valuable to fund and force agencies to make the easier cuts first instead of cutting the programs we need the most. That way, we can maintain what we do well and cut what we don't. We need to prioritize how we spend taxpayers' dollars, just like Wyoming.

Second, we need to implement my penny plan, which cuts overall spending by 1 percent—that is one cent out of every dollar we spend—and cap future spending so that government lives within its means. If we did that, within 5 years we could balance the budget.

Wyoming is finding a way to cut 8 percent. Why can't this body agree to cut 1 percent each year until our revenue is the same or less than expenditures? I am pretty sure after the first year people would say: You know, that wasn't too bad; we can live with that. And I think they would suggest we do two cents instead of one cent and get this done faster so that the next generation has hope for the same kind of country we have enjoyed.

Lastly, Congress needs to thoroughly consider and review its spending. The Wyoming Legislature considers its spending bills on time because they have created incentives to encourage it, and they use a 2-year spending cycle that provides more certainty and predictability than an annual cycle. Congress should follow Wyoming's lead by forcing timely consideration of regular appropriations bills—spending bills—and locking in that funding for 2 years instead of 1. A biennial process would also allow more time to review the details of proposed spending, eliminate duplication and waste and ensure the elimination of the worst first.

Mr. President, I would like to make one point to differentiate the problem Wyoming faces from the problem we face here. Wyoming is facing spending cuts because of declining revenues from oil, gas, and coal, which provide 70 percent of the State's budget. Those reductions are due to direct actions this administration has taken to make it harder to drill for oil and gas and to mine for coal.

But at the Federal level, we don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem. This year alone, we have seen attempts to increase spending by tens of billions of dollars without offsets. We cannot spend our way to prosperity. We definitely need to look at expired programs.

I sit up nights worrying about our Nation's $19 trillion debt and how it will affect our children and grandchildren. We have run out of money and are living on what we borrow from other countries. If we don't get serious about cutting spending soon, the programs people enjoy and rely on won't just shrink, they will disappear entirely—again, think about my example of what happens if we go to 5 percent interest for this country.

It is long past time for us to apply reasonable constraints on our spending, and if we need a blueprint of how to do it, we should look to my home State of Wyoming.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for all Members of the Senate, let me sum up where we are. There are three votes left to be cast. It is cleared on this side of the aisle to have all three of those votes momentarily. If there are objections to the consent request I am about to offer, the three votes would occur at 10:20 tonight. But whether we do it now or we do it then, there are three votes to finish the bill.

This bill is a product of a negotiation between the top Republican and the top Democrat on the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry which will protect middle-class families from unnecessary and unfair higher food prices, while also ensuring access to more information about the food we all purchase.

Chairman ROBERTS said this bipartisan bill will benefit consumers by greatly increasing the amount of food information at their fingertips, while avoiding devastating increases in the price of food.

The ranking Democrat on the committee, Senator STABENOW, noted that it will prevent a confusing patchwork of 50 different labeling requirements in 50 different States, and it recognizes the scientific consensus that biotechnology is safe.

It is the result of bipartisan work to address an issue that could negatively harm consumers and producers.

The amendments being bandied about threaten to derail this process, and the end result will be a tax on food for middle-class families.

So here is the deal, Mr. President. We need to pass it today. We need the House to take it up and pass it, and we need them to send it to the President to sign it. So the end game is clear. The only issue before the Senate at the moment is whether we do it in the near future or at 10:20 tonight.

Bearing that in mind, as I have said, we are prepared to vote on the Sanders alternative to the Roberts-Stabenow compromise language and to finish up this bill now rather than waiting until time expires at 10:20 tonight.

A bipartisan majority voted to end debate on the bill. Everyone has had an opportunity to be heard. It is time to finish this bill.

Under the regular order, there would be no further amendments on the bill. Under the consent agreement I am about to offer, the opponents would be able to vote on the Sanders alternative.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding

rule XXII, there be 20 minutes of postcloture time left, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that Senator SANDERS or his designee be allowed to offer amendment No. 4948 to the motion to concur with further amendment; finally, that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the Sanders amendment, with a 60-affirmative-vote threshold needed for adoption; and that following disposition of the Sanders amendment, the remaining amendment be withdrawn and the Senate vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment with further amendment with no further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the issue before this body is whether there is going to be an opportunity for amendments to be considered and voted upon.

We have heard today that we have three Republican amendments—three Republican amendments that address a prohibition on Federal labeling, that address criminal penalties, that address salmon. We also have three Democratic amendments we would like to have votes on.

Once upon a time—it now starts to seem like a fairy tale—this Senate was known as a great deliberative body. Well, a great deliberative body entertains ideas, discusses them, and votes on them. So in support and honor of the tradition of the Senate to put amendments forward and have them debated and voted upon, we are offering an alternative. I would ask the majority leader to modify his request and to do so in the following fashion: I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the only amendments in order to the motion to concur with respect to S. 764 with an amendment: Sanders No. 4948, Leahy No. 4966, Merkley No. 4969, Sasse No. 4972, Paul No. 4947, and Murkowski No. 4954; that there be 1 hour for debate, to run concurrently, prior to votes in relation to the amendments in the order listed; that all amendments be subject to a 60-vote threshold required for adoption; and that upon disposition of the amendments, all postcloture time be yielded back with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator has made a unanimous consent request for six amendments. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I go over each of these amendments, each one would undo the carefully crafted compromise that has been put together by the distinguished ranking member, Senator STABENOW, and me, so I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The objection is to the modification.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe everybody has objected. If not, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objections heard in duplicate.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, every now and then we have a chance to support a bipartisan bill that tackles a tough issue in the face of stiff, stiff opposition. The biotechnology bill before us today is just such legislation, and I come to the floor to speak in support of its passage.

This measure will avoid a patchwork of State labeling regulations, and in doing so will save families thousands of dollars a year, protect American jobs, and provide consumers with accurate, transparent information about their food. This bipartisan solution is a product of the hard work of Ag Committee Chairman PAT ROBERTS and Ranking Member DEBBIE STABENOW, who have shown real leadership in putting this bill together and are now working to get it passed.

Specifically, the Roberts-Stabenow biotechnology disclosure bill accomplishes three important objectives: First, it protects consumers by immediately ending the problem of having a patchwork of inconsistent State GMO labeling programs that would increase prices; second, it ensures farmers and ranchers can continue to provide Americans with an affordable, reliable, and safe food supply; third, it creates a uniform national disclosure system that will provide consumers with more information about their food products.

This bill will ensure that the Vermont GMO labeling law, which went into effect last week, July 1, does not end up costing American families billions of dollars when they fill up their grocery carts.

Food companies are already having to choose between one of three bad options for complying with the Vermont law and laws from additional States that may follow Vermont's lead: First, order new packaging for products going to each individual State with a labeling law; second, reformulate products so that no labeling is required; or third, stop selling to States with mandatory labeling laws. All of these options will increase the cost of food and could result in job losses in the ag economy.

For millions of Americans, the GMO or bioengineered food labeling program created by Vermont will impact the affordability of food without improving its safety. Testimony provided by the USDA, FDA, and EPA to the Senate Ag Committee last fall made clear that foods produced with the benefits of biotechnology are safe. Just last week, 107 Nobel laureates signed a joint letter to Greenpeace urging it to stop campaigning against biotechnology and GMOs, stating that ''Opposition [to GMO's] based on emotion and dogma contradicted by data must be stopped.''

The real risk is that if we don't address Vermont's GMO law, real families will have a tougher time making ends meet. In fact, if food companies have to apply Vermont's standards to all products nationwide, it will result in an estimated increase of over $1,050 a year per household. For families having a tough time paying bills, this is in essence a regressive tax, and it will hurt the poor more than those with substantial means.

From a jobs perspective, the story isn't any better. It has been calculated that if Vermont's law is applied nationwide, it will cost over $80 billion a year to switch products over to non-GMO supplies. Those billions of dollars a year in additional cost will hurt an ag and food industry that creates over 17 million jobs nationwide. In my State of North Dakota alone, 94,000 jobs and 38 percent of our State's economy rely on the ag and food economy.

This is a bad time to be making it more expensive to do business in the ag sector. Earlier this year, economists at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City testified that net farm income in 2015 is more than 50 percent less than it was in 2013, and it is expected to go down again in 2016. A State patchwork of food labeling laws will only make this situation worse, as many farmers who rely on biotech crops to increase productivity will be deprived of a critical tool. I know how hard farmers work and how much they put on the line every year when they have to take out an operating loan for crops that may or may not materialize. We shouldn't ask them to feed the Nation with one hand tied behind their backs by taking away biotechnology.

More than just overcoming the problems associated with having a patchwork of State regulations, I think it is important for Americans to know that this legislation ensures consumers have consistent, accurate information about the bioengineered content of their food. This measure creates greater transparency for consumers by putting in place a new national bioengineered food disclosure standard that will ensure products labeled as having been produced with biotechnology meet a uniform, national standard.

As I mentioned, foods produced with the aid of bioengineering are, according to the FDA, EPA, and USDA, safe.

However, many consumers do want to know if the food they are buying is produced using biotechnology, which is why this legislation provides a national bioengineered food labeling standard.

Many of us who sit on the Ag Committee would have preferred a voluntary labeling standard. After all, as has been demonstrated by scientific experts, whether a food contains bioengineered material is not a food safety issue. Yet there are many perspectives on this issue, and in the true spirit of compromise, Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW deserve a great deal of credit for coming up with a legislative solution.

This bill's national bioengineered food labeling standard will ensure that a consumer who buys a food product with text, symbol, or electronic link indicating bioengineered content in, say, North Dakota, for example, is purchasing a product that is held to the same disclosure standards as foods sold in another State—for example, New York or California. Meanwhile, this bill will provide regulatory flexibility to ensure farmers and ranchers can continue to produce affordable and reliable food for the Nation.

We need a solution, and this bill delivers that solution. It helps keep our Nation's food affordable, it supports jobs, and it provides consumers consistent information about bioengineered foods. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense measure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

MILCON-VA AND ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING BILL

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for once again reinforcing why it is so important for us to get this compromise bill—this bipartisan bill on agriculture biotech—to the President's desk so we can move on to take on other matters, and that is one of the matters I want to talk about now.

Again, I know that when we come into this Chamber and are on C–SPAN, sometimes for people who are watching or may be in the gallery, it is hard to understand some of what we are talking about. What I am talking about is a bill that I hope we vote on next week. It is a bill that in two separate measures went to the House with strong bipartisan support. Now it is coming back in what we call a conference report, and we are one vote away from potentially sending this bill to the President's desk. It has two parts. I am going to speak predominantly on the second part, but the first part has to do with funding our veterans.

I come from the State of North Carolina. We have a population of 10 million. Ten percent of our State—nearly 1 million of our citizens—are veterans. We are very proud of our military tradition, and we are certainly proud of those who have decided to call North Carolina their home after their military service. As a matter of fact, I think everybody in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—has veterans as a priority. I firmly believe that. That, I guess, is one of the reasons I am stunned that we have reached an impasse in moving forward and providing appropriations that will let us increase funding to veterans.

The bill that we seem not to be able to get consensus on—although we had consensus when we first sent it out of this Chamber—provides critical funding for veterans housing, for their disability compensation, for suicide hotlines, for treatment for PTSD, and for opioid addiction treatment. For all the promises that we are not keeping today, we can help fulfill those promises by providing the desperately needed funding the VA needs.

But instead of working to get this funding done, we are at an impasse now, and I simply don't understand it. To me, some of them may be genuine disagreements with the policy, but in some respects it feels a little bit like scoring political points, and I don't get it.

What I really want to talk about tonight is the other provision of the bill, and that has to do with something that is desperately needed in our Nation. It is funding—and taking seriously—the threat of the Zika virus.

Zika is here. We are in mosquito season. I went hiking this weekend, and I know mosquitoes are out in North Carolina. In fact, they are all over the Nation. We need to work quickly to get a vaccine. We need it desperately. We are told by the CDC we could be 18 months away from having a vaccine for Zika. What we need to do is make sure we are funding research efforts so that we can win the fight against Zika. But I will tell you, we can't do this without providing financial support.

As I said before, the Senate passed a bill earlier this year, and we sent it to the House. Now it is back in the Senate, and it is one vote away from going to the President's desk. The bill spends over $1 billion to fight Zika in all of its forms, and my Democratic friends voted for this bill earlier in the spring at the same funding level we talked about. There is discussion about spending more, but it seems illogical that we would spend nothing at all. That seems to be the position that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are taking right now.

We stand ready as Republicans in the majority to provide this funding, but it appears as though, because we have reached this political impasse, we could put Americans' health and safety at risk.

Again, we have a rollcall vote from earlier this year where most of us—virtually all of us—voted for $1.1 billion in funding. I will talk a little later about what that funding was directed toward. We have Members who voted with us on that bill who are not willing to vote now to send this to the President's desk.

I am going to submit for the record the list of people who voted for this bill the last time it was on the floor and are now voting against it. I am not going to spend time today with limited time to go through each of the Members. But it doesn't make sense to me when you have cases reported—5 cases in Colorado—yet we have someone opposing the bill. There are 24 cases in Pennsylvania, and before they supported it, and now they are opposing it. There are 27 cases in Virginia, 26 cases in Maryland, 52 cases in California, and 198 cases in New York, for a total of 671 cases that have been reported to date in the United States. Most of these are travel related, but we have the threat of sexual transmission. Now that we are in the height of mosquito season, we have the real threat of mosquitoes infecting American citizens, and the threat is real. Without going through the whole list, Florida is another example, with 162 cases reported already. It would seem to me that the Senators from Florida would want to get this funding to the President's desk so we can start solving the problem.

Again, Members who now oppose this funding voted for it just a couple of months ago. Again, if you add up the numbers, that is 671 cases solely in the States where Members now are opposing the bill, and the cases are growing. We now seem to be engaged in this political divide, which really is the Senate at its worst, and we are better than that.

I know there are a lot of reasons that have been put forth to oppose it in this version where they weren't against it before. There were some that said it is because we are not funding or we are preventing funding for certain organizations. It is not true. The funding can flow through Medicaid to any organization which provides health services that would be relevant to the disease.

The way you control the population of the mosquitoes that can potentially carry the disease is to kill them—to kill them where they breed. Right now we think, temporarily, for this mosquito season we should do whatever we can to make sure that we kill the potential source of the disease that is transmitted through these mosquitoes. It can be done. It can be done with chemicals the World Health Organization says is safe in so many other jurisdictions. All we are saying is during this mosquito season, before we get a vaccine, we use this chemical—this compound—that can kill Zika mosquitoes and prevent them from transmitting the disease. That doesn't seem like an unreasonable thing to do. For 180 days, allow us to try to dramatically reduce the threat to the population. These are commonsense policies.

The fact that we are having this discussion, the fact that we can't get it, the fact that time is running out and we have to get it done next week is ridiculous. We are well into the mosquito season. There is probably not anybody listening to this or in this Chamber right now that has not been bitten by a mosquito already this year.

Let's do what we have to do to keep America safe. Let's stop the partisan politics. Let's get this bill to the President's desk, and then let's move on to the many other things the American people expect us to tackle while we remain in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield my hour assigned to me to the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, eventually this evening, we will be voting on GMO labeling. As I mentioned earlier, this is the most politically contentious and divisive issue I can ever remember. I have been in Congress for a few years. Whenever this comes up in our caucus, it is going to be a heated argument. It evokes so many emotions, not just among the members of our caucus but certainly with the American people. It gets down to some basic questions.

If you are dealing with a food product that has bioengineered contents or genetically modified content, there are several questions we need to ask. The first question is, Should the consumer know this? Well, 92 percent of Americans believe, yes, they have a right to know if there is GMO content in the food they eat. That is what the polls show—92 percent. That is an overwhelming number when you have lived with polls as long as most of us have.

Then you ask a question, delving into it: Is that because GMO modified food is dangerous to a consumer?

I think the answer is very clear that the scientific analyses of GMO food have not reached that conclusion. They believe—the National Academy of Sciences and others—that GMO food by itself is not dangerous to consumers. That is the scientific evidence. Nevertheless, there is this strong public opinion that people want to know whether GMOs are part of the food that they are consuming.

I have done some research on this, and I am sure every Member has tried to look at this very carefully. The one article that has stuck with me through the entire debate was published in the New England Journal of Medicine in August of 2015 last year. It was about a year ago when two doctors, Dr. Philip Landrigan and Dr. Charles Benbrook, published this article in what I think is highly regarded as a nonpolitical professional medical journal, the New England Journal of Medicine.

They go through an analysis of GMO in foods. They acknowledge at the outset what I have already said—that there is no scientific evidence of danger if there is GMO content in your food. Then they take it to a different level—an important level, as far as I am concerned. Is there any difference in the way GMO products or plants are grown? The answer is yes, and it was designed to be different. This was inspired initially by Monsanto, a company that has a major presence in my State. It was designed to create a seed corn that they made and sold that was resistant to an herbicide—that is a weedkiller—Roundup or glyphosate. They were selling the seed corn, which obviously is a source of profit for them and then encouraging the farmers who bought it to use this weedkiller or herbicide in their fields, saying this herbicide would not hurt the corn crop, just the weeds.

These two doctors of the New England Journal of Medicine then proceeded to analyze what happened next. What happened was that over time, there were weeds that were becoming more and more resistant to Roundup—stronger, thicker, bigger weeds. To put it a different way, Mother Nature was not cooperating with Monsanto. Weeds were appearing that they didn't anticipate. So they decided to apply even more of this herbicide, this weedkiller called Roundup, to see if that controlled the problem, and it didn't. They had to add another weedkiller—another herbicide—2,4–D, which has a long history in the United States, and then they started combining the two, hoping to stop the weeds with this new combination.

The net result, which these two doctors published in this article of the New England Journal of Medicine, was a dramatic increase in this glyphosate—this Roundup, that was being applied across the world. Roundup-ready crops now account for more than 90 percent of corn and soybeans planted in the United States. They go on to say:

> But widespread adoption of herbicide-resistant crops has led to overreliance on herbicides and, in particular, on glyphosate.
>
> In the United States, glyphosate use has increased by a factor of more than 250—from 0.4 million kg in 1974 to 113 million kg in 2014. Global use has increased by a factor of more than 10. Not surprisingly, glyphosate-resistant weeds have emerged and are found today on nearly 100 million acres in 36 states. Fields must now be treated with multiple herbicides, including 2,4–D, a component of the Agent Orange defoliant used in the Vietnam War.

The EPA anticipates that a 3-to-7-fold increase in 2,4–D use will be the result of these Roundup resistant weeds. Is that important? I think it is very important. It is important because we know that if you apply large quantities of chemicals to our agricultural fields, you may produce and harvest a big crop, but there is an environmental risk. How much of a risk depends on the chemicals being provided, being used by the farmers.

If GMO foods on your table are not a concern to your family because of scientific analysis, there is another question. Is the method that is being used to grow these Roundup-resistant crops, these GMO crops, an environmental danger to anyone? These two doctors came to a conclusion that it is—a determination in 2015 that glyphosate is a probable human carcinogen and 2,4–D is a possible human carcinogen.

Because of the link between these chemicals and cancer, these two doctors have concluded that labeling is important so consumers know that they are consuming products that on the table are no danger but that may have called for the use of more chemicals leading to more environmental danger. They conclude that there should be labeling. It is a different approach, but it is one that I think is valid, and it comes from a totally nonpolitical source—the New England Journal of Medicine.

The question then comes, if we are going to have labeling, what kind of labeling? I mentioned earlier today—and I want to repeat it—that my hat is off to the Campbell Soup Company. They have been around a long time. They put out information in a press release in January of this year announcing that they supported the enactment of Federal legislation to establish a single mandatory labeling standard for foods derived from genetically modified organisms.

They went on to say that Campbell's believes it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide a national standard for labeling requirements to better inform consumers. I agree.

They go on to say that the notion of every State setting a labeling standard is madness. It would be impossible for major food manufacturers to keep up with the variety of different labeling requirements, and it isn't practical in a nation like ours for us to really accommodate that kind of labeling requirement.

Campbell's has stepped forward and said we don't believe that GMOs in our product are any danger to consumers, and we are prepared to declare on our product, in clear words, whether or not they contain genetically modified organisms. I think this is a responsible corporate answer to a vexing problem we faced for years.

I salute Campbell's for trusting consumers and trusting their ability to convince consumers the food they are selling is wholesome. I wish the food industry had followed the Campbell's motto, but the bill we have before us does not. It provides three different opportunities to disclose on food products—mandatory—whether or not they contain genetically modified organisms. One is a simple declaration: GMO, non-GMO. The second is using something that will be developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and that consumers will come to learn—a signal or some sort of a sign or symbol as to whether GMO is included.

It is the third approach that troubles me the most. I have said this over and over to the people in the food industry across America who support this approach. I call this the secret decoder ring approach. What it means is, if you are a consumer walking into a store buying groceries for your family, you will be facing what is known as a QR. I am learning as it goes on what this

means. It is one of those little boxes with squiggles in it, which makes no sense to you as you look at it, but it can be read by a computer. That reading would then signal whether or not you receive additional information. I think that is deceptive. I think it is unnecessary, and I think Campbell's has the right approach.

The QR codes would literally have consumers who want to know—and 92 percent do want to know—about the GMOs in their food either use their cell phones on the products they are about to buy in the grocery store or turn to some reader in the grocery store that will give them a page or two of information about the contents. I really believe that is an attempt to obfuscate the situation. I think most consumers will rightly assume that if there is not a clear declaration on the product which shows that it is non-GMO, that it contains GMOs.

I think the food industry is taking an approach which can't be defended with a straight face. Can you really expect a busy consumer—a mother with children in her shopping cart to pull out her cell phone and stop at every can of soup to try to get a reading and then read her cell phone to see if there is a page or two of information about that product? That isn't fair to consumers, and that is why major consumer organizations oppose this bill. It is one of the major reasons I oppose the bill as well.

If there were a declaration, such as a symbol, or straight acknowledgement of wording as to whether the product contains GMOs or is non-GMO, which every seasoned consumer would come to understand, I think that is an honest approach. I don't think it is reasonable or honest to expect a consumer to have to scan a QR code and then have to read their cell phone to determine what is in the product.

Let me conclude by saying I salute those who have taken up this battle. Many have taken this up for many different reasons. It has been a vexing and contentious issue for a long period of time. I do not support State labeling. We have to avoid that. I do support honest disclosures on food products so American consumers who rightly believe they have a right to know have a way of finding that information in a way that is reasonable.

I also want to add that it is my understanding that there is a 2-year delay in terms of imposing this requirement. I don't know why 2 years would be necessary. It would seem to me that if Campbell's can move on this more quickly, the rest of the food industry should be able to do so as well.

I thank the Senator from Oregon, who has been working hard on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that either directly or indirectly, the Senator from Oregon controls the time, but he has agreed to yield up to 10 minutes to me to make some comments. I wish to confirm that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I do not control the time. I was prepared to speak, but when my colleague requested to go first, I asked if he might keep his comments to a reasonable period.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I had the nature of the courtesy slightly wrong, but nevertheless the principle remains, and I appreciate the cooperation of my colleague. I will keep my comments to 10 minutes, especially if the Presiding Officer is kind enough to inform me when the 10 minutes has expired.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I wish to speak about an epidemic that every one of us knows is raging across every one of our States and is absolutely the case in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that is the heroin and opioid epidemic. This is excruciating to so many families. I think at this point we all know people who have been victims of this epidemic. I certainly do. We have to do all we can about this issue.

I have the privilege of being the chairman of a health subcommittee on the Finance Committee. In that capacity, I have tried to learn what I can about this epidemic. I have traveled all across Pennsylvania hosting roundtable discussions, field hearings, and getting as much input as I can. What I have learned is that there are at least three things that we could be doing here in Congress to at least help address this terrible epidemic of opioid and prescription drug abuse. None of them is a silver bullet that will end this epidemic, but it can help, and we need to do what we can to help. No. 1, we can reduce the diversion of these powerful prescription narcotics, and there are ways we can do that. No. 2, we can deal with overprescribing because that is a problem. No. 3, we can improve access to and the quality of treatment for people who are already addicted. We have an opportunity to make progress on all three of these really important areas if we will just approve the conference report on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. We know it as CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, which we will be voting on soon. Let me quickly run through how this bill helps in all three of these areas.

No. 1, I mentioned reducing the diversion of powerful narcotics. The Government Accountability Office estimated that in a single year, 170,000 Medicare beneficiaries were doctor shopping. That is to say they were going to multiple doctors getting multiple prescriptions, getting them all filled at multiple pharmacies, and ending up with a commercial-scale quantity of these powerful, addictive narcotics. And 170,000 is a tiny percentage of Medicare beneficiaries, but it is a big number.

When Medicaid and commercial insurers discovered there were people on their plans doctor shopping, they came up with a device to stop it. It is called lock-in. What they do is, when they discover a person is doctor shopping, they require that person to get their prescription from a single doctor and a single pharmacy so they can't continue the abuse.

This tool does not exist in Medicare. I sat down with Senator BROWN, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator KAINE and wrote a bill that would give Medicare the power that Medicaid and private insurers already use that would allow Medicare to lock in a patient to a single prescriber and a single pharmacy when they discover doctor shopping.

This has broad bipartisan support. The President called for this legislation in his budget. The Pew Charitable Trusts, law enforcement officers, doctors, and seniors groups all support this legislation. It will help stop fraud, help coordinate care, reduce costs, but most importantly, it will safe lives. It will reduce the diversion of addictive narcotics onto the streets, and that is something we can do.

This bill that Senators BROWN, PORTMAN, KAINE, and I wrote is in CARA. It is in this legislation. It is a good thing.

No. 2, I mentioned reducing overprescribing. The Centers for Disease Control has found that we are, in fact, overprescribing opioids for many medical conditions, and doctors don't always know this when they are seeing a patient. They don't know that maybe there is another doctor who is maybe providing similar or equivalent prescriptions. There is an electronic database system that would allow physicians to know what a patient has already been prescribed so they wouldn't create an excessive or inappropriate prescription. It is a called prescription drug monitoring program, or PDMP, and it will provide that information, such as the patient's history.

Senator SHAHEEN was the lead on the bill. Senator COLLINS and I joined her on this legislation in order to provide assistance to States to make sure their prescription drug monitoring programs are interoperable across State lines. This is a tool that will help reduce the overprescription and end up making sure we have better care and diminish the incidence of these narcotics getting into the wrong hands.

Finally, I mentioned that we need to improve access to and the quality of treatment. The CARA bill does that in a number of ways. It will establish a demonstration program for evidence-based treatment programs. It will help connect individuals battling addiction with services. It expands access to naloxone, or Narcan, which is a drug that immediately reverses the effects of the overdose and saves lives. CARA will help law enforcement set up heroin

task forces, and it will increase opioid drug disposal sites.

There is a lot here. This is very constructive. The bill has enormous and broad bipartisan support. CARA passed in the Senate 94 to 1. It passed in the House 400 to 5. The conference report we will be considering is substantively the same as the bill that passed the Senate. In fact, it is broader and does more to help deal with this terrible problem. It has the support of all kinds of public health groups. It has Democratic and Republican ideas. It is exactly the kind of thing that we should come together and get done.

I urge my colleagues not to play politics with this one. I know this is the political season and there is a temptation. It has happened with other pieces of legislation. But this is too important. There is broad bipartisan support. It is constructive. It won't end the epidemic, but it will save individual lives and help us make progress for the people we represent.

I hope that very soon we will approve this conference report and get it over to the House so they can approve it and get it to the President's desk. I am sure the President will sign it. That is exactly what we need to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 2 hours to the junior Senator from Oregon, Senator JEFF MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, tonight in this Chamber, we are discussing an issue that is of concern to millions of Americans. It is an issue that goes to the heart of one of the most important concerns to a family, and that is the food that we eat as adults or parents and that we provide to our children. The real heart of the question is, Does a citizen have a right to know what is in the food they are putting into their own mouths or putting on the dinner table for their children?

The simple point that I will argue day and night is that a citizen does have that right. It is the right to have information about an issue related to your family's health and related to the environment. How can you, as a consumer, make responsible choices related to both the health of your family and the health of the environment if you do not have the information at the point you are purchasing a product? That is why we have all kinds of information disclosure rules in America. For example, let's say you are considering buying fish in the supermarket. If the fish is farm-raised, it has to say on the package that it is farm-raised. Why is that rule in place? Well, that rule is in place because people buying the fish often care a lot about whether it is a wild fish or a farm-raised fish. They care in part because it may differ in the quality of the food they are putting in their body and because the way that farmed fish are raised may raise concerns about the environment and they may want to exercise a choice of only buying wild fish. That is why it is on the label.

Why do we put the number of calories on the label? This is an issue citizens care about. Folks often wonder how much that food is going to add to their weight or how much they may need to exercise.

By the way, folks also want to know how much sugar is in a product, how much fat is in a product, how much unsaturated fat, and whether there are peanuts in a product. We answer these questions because consumers care about these issues. It is related to the consumers' health, and that is the key. The consumer has a right to know. Tonight we are addressing a specific issue, which is the right to know whether the ingredients in the food we are eating are genetically modified, has gene splicing occurred to change the makeup of the food we are eating.

Just a little while ago, the Senator from Illinois was sharing a study with this body from the New England Journal of Medicine in which two doctors looked very carefully at this question and they came away with a simple conclusion: It is reasonable, they found, for citizens to be concerned about the impact of consuming GMO ingredients, and therefore it is reasonable for citizens to be able to have this information on the package and they supported labeling.

I know from other studies I have examined, that in areas where glyphosate, a weedkiller, is applied, which is very much tied to glyphosate resistance to genetically modified crops—crops such as sugar beets and soybeans and corn—we have results that show the glyphosate actually ends up in samples of the rainwater because it is dispersed in a spray. We have results that show it ends up in the urine of people who live in these areas, and we know various international bodies have said glyphosate is a probable carcinogen. So if it is showing up in urine, as a parent, you might have concern about a probable carcinogen showing up in that fashion and what impact it might have on your health.

There are those here who say we can't find an established cancer cluster that is directly related so we are comfortable making the decision for the men and women and children of America. We are comfortable denying the right to know. That is why this bill is labeled the DARK Act: Deny Americans the Right to Know.

I am going to go through how it is that this act that is before us tonight—which has been presented as a mandatory labeling bill and is nothing of the such. In fact, it is an effort to guarantee that citizens do not get a label they can use.

So let's talk about these various loopholes in this bill—these Monsanto loopholes. Monsanto loophole No. 1. One may wonder why I call it a Monsanto loophole. Well, first, Monsanto is the biggest producer of Roundup. That is the commercial name for glyphosate. They sell it across the country, and they sell it along with their seed for GMO soybeans and GMO sugar beets and GMO corn. So they sell the plants to be raised that are tolerant to this weedkiller, glyphosate, and then they sell the glyphosate itself, and that has resulted in a massive increase in the amount of weedkiller applied across America.

That has a variety of impacts that people are concerned about related to the environment. It has an impact because we start to see the emergence of superweeds—which are weeds that because they are exposed so often and there are random mutations, they start to become resistant to glyphosate so you have to apply more of it than you did before—or, as pointed out in this article my colleague from Illinois was reading from a little while ago, you have to start applying a different weedkiller because of the emerging superweeds resistant to the weedkiller Roundup.

Also, we have the evolution of superbugs. Now, what is a superbug? The corn has been modified so then not only is it resistant to glyphosate or the weedkiller, but it also produces a pesticide inside the cells called Bt corn. I think many citizens would want to know more about that. They would be a little bit concerned that there is a genetic code inside every cell of the corn plant that is designed to generate a pesticide within the cell of the corn. And then if they looked into it a little further, they would find out the insect this is attempting to kill is also starting to evolve to be resistant to this pesticide. So not only are they concerned about does this pesticide get generated inside the corn kernel, since the DNA grower of this pesticide is now inside every cell, but what about the evolution of superbugs—bugs which now, because they are resistant to the pesticide inside the corn, are in a cornfield and the farmer has to start to apply other pesticides to the corn as well.

What happens when this pesticide runs off the cornfield? What happens when the weedkiller, glyphosate—Roundup—runs off the cornfield or the sugar beet field? This runoff puts a lot of weedkiller into our creeks and into our streams and into our rivers, and that has an impact on the biology of the streams. So a key concern is the issue of the impact of this type of farming surrounding these particular genetic modifications and its impact on our environment.

In addition, we have another impact where it is heavily applied. It has killed the milkweed, and the milkweed has been the primary food for monarch butterflies so we see a huge crash in the Midwest population of the monarch butterfly. Well, that is reasonable for people to be concerned about.

Just this weekend, I was talking to some friends and we were all relating that when we were kids, we saw monarch butterflies all the time, and this is in Oregon. Now, the population hasn't crashed equally everywhere, but it certainly has diminished greatly, even in my State of Oregon. We were noting that our kids are not even sure what a monarch butterfly looks like. That is how much of the population has decreased.

In a very short period of time, we have had a profound impact on the environment. That is a reasonable concern for individuals.

Here we have a bill that says we are going to label products as GMO in order to address the citizens' concern, except the bill doesn't actually do that, and it has some serious loopholes that serve Monsanto and its various crops very well. So let's look at the first Monsanto loophole; that is, that the definition exempts most of the Monsanto GMO crop. Let's address that a little bit.

What does the bill actually say? Well, it starts with a definition of bioengineering that is not used anywhere else in the world. I will just read it: ''The term 'bioengineering,' and any similar term, as determined by the Secretary with respect to a food, refers to food: that contains genetic material''—those key words, ''contains genetic material''—''that has been modified through in vitro recombinant techniques.''

And I will go to the second loophole in a moment. So it says ''that contains genetic material.''

Isn't that clever because, you see, here is the way it works. When you take genetically modified corn and you make high-fructose corn syrup, the genetic material is stripped out. So what this definition does is it says that GMO high-fructose corn syrup used in products throughout America is magically no longer considered GMO in the definition in this bill. Furthermore, the same thing with sugar beets. GMO sugar beets produce GMO sugar, except that under this definition, once again, the genetic material is stripped out so the sugar is magically not a GMO ingredient. How about soybeans? The same issue. Soybean oil does not contain genetic material. So this definition, used nowhere else in the world, was written specifically targeted to exempt the three big Monsanto GMO crops and the things that are made from them.

We have looked across the country and many people—many scientists, many groups—have pointed out this shortcoming. The Food and Drug Administration gave technical advice and made it very clear that this definition fails the test of covering these products—high-fructose corn syrup and soybean oil—but here is what another person from outside government said: ''This definition leaves out a large number of foods derived from GMOs such as corn and soybean oil, sugar beet sugar, and HFCS''—high-fructose corn syrup. ''That is because, although these products are derived from or are GMOs, the level of DNA in the products is very low and it is generally not sufficient to be detected in DNA based assays.''

So here is what happens then. If we were to look at definitions around the world—everywhere in the world—corn oil from GMO corn would be a GMO ingredient. That would be true whether you are talking about the two dozen-plus countries in the European Union or you go south to Brazil or you go around the world to China, but under this definition in the USA, magically, this GMO corn oil is no longer a GMO ingredient.

Soybean oil is covered if it comes from GMO soybeans in the European countries—in Brazil, in China, all around world—but not in the United States.

Sugar from sugar beets, GMO sugar beets. It is a GMO ingredient in every undertaking around the world to provide labels, except in the United States of America under this bill.

So this is a massive GMO loophole. That is not the only Monsanto loophole in this bill. Let's go to the second one. The second one is there is no requirement for a GMO label. You say: Wait, wait, wait. We have heard from the proponents that this is a GMO labeling bill—a mandatory GMO labeling bill. Let me say it again. There is no requirement in this bill to put a GMO label on your product. This is the no label required, no GMO label required bill. So it is a little bit of false advertising or actually a lot of false advertising to call this a mandatory GMO labeling bill.

What the bill says is, there are a couple of options that exist today that people can use voluntarily. Let me show my colleagues an example of that. This is a Mars product. It is the omnipresent Mars peanut M&Ms, one of my particular favorites. Mars has said we want to make sure our consumers know what is in the product so they list all of the traditional things—the serving size and the calories and the total fat, cholesterol, the protein, and the sodium. But our consumers also want to know if there are GMO ingredients so they answer the question: ''Partially produced with genetic engineering.'' It is a GMO product. Now, we don't know from this label which ingredient is the one they are referring to, but to the consumer, that tells them the first important thing they want to know, and the consumer can look into the details elsewhere if they want to explore it more thoroughly.

That is integrity. That is honesty. That is responsiveness to consumer concerns. Why do I say responsiveness to consumer concerns? Here is why: Because across the country there have been surveys of whether individuals want to have a simple label on their product. The answer is, rounding off slightly, 9 out of 10 Americans want a simple label on the product.

Here is something else that is kind of intriguing. This number is essentially the same whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent. Think: Here we are in a campaign year—a campaign year where the differences between Americans are highlighted with great emotion, great passion, and great determination that one side is right and the other side is wrong. But here we have an issue where Democrats and Republicans and Independents all agree they want a simple label on the package. It is kind of exciting. It is kind of exciting to have something that Americans completely agree on. Wouldn't it be wonderful to have Congress say: Finally, we found something we can all agree on, and we are going to honor the desire of our citizens of every political stripe to have a simple consumer label on the package.

Well, I would love to state that this Senate, these 100 Members of the Senate, actually are honoring the perspective of their Republican, Democratic, and Independent citizens and that they are determined to make sure that any bill written honors this desire for a simple on-label indication of whether there are GMO ingredients. I would love to tell you that is the case. Wouldn't that be complimentary of this Chamber of 100 Members, this Chamber that I have been so honored to serve in and affectionate toward since I was an intern here 40 years ago?

But something destructive has happened in America. This Chamber seems to no longer care about the opinions of consumers and Americans. They seem to care about one thing: Is there a powerful special interest that I need to toe the line for, that I need to be obedient to, that I need to make sure will help me when the next election comes up?

So we have that powerful special interest that doesn't want American citizens to know what is in the food products, and that is Monsanto and friends—powerful special interests versus 90 percent of American citizens. Powerful special interests, 90 percent of American citizens, and this Chamber tonight is prepared to vote for that powerful special interest instead of the American people.

That is not the way it is supposed to be in our country. In fact, the first three words of our Constitution sum it up: ''We the people.'' The whole idea was that, contrary to Europe where there was this powerful, elite class and monarchies and Kings and Queens who made decisions for the people, here we were going to have a system of government that was responsive to the people. Well, if we are going to be responsive to the people tonight, we will vote down this Monsanto DARK Act, the Deny Americans the Right to Know Act. Unfortunately, I am sorry to say—I am sorry to feed the cynicism across the country—that tonight, instead, you are going to see a majority vote with Monsanto and against the people. Our Founders wrote those three words, ''We the people,'' in supersized font. They put them in really big font so you can

read that part of the Constitution from across the room. You have to get very close up to read the rest. They put those three words in supersized font to remind all of us, the citizens, the legislators, the President, years and years later, decades later, centuries later, that is what our Constitution is all about.

Jefferson summed this up. He said: We can only claim to be a republic to the extent that the decisions we make as a government reflect the will of the people. He said that will happen only if the people, each member of the citizenry, have an equal voice. What he was basically conveying in a powerful way is that in order to have a ''we the people'' government, you can run a test. This Jefferson test—he referred to it as the ''mother principle'' of our republic—was that we were only a republic if our decisions reflected the will of the people, and that would only happen if people, each member of the citizenry, have an equal voice.

But today citizens no longer have an equal voice because of a couple of court decisions that have created disproportionate voices, giving multimillionaires and billionaires a very powerful, loud voice and giving ordinary people a very tiny, quiet voice.

The first of these decisions was Buckley v. Valeo, 40 years ago. The second was Citizens United. These two decisions turn our Constitution on its head. They change it from ''We the people,'' and they take the word ''people,'' and they pluck it out of our Constitution, and they change it to the word ''powerful''—''We the powerful.'' That is what those two corporate decisions do because they allow the very wealthy and they allow powerful corporations to spend unlimited sums in campaigns in America, and that spending corrupts this body so that when this body is making a choice between that powerful special interests and the people, it chooses the powerful special interests. That vote—that type of vote—is being held tonight. You are going to see Members of this body voting with that powerful special interest rather than the people.

So let's return to this Monsanto loophole No. 2. Essentially, if this bill were a true labeling bill it would do this: This is a poster of a Campbell's label. Now Campbell's, like Mars, values its integrity with its customers, so it put a simple label on its soup that states ''Partially produced with genetic engineering.'' Then it says ''For more information about G.M.O. ingredients, visit [our Web site].'' And it lists the Web site. Well, that is pretty cool. They are going the extra step. They are not only saying, yes, there are GMO ingredients, but we will give you all the details on our Web site. The customer at the store, at the point of sale, immediately has an answer to the question, and they know where to go for immediate information.

Mars, Campbell's, and so many other big companies—those that value honesty and integrity with their customers—are answering the questions of customers even though at this point it is not required by law.

Let's go back again to that Mars label on Peanut M&Ms: ''Partially produced with genetic engineering.'' Campbell's says ''Partially produced with genetic engineering.'' They chose the same phrase even though there is no law that lays it out.

Why can't we have a bill that says that if there are GMO ingredients you will put below your ingredients list ''Partially produced with genetic engineering.'' Why can't we have that? That would be an honest labeling bill.

This is being done voluntarily right now. Under this bill that is coming up, it can still be done voluntarily. But the proponents of this bill aren't saying it is a voluntary labeling bill; they are saying this is a mandatory labeling bill. This is simply not true. This is a voluntary option.

Another option is to put a symbol on the package—a symbol to be chosen by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. That would be a reasonable way to go. What if we said you either need to put in this phrase and maybe a Web site to go to for more information or you can put in a symbol? Brazil uses a symbol. They use a T in a triangle. Why do they use a T? Because T means transgenetic, which means one gene has been plucked out and inserted into another. It is another way of saying bioengineering. We can use Brazil's approach—a T with a triangle. It is easy to see at the bottom. We can take a B for bioengineering and put it in a circle or we can proceed to put the letters GMO in a rectangle. It doesn't really matter what the symbol is, as long as it has some connection, and an ordinary consumer knows the answer to the question if a symbol is there that means it is partially produced with genetic engineering.

So a requirement for a phrase or a symbol—that would be a labeling bill. But they are voluntary now, and they are voluntary in this bill.

What is required if you don't voluntarily put this phrase or voluntarily put a symbol? Here is what is required.

All right. I wonder if anyone in this Chamber can look at this computer code, this box, and tell me if there are GMO ingredients in this product. Well, humans are not very good at reading computer boxes, so I think I can safely say that no one here can look at this box and tell me if there are GMO ingredients. It says to ''scan here for more food information.'' What type of information would that be? There is no connection to GMOs. It is just any old food information. It could be information about the entire product line of this company. What food do they produce? It could be information about the details of what type of tomato puree it has or about what type of wheat flour or how much there is in it. Or maybe it is a repetition of the other list of how much sugar is there or how much glucose or how much salt or how many calories or so on and so forth—everything that might go into the ingredients. No one can look at this code and know that has anything to do with saying that this is a GMO product. And that is the idea.

So I proposed an amendment. The amendment simply says that instead of saying ''Scan here for more food information,'' it says ''Scan here for more GMO food information'' or, alternatively, it could be ''Scan here for more information on GMO ingredients of this product.'' But see, that would actually be a label. That would be a GMO label. That would actually be honestly labeling the product, and Monsanto is determined that the products not be labeled.

So perhaps we are wondering, what do we do with this code? Just scan it. Well, most Americans have never scanned something with a smartphone. You can get an app and you can put it on your phone and you can take a picture of this, and it can take you to a Web site. That is what they are talking about. OK. That is an obstacle course. It is an obstacle course because you have to have your phone with you. You have to have wireless service in the grocery store. You would have to have a digital plan on your phone. Most importantly, you would have to be willing to take the enormous amount of time that it takes.

If what is on the package is ''Partially produced with genetic engineering,'' I flip it over, and I see it in one second. I know the answer. I can compare five products in 5 seconds. That is functional for a consumer shopping in a grocery store. Maybe you have 20 things on your list. You spend 5 seconds reviewing products on GMO ingredients. That is 100 seconds.

Here you would probably have to spend one-half an hour to go to five different Web sites and scroll through all the information to try to find the answer—that is, if you had a smartphone and you had an app for reading this and you wanted to spend your digital time doing that. No shopper—no shopper—is going to make use of this in ordinary shopping in a grocery store to make decisions. That is the whole idea. Set up an obstacle course to ensure that shoppers never find out that there are GMO ingredients, not in any fashion that helps them at the point of sale.

Some say, of course, that people don't have to have a smartphone. We will ask stores to set up a scanner. Well, I found this interesting because when there wasn't a price on a product that I was shopping for one Christmas, I asked somebody who worked in the store—I said: Hey, what is the price of this product?

And they said: Oh, well, there is a scanner here in the store somewhere, and you can scan the code on this, and you can find out about the price.

They weren't sure where the scanner was, and they went and checked and found out where the scanner was. They

helped me find the scanner, and the scanner didn't work. They said: We think there is another scanner in the store somewhere. And they checked that out, and it was on the far side of the store—all of which shows you the ridiculousness of this whole scanning option, this whole obstacle course being set up.

What really bothers me the most is that the Members here are presenting this as a mandatory GMO labeling bill when they know darn well it doesn't require a GMO label. That really bothers me. It is deception of the public.

(Mr. ROBERTS assumed the Chair.)

That is not the only problem with this bill. Monsanto was very thorough in the number of loopholes they included. Here is of the third one. The bill prohibits basic enforcement of its own provisions. I know you are thinking it cannot be true that, unlike every other labeling requirement we have which has penalties if you don't participate in it according to the rules, this law has no penalties. Well, I am sorry to say that is the case. There are no penalties in this bill. Isn't that amazing? Even if you ignore this bill completely, the U.S. Department of Agriculture doesn't have the power to tell you not to sell your food in the grocery stores. It doesn't have the power to tell you to recall your products from the grocery stores. It doesn't have the power to levy a fine on you, no. Here is the only thing that comes close to being a penalty in this bill. It says the U.S. Department of Agriculture can audit to determine whether you are complying, and they can release the results of that audit to the public.

So if you choose to not proceed in any way to adhere to this law, you get an audit, and the Department, after a long period of time, says: Well, OK, we are telling the public we audited you and you are not compliant with the law. And you say: Oh, my goodness. That really worries me.

Of course, it wouldn't worry you at all. No civil fine, no impact on the distribution of your products, no recall of your product, no teeth. This is like the old man whose teeth have all fallen out, and all they can do is gum the food. That is what this law is like. They can just kind of gum a little bit, which doesn't worry anyone.

It is kind of amazing the three levels of complete protection Monsanto incorporated into this bill—the three levels of completely betraying the American public, those 9 out of 10 Americans who want a very simple, a very simple label on their food products. Let me put it another way on this enforcement provision. This bill would create the first and only food label without a fine for violators—the first and only food label without a fine for violators.

We have had other food label requirements. I mentioned one that if you have farmed fish, you have to put a label on it that it has been farmed rather than wild caught, and you sell it in a grocery store.

We can look at another that is called COOL, C-O-O-L, country-of-origin labeling. COOL is something that has disappeared from the American lawbooks. It has disappeared because of a trade agreement called WTO, the World Trade Organization, something the United States signed up to. In this World Trade Organization, someone can complain that your requirements for disclosure inhibit the entry of their products into the market. So various countries complained that labeling meat, chicken, or pork and beef, specifically—labeling them would unfairly prejudice people against buying their out-of-country beef or their out-of-country pork. I will tell you something. I want to live in a country where an American citizen who wants to support American ranchers can make that decision when they buy their beef, when they buy their steak, when they buy their pork chops. That should be the right of every consumer to choose to buy a product grown in America by red, white, and blue American ranchers.

But we signed a trade agreement that gave away our sovereignty on this issue to an international tribunal, an international tribunal that has no stake in the future of America. It has no stake in our vision, our ''we the people'' Republic. We gave away our sovereignty and that court said: No, that discriminates. They didn't see it as the consumer right to choose, as simply information that would be provided, no. They said that discriminates and therefore we are striking down the American law.

Our law, our COOL law—it wasn't struck down by a vote on the floor of the Senate, it wasn't struck down by some amendment slipped into a last-minute bill over in the House, it wasn't struck down because a coalition of American ranchers wanted to strike it down, it was struck down by a court that had no foundation in America, but we were controlled by it because we gave away our sovereignty.

By the way, that is something we should be very concerned about when thinking about the Trans-Pacific Partnership because that can have an impact as well on the flow of goods, and I might just take a while to address that, but right now what I wanted to convey is before the WTO court struck down our country-of-origin labeling law, there were teeth in that law, teeth that we put in the law, teeth that were put into the law on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House. It provided a fine if you didn't comply. You had to label where the meat was grown. That was great because it meant that people followed the law. But in this case do we have the same fine structure that was in country-of-origin labeling or that affects other provisions like, for example, labeling fish as wild? No, we don't.

We even require labeling as to whether juice is fresh squeezed or reconstituted. Why is that? Because the consumer wants to know, and it is their right to know. In fact, this belief that the consumer right to know about the food they put in their mouth is so powerful—so powerful—that the advocates for this bill put forward the idea that this actually provides that information, that it actually labels it when it doesn't, when it doesn't say it is a GMO product, but it is a kind of testimony as to how powerful that consumer concern is. So there we are with these three fundamental loopholes in this bill that serve Monsanto very well.

You can see now why this is simply a repackaged version of the earlier DARK Act, the Deny Americans the Right to Know Act. That is why some have called this the DARK Act 2.0, because it is simply a rehashing of what we saw previously.

This is representational. It is a quote from a letter to Senators from a group of 76 pro-organic organizations and farmer groups. They are writing specifically about this act we have before us tonight, the DARK Act 2.0, that we will be voting on tonight—this act that tonight we will be voting on that takes away the power of States to put the type of label on the package that consumers want across this entire country.

This is what they said: ''We oppose the bill because it is actually a non-labeling bill under the guise of a mandatory labeling bill.''

Well, who are these organizations? Let's just give them their opportunity to be recognized.

The Center for Food Safety, Food & Water Watch, the Abundance Cooperative Market, the Beyond Pesticides, the BioSafety Alliance, the Cedar Circle Farm & Education Center, the Central Park West CSA, Citizens for GMO Labeling, Crop CSA, Crush Wine & Spirits, Dr. Bronner's, the East New York Farms, the Empire State Consumer Project, the Family Farm Defenders, Farm Aid, Food Democracy Now, Foundation Earth, Friends of the Earth, Genesis Farm, the GMO Action Alliance, GMO Free NY, GMO Free USA, GMO Inside, Good Earth Natural Foods, iEatGreen, the Institute for Responsible Technology, the International Center for Technology Assessment, Katchkie Farm, the Institute for Responsible Technology, the International Center for Technology Assessment, the Institute for Responsible Technology, the Keep the Soil in Organic Coalition, Diesel Lane Farm, Kezialain Farm, the LIC Brewery, Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association, the Midwest Organic & Sustainable Education Service, Miskell's Premium Organics, Moms Across America, the National Family Farm Coalition, the National Organic Coalition, Nature's Path, the Nine Mile Market, the Non-GMO Project.

I am reading all these names to convey how, within just a few days, just a short period of time in which this bill has been brought to this floor in a fashion that completely bypassed committee process in the U.S. Senate, how many have responded. I am only partway through this list so we will give

respect and voice to all of these organizations: Nutiva, the Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance, the Northeast Organic Farming Association, the Northeast Organic Farming Association of New York, the Northeast Organic Farming Association of New Hampshire, the Northeast Organic Farming Association of Vermont, NYC H2O, Oregon Right to Know, the Organic Consumers Association, the Organic Farmers' Agency for Relationship Marketing, the Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association, Our Family Farms, PCC Natural Markets, the Pesticide Action Network North America, Presence Marketing, Regeneration Vermont, the Riverside-Salem United Church of Christ/Disciples of Christ, Rodale Institute, the Rural Advancement Foundation International, Rural Vermont, the Sierra Club, Slow Food California, Slow Food Hudson Valley, Slow Food North Shore, Slow Food USA, Soil Not Oil Coalition, Sunnyside CSA, the Cornucopia Institute, the Organic & Non-GMO Report, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Vermont Public Interest Research Group, Vermont Right to Know GMOs Coalition, and Wood Prairie Farm.

Now, if this bill had gone to committee, there would have been people coming to testify pro and against this all-new definition put here on the Senate floor with no review. They would have analyzed it. They would have educated Members of the Senate about why this new definition was included in the bill. Senators would have been able to ask questions directly of the sponsors, such as, when did you decide to use a definition that excludes the major products from GMO Monsanto crops in America? When did you decide to do that? They could have asked the question: Why did you decide to do it?

Doesn't this mislead the public—pretending to cover GMO products but slipping in a definition that excludes the big three in America—the GMO soybeans, the GMO corn, and the GMO sugar beets? Isn't that a little misleading? They could have asked that question if there had been a committee hearing on this definition. And, in fact, they could have explored it further and asked: Why not use one of the definitions from the 64 countries around the world that have a mandatory GMO labeling bill that actually covers what most people consider to be GMO products?

In fact, here is an interesting point about the definition included in this bill. This definition speaks about recombinant DNA—genetic modification through recombinant DNA—but there is a new technique called CRISPR that changes the genetic code with a completely different technology. Why isn't that included, or would it be included? That is a reasonable thing to ask. What about other new techniques for modifying genetic code? Someone might have asked: Why not include those future techniques rather than excluding them?

In fact, if this definition had been examined in committee, we could have asked another question about something I referred to earlier, which was a second loophole in the definition. But before we talk about that, remember that we looked at the first part of this, which said that it has to contain genetic material. I have already explained how it is that the major products—the oil, high-fructose corn syrup, sugar from genetically modified plants—don't actually contain genetic materials. That is a big loophole.

If this bill had been in committee, my sincere colleagues exploring this could have asked about this second piece of the definition that says that it only refers to a food as ''bioengineered'' if the modification could not otherwise be obtained through conventional breeding or found in nature. Well, that is very interesting. Why is that in the bill? Is that designed to allow a genetically modified plant, under this provision, to be considered nongenetically modified because it might possibly have been obtained through conventional breeding or is found in nature? I don't know why this was included because there has never been a hearing on this definition.

So here we are, violating a major premise that Americans believe—Americans who are Republicans, who are Democrats, who are Independents. That major premise is that they have a right to know what is in the food they put into their mouths. And this says: Well, you know what, we are not going to define it as GMO, even if it is genetically modified, if it could possibly be found in nature.

I would love to know exactly what executive came up with this phrase and what product they are trying to protect, but we don't know because no one will tell us. I would be interested in having Senator ROBERTS, who leads the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, come and tell us where this phrase came from, who suggested it, and why it was suggested.

I will tell you what it makes me think of. I talked earlier about the fact that with the massive application of glyphosate weedkiller across America—in a moment, I will show you how much of an increase there has been—with that massive application on millions of acres across this country, so many weeds have been exposed that, slowly, genetic mutations in the weeds that make the weeds naturally resistant to glyphosate have, in fact, started to spread because those are the weeds that can reproduce because they are not killed by the glyphosate. So we have this growth in superweeds, essentially through natural selection driven by this massive application of weedkiller. Can one say, therefore, that we now have resistance to glyphosate found in nature? We find it in the weeds. The weeds haven't been genetically modified; they have been modified through the driving force of millions of tons of weedkiller applied across America. The natural mutations that occur in nature have slowly started to spread as those weeds survive and reproduce. So is this another way of saying that the GMO crops—the Monsanto big three—are not actually GMO because they are resistant to glyphosate and can be found in nature? It sure sounds like that is what is going on here.

There is something interesting here as well. This first loophole, which says ''contains genetic material'' only provides a free pass for the derivatives of the big three crops. By that, I mean the soybean oil that comes from GMO soybean, the sugar that comes from GMO sugar, and the high-fructose syrup that comes from GMO corn. But this second loophole here could be a way of saying that even the GMO corn itself, if you were to eat it as corn on the cob, wouldn't be GMO because it is resistant to glyphosate and is found in nature. I am not sure if that is what drove this because there was no committee hearing; there was no explanation; there was no investigation; there was no testing of what is here.

I made reference to the fact that the massive application of glyphosate is, in fact, changing what is happening in America and producing superweeds, but I thought it would be useful to show how much that has changed.

This chart shows a couple of things. First, let's look at the increased use of glyphosate—and that is Monsanto's Roundup product. It was introduced around 1994 here, and we are talking about 7.4 million, I believe that was—I want to read the notes to be sure I have it right. It is pounds or tons. I thought it was 7.4 million tons. I may be wrong. I may have to come back and correct that. But you can see that as the distribution of GMO seed for sugar beets and corn and soybeans spread across America, the application of this weedkiller increased enormously, until in 2012 we are up to 158.9 million—and I believe that is tons, but I will have to check. It is a massive amount of weedkiller being sprayed all across America.

This note is from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They say:

> The wide-scale adoption of herbicide-resistant corn and soy crops has drastically changed the agricultural landscape. This resistance enables broad and non-targeted application of herbicides that indiscriminately kills vegetation growing around farm fields and in nearby habitat, including Milkweed.

That is a statement from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service dated April 25, 2015.

And we see here this massive increase in the application of weedkiller. That certainly supports what the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is saying. When they are referring to the fact that the spray affects nearby habitat, that reflects that this spray drifts in the wind and it affects weeds off the field, and one of the things it affects is milkweed. Milkweed is the foundational support plant, the

foundational food for the monarch butterfly. So we see a massive decrease in the monarch butterfly populations. A high here in 1997. In 1997 there was very little glyphosate being applied, and then there was a massive increase, and by the time we get out here—and we don't have 2013, 2014, 2015, but if we did have it, we would see high bars as well—we see the monarch population crashing. Sometimes we use the word ''decimation,'' meaning one-tenth of a population, but this is in the more broad use of the term because it is far more than a reduction to one-tenth. It is more reduction than that. It is a smaller fraction from this high in 1997 on down to 2015. So that certainly is the case.

Mr. President, I think this would be a good moment to take a pause and reserve the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A TALE OF TWO CITIES

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise briefly to offer a tale of two cities. My comments are in a deep and disturbed reaction to the police shootings of Alton Sterling in Louisiana and Philando Castile in Minnesota. The videos of these shootings—one of an African-American father of five selling CDs outside a convenience store and one of a beloved African-American school cafeteria supervisor stopped for a broken taillight—are shocking. All people of good will have to ask—in the words that President Obama uttered an hour or so ago: ''What if this happened to somebody in your family?''

The first city is the world of America's police officers. Our law enforcement officers are heroes. While we are told in the Scriptures that the greatest love is to lay one's life down for a friend, police officers risk their lives every day not just for friends but for people they have never even met.

As a mayor and Governor, I came face to face with the danger of police work and went to too many funerals for local and State law enforcement officials who gave up their lives in service to their fellow citizens. Just in February of this year, Prince William County police officer Ashley Guindin was shot and killed on her first day working her beat after service as a Marine reservist and veteran. Police work is hard and dangerous, and we have to be grateful for those who do it.

But here is one glimmer of hope. For a police officer, the threat of death by gun violence is being dramatically reduced even as our Nation's population grows and even as the number of weapons grows. The death of police officers by gun violence hit its peak in the early 1970s. In 1973, 156 police officers in this country were shot and killed. In the first decade of the 2000s, that number had been reduced to an average of 57 police officers killed by gunfire every year. In 2014, 49 police officers were killed by gunfire. Last year, the number of police officers killed by gunfire had come down to 42. This year, police deaths by gunfire are at the same level as 2015.

We know that one police death by gunfire is too many, and police die in traffic accidents and by other work-related causes that also need our attention and resolution. But the experience of our Nation in the last 40 years—and this is what should give us hope—is this: We have made our police safer from death by gunshot. We have shown we can tackle a problem and begin to solve it, and that should give us hope that we can bring down the number of police killed by gunfire even more.

The second city is the world of people, especially young African-American males shot by the police. In 2015, according to painstaking research undertaken by the Guardian newspaper, 1,010 people were shot and killed by the police in the United States. Young African-American males were five times more likely to be killed by police than White males of the same age. This data suggests that 102 unarmed African-American males were killed by police in 2015. This number was also five times the rate of unarmed Whites killed by police.

How does this number compare to past years? It is nearly impossible to know. While deaths of law enforcement officers have been carefully tracked for decades, the deaths of individuals killed by the police in this country have only recently been counted. At least since the early 1990s, there have been legal reporting requirements at the Federal level for such deaths, but actual data collection was weak, and it has not been until the last 2 years that there has been an effort driven by journalists and citizens to systematically collect this data. Even now, there are questions about whether current data is actually comprehensive.

How did our Nation bring down the number of police killed by gunfire even as the Nation grew and even as the number of firearms in this country increased? Because we cared about it. Because we kept records and resolved to do better, and police departments trained to reduce risks and society supported those efforts with budgets and emotional commitment.

How will our Nation bring down the number of people—especially African-American males, especially young African-American males, especially unarmed African American males—killed by police? We will decide that we must care about it. Again, in the words that President Obama said an hour or so ago, because we will decide that ''this is not just a black issue, it's an American issue.'' We must decide that we care about it. We must decide that we will keep rigorous records and resolve to do better, and provide better police training and support those efforts with our budgets and with our emotional commitment.

If we have brought down the rate of police deaths by gunfire, we can bring down the rate of people killed by the police. But we cannot do it unless we care and unless we act.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, inquiry: We are not in a quorum call; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time under cloture to the Democratic leader.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to say a word on behalf of Senator MERKLEY. He has a very reasonable compromise on this GMO bill. I wish we would get a chance to vote on it because that is what the Senate is supposed to do—debate and to express our opinions and then vote. A bill that is a compromise, that was put together with great intentions, and yet one that did not go through the regular order, as hard as the negotiations were, and all the good intent—it is just a shame that the Senate is sitting here until—the parliamentary rules allow us to run a certain number of hours, which is going to occur somewhere around 10:30 tonight, to proceed to the voting on this bill.

The only expression of those of us who would like Senator MERKLEY to have a vote is that we got to vote on a motion to table an amendment that is unrelated, and it all has to do with the parliamentary procedure. It is a shame that we can't have the substance of a real debate on a real issue facing the country.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. President, as the Senate is biding its time, I can tell you we are not biding our time in Florida on two subjects, the first of which is that in these closing days of the Senate before we recess for the rest of the summer because of the political conventions—we had another 11 cases of the Zika virus yesterday in Florida. There are now well over 250 cases in Florida, and in Florida there are somewhere around 40 pregnant women who are infected with the Zika virus. You know what that means because you have seen the horrible pictures of the babies. When the Zika virus infects a pregnant female, it attacks the growing fetus and stunts the growth of the brain and the head. We are starting to see that now in about six babies born in the United States with microcephaly, three of

whom died at childbirth. You can imagine the tragedies for those families in which this is occurring.

It could all be done if we would go ahead and develop the vaccine. There is a lot of promising research and development on a vaccine, but that means we need to get money through the National Institutes of Health, NIH, to continue the research. We have a Zika bill for supposedly $1.1 billion that was passed last week in the House, but it is not a serious bill. It has all of these poison pills in it. It has all of these political messages. It is totally partisan. In fact, one of the things it does to fund the so-called Zika bill from the House is to take money from the Medicaid Program in Puerto Rico—the very place that needs it the most right now because 3.5 million American citizens on that island are now at risk of being infected when that mosquito bites or by sexual transmission.

Another part of the bill doesn't allow birth control through Planned Parenthood. Well, isn't that inimical to the very reason that you want to stop the pregnancy so that you don't have this tragedy? Yet the House bill is eliminating those funds.

This is what I hope, and this is what I did this morning. I wrote to the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and asked him if he would take up the Zika bill that we passed in the Senate. It was bipartisan. It was overwhelmingly supported. It was not the $1.9 billion the President requested, but it was $1.1 billion. Take that up, send it out of here to the House so that before Congress adjourns at the end of next week, we would have a chance of having this money be there over the summer to continue the assistance to local governments for mosquito control, to continue the research and development of a vaccine, and to help with the medical counseling that is going on and is necessary not just in Florida, not just in Puerto Rico, but Zika is now in more than 30 States in the Union. I wanted to talk about that one thing, which is, in fact, an emergency.

CENTRAL EVERGLADES PLANNING PROJECT

Mr. President, I want to tell you about another emergency, and I want everyone to see these photographs. This blue-green algae is surrounding these docks. You can see how it has collected. The brown that you see mixed in with the blue and green is rotting algae.

This photo shows a wave coming up on shore in Stuart, FL. This is the St. Lucie River. You can see how much algae is in the river. What is algae? Algae is a plant. It is a plant that is in water. Algae grows like this. Instead of being naturally balanced in the water column, it grows like this when it is fed a lot of fertilizer.

Where is that fertilizer coming from? Right now it is coming from the excess nutrient-laden water that is being dumped out of Lake Okeechobee by the Corps of Engineers because the water has gotten too high in Lake Okeechobee, which is a huge lake. This water pressure is now threatening the integrity of the dike around the entire lake where thousands and thousands of people live. In order to relieve that pressure immediately, the Corps of Engineers has opened the floodgates. It has allowed that nutrient-rich water to flow out to the east into the St. Lucie River, which eventually empties into the Atlantic in Stuart, FL, and to the west of Lake Okeechobee and into the Caloosahatchee River, which goes out into Fort Myers. This is obviously a sick river.

What happens when you get too many nutrients in the water? It causes the algae to grow. In order for the algae to grow—it is a plant—it sucks up the oxygen in the water and nothing can live. The fish can't breathe, and it becomes a dead river. That is a dead river. Not only is it dead, but all of the algae has floated to the surface, and now it has all of that brown rot.

Can you imagine what that smells like? Well, as a Florida boy, to me it smells like rotting algae. If you have any kind of a respiratory situation or if you have allergies, go over there and take a deep breath on that dock and all of a sudden you will be coughing, wheezing, and sneezing. There are a lot of environmental medical health effects as well.

What do we need to do? Well, here again, I have written to the two leaders as to what we should do, and I have written to the President about what we ought to do. Ultimately, you don't solve a problem like this until you get a reversal of over three-quarters of a century of diking and draining, and that is called the Everglades Restoration Plan. It has been going on for 20 years, and it is going to go on for another 20 years, but in the meantime, especially when we have emergencies like this, we need to tinker around with that plan.

First of all, we need to get to the Water Resources Development Act, or WRDA, that we thought was going to come up in July and has the bipartisan support of the leaders on the environmental committee, Senator INHOFE and Senator BOXER. It is ready to go. We need to get it on the floor and pass it.

The WRDA bill has the Corps of Engineers authorized plan to continue the Everglades restoration with what is called the Central Everglades Planning Project, which includes four or five projects over a number of years, so you don't have to dump the water to the east and west out of Lake Okeechobee and create situations like this.

There is something else that we can do. We can hold as much water as possible north of the lake in the Kissimmee River basin during the time of the rains that are going to fill up Lake Okeechobee anyway; don't allow the water to go south into the lake.

There is something else that the Corps of Engineers can do. They can send more water south by raising the level of the canals to the south just as they did a few months ago during an emergency. This is obviously an emergency, and they need to do that.

There is one more thing that can be done. A couple of years ago, the people of Florida voted to amend the Florida constitution to provide for a dedicated source of funding that is already there—it is real estate taxes—and use that money for the acquisition of endangered lands and lands that are needed to preserve the environment. Thus, there is a ready source of funding for the State of Florida if they would appropriate the money to start purchasing lands south of the lake that would become storage areas in a flow way going south and cleansing areas as the water moves south into the river of grass otherwise known as the Florida Everglades.

There are many things that have to be done all together, but what we could do here right now—before we adjourn next week—is bring up the WRDA bill. It is ready to go. It is bipartisan, and it will also include the projects that will start the process of alleviating this problem so that no river in America would have to experience what the St. Lucie River and the Caloosahatchee on the west side of Florida are experiencing now. Lord knows that I hope we can suddenly have a miracle around here and get this bipartisan legislation up and moving.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SHOOTINGS IN MINNEAPOLIS AND BATON ROUGE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, it seems as though every time we turn around, we have a situation where some individual in the African-American community is shot while in the custody of police, and many in America, myself included, are mourning the death of Alton Sterling and Philando Castile, the individuals who were shot in Minneapolis and Baton Rouge.

The ubiquity of video cameras today has shown the rest of the country what African-Americans have always known: That with shocking and horrifying regularity, African-American men and boys are the victims of police—the very people who are charged with keeping all of us safe.

I don't know what it is like to be fearful for my life during a traffic stop by law enforcement. Unacceptably, however, that is the everyday reality of Black Americans in our Nation. While I will never know this experience firsthand, I stand with communities of color and demand that those who swear to uphold our laws to protect and serve all in America do so equally and that they are held accountable when they don't.

We must also realize that this is not just a police problem; it is an American problem. We need to come to terms with our Nation's long history of racism and the many ways that racism continues to permeate nearly every aspect of our society.

Our country has made enormous progress from the worst days of Jim Crow. We elected an African-American President to two terms, but there is an enormous difference between progress and success, and that difference is measured in Black lives cut short, the resegregation of our schools, health disparities, housing patterns, dropout rates, and incarceration rates.

We will not end the scourge of racism until we understand that racism is not just Bull Connor, firehoses, and dogs. We will never solve the problem if we don't admit we have one.

I was thinking about the situation back in the 1980s when I was working with a friend from across the street. He was actually the brother of the woman who lived across the street. He had come up to DC for a while and was helping me install some windows.

We needed to go to a hardware store but didn't know exactly where the store was, so when we pulled up next to the sheriff's car, I asked my friend to roll down his window and ask the sheriff for directions to the hardware store. He looked over at the sheriff, and he turned back straight ahead. He just looked straight ahead and didn't say a word.

Then I looked over and I saw the two sheriffs, and I saw the gun mounted between them at an upward angle. It was a shotgun or a rifle. But, as I looked to the right past him, I saw the absolute fear on his face. There was absolutely no way he was going to roll down his window and ask the sheriff—the sheriff in the car next to ours—for directions. To me it was just a casual interaction among folks getting a little bit of help, which was to him a potential life-threatening situation.

Nobody in our society should live in fear of our public safety officials. Of course, I celebrate that the vast majority of our public safety officials treat everyone equally, but we need for 100 percent of our public safety teams to treat everyone equally. That small fraction that doesn't is responsible for an enormous number of lives cut short, and that is unacceptable, and we have to change that. We have to talk about it, and we have to wrestle with it.

So, once again, it seems like this is the case every week or so. We have another death that seems like it should have been possible to avoid, and sometimes these deaths are very clearly ones of intentional infliction. We have to work hard together to change this.

Mr. President, I thought it would be worthwhile to consider a little bit about the organics provision in the bill we are considering tonight. Now, there are several organics labeling provisions, and the sponsors of the bill said this is very wonderful stuff. I know that we only have one organic farmer that I am aware of in the Senate, and that individual is the Senator from Montana, JON TESTER. I have heard him speak to this issue. I know that he feels that the bill does not do for organics anything that the organic community doesn't already have. That is my understanding of his perspective.

So it is important to call attention to the fact that many organic organizations across the country, despite the language that has been placed in this bill, are strongly opposed to it. They believe that if you are going to put out a bill that is a mandatory GMO labeling bill, it has to actually have mandatory GMO labeling in it. So let me read this from Andrew Kimbrell, executive director of the Center for Food Safety. Andrew says:

> Organic organizations, farmers and companies rightly fear that this bill could change important regulations governing the federal organic program including those prohibiting the use of genetic engineering in organic. They also refuse to be part of a sham labeling bill that blatantly discriminates against low-income, rural, elderly and a disproportionately high number of minority Americans.

Then let me read this as well:

> Organic organizations, farmer groups and companies around the nation representing millions of organic consumers and thousands of organic farmers have voiced their opposition to the discriminatory and deeply-flawed GMO labeling bill being offered. Thirty-six major organic groups have signed on to a letter sent by a national coalition of consumer, food safety, farm, environmental, and religious groups to all members of the Senate earlier this week. The groups condemn the so-called compromise bill which could be devastating to the organic standard.

Organic groups that have signed on to this letter include the following: Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, Center for Food Safety, Dr. Bronner's, Equal Exchange, Farm Aid, Food and Water Watch, Genesis Farm, Good Earth Natural Foods, Katchkie Farm, Keep the Soil in Organic Coalition, Kezialain Farm, Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association, Midwest Organic & Sustainable Education Service, Miskell's Premium Organics, the National Grocers Coop, the National Organic Coalition, Nature's Path, the Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance, the Northeast Organic Farming Association, the Northeast Organic Farming Association of New Hampshire, the Northeast Organic Farming Association of New York, the Northeast Organic Farming Association of Vermont, Nutiva, Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association, Organically Grown Company, Organic Consumers Association, Organic Seed Alliance, Organic Farmers Agency for Relationship Marketing, Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association, Our Family Farms, PCC Family Farms, PCC Natural Markets, Rural Advancement Foundation International, the Organic & Non-GMO Report, Sunnyside CSA, and Wood Prairie Family Farm.

So these are organic organizations, farmer groups, and companies from around the Nation that are representing millions of organic consumers and thousands of organic farmers who are voicing their opposition to the bill that we are considering in this Chamber tonight.

So I thought that was worth noting.

It is very important because one of the items that the proponents of this bill have said is that they have put some wonderful stuff in there for organic farmers. If there is wonderful stuff, why are the organic farmers saying that this bill could change important regulations governing the Federal organic program, including those prohibiting the use of genetic engineering or organic?

That is right. You heard that it is actually possible that this bill would enable those growing GMO crops to label their crops organic—how completely absurd. What hall of mirrors have we entered into with the twisted definitions in this bill that GMO crops could be labeled organic because of this bill?

Now, let me turn to why we are here on the floor waiting for these 30 hours to run out. We attempted to strike a deal earlier today simply to have amendments voted on. In fact, get this: We agreed to vote on every single Republican amendment—every single one. We asked for the ability to vote on some Democratic amendments as well.

Now, that is what the Senate used to do. This body was known as a deliberative body because people were actually here arguing with each other, debating with each other, offering amendments, debating the amendments, voting on the amendments, voting on the bills—almost always by simple majority. That is why this was a deliberative body. The Members brought the power of their life experiences into this room. They brought their intellect, their knowledge, their reading, and their wisdom into this room. They brought the stories of their constituents, the experiences from the front line in America into this room. They debated, and they argued, and they voted.

That Senate is the opposite of what we are experiencing here at this moment—a Senate where the majority leader refuses to allow any amendments on these bills to be debated or to be voted on.

Now, the unanimous consent proposal that I put forward a couple of hours ago said there are three Republican amendments that have been filed. Let's vote on all of them. One of them is from my colleague who is sitting in the chair, and that amendment puts a prohibition on Federal labeling. Now, I tell my colleague that if that was up, I would be voting against it, and I would be happy to explain why. He would be happy to explain why it is a good amendment, and that is called a debate. That is called a discussion. The vote is a decision in which we are all bringing our best insights to bear. But, unfortunately, we are not debating the amendment of my colleague on a prohibition on Federal labeling because the

majority leader refused to allow him to bring it up. He rejected the unanimous consent request that would allow the amendment of my colleague who is sitting in the chair to be considered.

We agreed that the amendment of my colleague from Kentucky, Senator PAUL, could be considered. His amendment seeks to clarify and make sure that there are no criminal penalties in this labeling law. Well, I would be happy to vote for that amendment, because there are no criminal penalties and there shouldn't be any, and if we want to put an exclamation point behind that through this particular amendment from my colleague, I would be fine with that. If he were allowed to bring up that amendment, maybe he would show some other aspects of it on the floor—some other ways that reverberate and some other ways that I don't actually recognize when I read his amendment.

But he can't fill us in on the details of what his amendment would do because he is not allowed to bring it up. Even though he is a Republican, he is not allowed to bring it up, even though the Chamber is governed by a Republican majority. His own leader refuses to allow him to have his amendment brought up and debated. In fact, we agreed for another Republican amendment, the Murkowski amendment, on the labeling of genetically engineered salmon to be brought up and debated—an issue we have wrestled with here before. We have probably all heard most of the pros and cons. But perhaps in the formulation of this amendment, there are some new aspects that would have been brought to bear that would have influenced us to support it or to oppose it.

But this Republican amendment can't be brought up because the Republican leader rejected a unanimous consent request that would have allowed all of these amendments to be brought up. In fact, there were only three Republican amendments, and we agreed to hear all of them and, in exchange, we asked for three Democratic amendments.

I see that my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL has arrived to speak. I think I will come back and explain what those Democratic amendments were a bit from now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

SHOOTINGS IN LOUISIANA AND MINNESOTA

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator MERKLEY, for his very powerful arguments for improving this law. I wish to speak about the GMO labeling act. But before I do so, I wish to speak separately about concerns that are on the hearts and minds of every American today after the shootings that we have seen in Louisiana and Minnesota. These are incidents that weigh on our hearts and our minds as we watched—literally watched—the videos that have been played again and again and again on TV around the Nation.

I echo President Obama's eloquently expressed concerns shared by many Americans after the recent tragic shootings in Louisiana and Minnesota. My heart breaks for the families and communities. I agree with President Obama that acknowledging we must do better in no way contradicts our respect for law enforcement.

As a former prosecutor, a U.S. attorney, and attorney general of my State for 20 years, I worked with law enforcement officials closely for more than two decades. I worked with them with great admiration for their courage and professionalism. I understand and appreciate the challenges they face every day, their selflessness in the line of duty, and their commitment to keeping our communities safe, often at great sacrifice to themselves.

Tragedies like the deaths of Philando Castile and Alton Sterling threaten to undermine trust and understanding between law enforcement and the communities they serve. That is why I fought to pass the Death in Custody Reporting Act—bipartisan legislation which requires States to report to the U.S. Department of Justice information regarding individuals who die every year while in police custody or during the course of an arrest. I have also supported funding to help local law enforcement agencies cooperate and collaborate more closely with communities and build trust by purchasing and using body-worn cameras, which have been shown to reduce citizen complaints by as much as 88 percent.

We have much more to do in effectively assuring justice for communities of color. We must have an honest conversation about the role of race in society, not just in the disparities in the criminal justice system but in our economy, our media, and our communities. Words alone are insufficient. We must act. I will continue to work with my colleagues in Washington, across the country, and Connecticut to bring Americans together and make our society more just for all.

As a separate part of the record, if there is no objection, Mr. President, I would like to continue our discussion about the GMO labeling bill. I regret very sincerely the absence of an opportunity to offer these amendments that might improve this bill and enable us to provide the American people with what they need and deserve—the best possible legislative product this body can provide, a legislative product that matches the desires of 90 percent of Americans to know more about what they are eating, the 15,000 Connecticut people who have corresponded with me, and the many individuals, activists, and advocates who tell me they believe they have a right to know what is in their food when it comes to GMOs.

The science is beyond my advocacy, but the consumer protection issue is one all of us are experts on. We all know we need better and more information, and so to make access to that information more difficult and cumbersome and even costly for Americans flies in the face of what we regard as free and open and fair markets and free enterprise. It is more than just about the doctrines of deceptive and misleading marketing which the good guys in the world of business certainly want to avoid. It is about providing more information, as much accurate information as possible, because consumers have a right and a need to know. Throwing roadblocks in the way of that right doesn't do justice for them. They deserve better.

So I will continue this fight. We are near an hour now where we will vote. I greatly respect the dedication of my colleagues who have worked hard on this measure. My very distinguished and able friend from Michigan Senator STABENOW is now with us. She and I are in agreement, my guess is, 99 percent of the time, and I respect as well our colleague Senator ROBERTS, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, but the issue here is supremely important to the health and well-being of Americans—not just today, not just children and families at this moment but for years and decades to come. While the science may be debated, the consumer protection issue is beyond doubt. Let's open information to the American consumers, make it more available, not less so; remove the obstacles, not create more hurdles; reduce the costs, not raise the expense; and provide the access that Americans need to full and fair information about GMOs that may be in their food.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Mr. President.

I couldn't agree more with my friend from Connecticut. I think probably 99 percent of the time we are voting the same way. There are good people on both sides of this discussion. There is a lot of emotion, and I think this issue around information and GMO labeling is really a proxy fight in many ways for those who support biotechnology, those who don't, and those who want to debate pesticides and other important issues that don't relate to labeling but have come into this situation.

I think what we need to focus on is the fact that, A, people have a right to know information, how do we make sure it is done effectively, and at the same time we certainly don't want costs to be going up as was indicated. I know if we have 50 different labeling laws in 50 different States, that means the cost of putting those labels on and manufacturing and to grocers and so on, it is going to go up and not down, which is why there was great concern in the House when the bill was passed there a year ago.

So the question for us is, How do we make sure costs don't go up? How do we ensure we have a right to know? And how do we make sure we believe in the science and respect the science?

The FDA has said very clearly, in rejecting petitions to label under human health and safety laws, petition after petition, they have said the science does not show risk to human health.

So looking at the National Academy of Sciences and the FDA and others, both world medical groups as well as those in this country, it is clear this is not a health and safety issue, but it is an information issue, and I believe it needs to be addressed, which is why the FDA, which handles the information and marketing, is the place where this belongs because the FDA does not believe it is in their jurisdiction related to science around food safety.

So we know if we go back a moment—let me just say, before talking about labeling, I believe in supporting all sorts of agriculture. When I chaired the Agriculture Committee and we started working on the 5-year farm bill a number of years ago—it is hard to believe we are halfway through it right now—but I said it was very important that we support all parts of agriculture and not pit one group against the other, which is one of my concerns right now in this whole debate, pitting one side against the other, because we didn't do that in the farm bill. We created great increases in organic research, organic checkoff and marketing as well as traditional production agriculture. We did some very exciting creative things for local food hubs and urban agriculture that had not been done before. We said we were going to support all of agriculture.

I believe, from a consumer standpoint, if we give choices, then consumers will decide. We know also that the fastest growing sector of the food sector is organic, which is non-GMO, by the way, and one of the things we do is strengthen that label and make it clear for the public to know they are purchasing organic and a non-GMO product.

We came out of the farm bill with all parts of agriculture working together and we won a good farm bill. I think probably one of, if not the most, progressive farm bills we have had, supporting all parts of agriculture because we weren't pitting one group against the other, which, unfortunately, that is what this debate has become right now.

When the House almost exactly a year ago passed a bill to preempt States—I know Vermont passed a State law. When the House voted to indicate there shouldn't be 50 different States with 50 different labeling laws and passed a preemption, they included only voluntary labeling, and consumers called that the DARK Act because it wasn't a required mandatory labeling of information and transparency. So the House bill, with the voluntary process, came here and I opposed it. I opposed it at every turn and indicated we had to have a mandatory system of information and of labeling for consumers that should be done in a way that does not stigmatize biotechnology, and it should be done in a way that does not set up more costs for consumers by 50 different States with different labeling laws adding costs for grocery manufacturers and grocers and so on, which is what would happen if we had 50 different laws.

I went through this at one time back years ago when we were debating fuel economy standards when California passed its own fuel economy standard for automobiles. As other States looked at that, they were trying to push the Federal Government—rightly so—and the industry said: We can't have 50 different standards for fuel economy. So we said: OK. You are right, but that means you have to have a national standard on fuel economy, and that is where we ended up.

So the people of Vermont, first of all, should feel very good that what they have done has created this situation to get us to a national labeling program, but here's what happens if we do nothing right now. We have a couple of choices. One is that Vermont has a GMO label. We have two other States that are waiting to see if States around them pass labeling laws that at some point may come into this, but that is basically who is getting information. We talked about everyone should have information. Right there. Those are the folks who have labeling laws.

There were attempts on the west coast to pass labeling laws, and those were not successful so this is what we have.

Now what we are proposing is that everybody will have information, people in my home State of Michigan, people across the country, everybody will get information and there will have to be a mandatory label. We give three choices on food that contain GMOs, not voluntary but a mandatory labeling system. So what do we do and how is it different than what happened in the House?

Well, first of all, as I have indicated, a national mandatory labeling requirement, and I will talk more about that in a moment.

Secondly, in Vermont and at the State level, meat, eggs, cheese, and dairy are exempt—totally exempt. So someone called it the Vermont meat loophole. So we said: You know what. That is not acceptable. So we added 25,000 more food products under this law that we would be voting on tonight. On this bill, 25,000 more food products will be labeled for people to know whether they are getting GMO ingredients.

Next, the organic label. I have to say the organic trade organization was extremely effective in the efforts in passing the farm bill. They came to me with four different items they were interested in including. It was tough to get all four of those. I didn't think we actually could get them in negotiations. After our tough negotiations, I appreciate that we actually were able to achieve all four requests of the Organic Trade Association.

Even though they would prefer to have one kind of label, like Vermont, they understand this was a very big step forward for the organic community. It was a step forward to get mandatory requirement and accountability. And I very much respect and appreciate the fact that when they were able to achieve all four items they felt were critical for organic farmers, they indicated they were very supportive of that and what we are doing here.

Then we made sure that State and Federal consumer laws were protected, so that the label is preempted, having a label, but enforcing penalties if there is fraud or misinformation or something else related to the label—those enforcement mechanisms are maintained. So that is where the enforcement comes from.

The only way we are like the House is that we prevent a patchwork of 50 different labeling laws. But everything else we have done builds on and strengthens the public's right to know as it relates to GMO ingredients.

One of the big debates: OK, there are three different options. Vermont has words on the package, and we have some companies now that are doing that. They are going to indicate—regardless of what we do, they want the definition settled and they want a national policy, but based on consumer demand, they are going to proceed to have words on the package. I believe we will see more and more of that happening in the marketplace, companies responding to consumer demand.

The other option we give is a label, an on-pack symbol. We don't specifically say ''GMO'' in a circle, but something like that.

The third option we give is an electronic label. Some people say QR code, which actually came from the auto industry and stands for quick response code—when they were tracking labels and checking parts and other parts of the system, which actually has worked very well. But the fact is that some kind of electronic label—and technology is changing every day. Apps are changing every day. So there will probably be other options that are talked about other than a QR code.

But the reality is, just as a number of groups right now that care about food and the environment have their own apps that give consumers information, this is the other option. You would be able to take your phone—by the way, according to Nielsen, 82 percent of the public has a smartphone—82 percent, not 10 percent—and we are expecting that to be more like 90 percent very shortly. You are able to scan, and immediately it will come up on the front—immediately, not hidden somewhere, not two or three clicks to get there, but you will immediately get information, yes or no, on whether there are GMOs. In fact, when you see whatever the code is, you are probably going to have a pretty good hint by that as well.

So why do that? Well, some in the food industry would say there is a desire to make sure that when people are

given information about genetically engineered or genetically modified foods, that they actually get information such as ''The National Academy of Sciences says this is safe for human consumption.'' That is the reason.

I think there is another reason for this, and the reason it has been suggested in other forms is so that people really do get more information about their food. The reality is that the No. 1 question people ask is about food allergies. It is very difficult to find that out right now. Going forward, I think we can create an effective, user-friendly electronic label that will give people ''yes'' or ''no'' on not just GMOs but on food allergies.

The next question was about antibiotics in meat. There are multiple questions people have that need to be answered, not just one. There are multiple things people are interested in.

Despite the emotions around this debate, I think probably in the future we are going to see effective uses of our technology to give us more information in a user-friendly way.

The other thing we do is say that the USDA has to review accessibility of broadband, accessibility of the technology before this starts, that they have to do that right away. They are required to and are given the authority to be able to put additional scanners in stores, so that if somebody doesn't have a phone, they can take the can, put it up to the scanner, and it will give them information about food allergies or GMOs or whatever. The first thing that comes up has to be GMOs.

The USDA is required to look at accessibility because there are legitimate issues around accessibility that need to be addressed, and that is one of the things they are given the authority to address, and we need to make sure that continues to be addressed.

But the final thing I will say about this is that companies, consumers, stores, grocery stores will drive this. Once we say this is it—we have companies right now saying: Great. Three options. We are doing this one because that is what our customers want.

We have stores, great stores like Whole Foods, that say: You know what, you can have three options, but we are only going to allow an on-pack symbol or words in our store.

That is going to drive the marketplace. The marketplace is going to be driven by those who are involved—by consumers, by the companies, by others who make sure they are giving people the information the way they want it.

Let me say just a couple of other things. I mentioned 25,000 additional food products in the stores. Anything that is a GMO product, package, frozen, that includes some meat in it—we are going to be adding to the information consumers will have access to. I will give an example. Right now, fettuccine Alfredo is labeled in Vermont, but if you put chicken in it, it is not labeled. To go on, if you have a vegetable soup, it is labeled, but if it is beef vegetable soup, it is not. If there is even beef broth in it, it is not. I don't know how that makes sense, and yet that is the law under Vermont. I think people should be asking for more than what is going on in Vermont. Cheese pizza is labeled in Vermont, but if you put pepperoni on it, it is not, even though it still has GMO ingredients. So 25,000 additional products will be labeled because people have a right to know.

Let me finally indicate again that we have strengthened the ''USDA Organic'' label. This is no small thing. This is very important. The public needs to know, has the right to know, that USDA Organic also means non-GMO and that that is a choice you have right now, to be able to make sure you are getting the products that have the kinds of ingredients you want.

Again, I appreciate the emotionalism. In all honesty, I have to say this debate has gone in a lot of directions. A lot of things have been said that I certainly don't agree with. I question a lot of the things that have been said in terms of a factual nature. I also think we have gone into a lot of other tangents on things, debating other kinds of things and using the debate about the label as a proxy for a broader debate about biotechnology in the public. I appreciate and I respect that debate. Even though I disagree with things that are said, I respect that; that is why we are here.

I also will say in conclusion that we have a responsibility to govern, and governing means that you have to come together and work together. If we are going to get things done, it has to be bipartisan, or it doesn't get done. That is just a fact.

So if we are going to do something that is meaningful, that makes sure all of the country has the opportunity to have information and a national standard and the maximum amount of products labeled and that will protect the organic label in all of the country—by the way, the organic protections we have are not in the Vermont law. So if we are going to make sure all the provisions I talked about are not just available in some places but everyplace, that means we have to come together and work together. That means rough-and-tumble negotiations, tough negotiations. These are some of the toughest negotiations I have ever been in, and we have to be willing to have some give-and-take.

In the climate we are in today, I know it is a lot easier to go to your corner and point fingers at the other side and to develop conspiracy theories and to create situations and say things that, frankly, are extremely disparaging about people's motives and so on, and that is unfortunate. But we also know that we are people of good will; that is why we get things done. We may disagree on this one particular issue, but we are a group who gets things done when we work together, when we respect all opinions, when we fight as hard as we can to get as much as we can for what we believe in and then stand together to be able to move forward.

Debating is great. It is not enough. People expect us to actually get things done. And contrary to what was done in the House, we have a mandatory national labeling system with 25,000 additional products than what is currently being labeled in Vermont or proposed in other States. We strengthen the organic label. We protect consumer laws to be able to enforce when there is fraud or there are other mislabeling issues. And at the same time, we make sure that citizens across the country, not just in one part of the country, are getting their right to know in a way that provides accurate information.

I thank everyone. I thank my partner, Senator ROBERTS. I appreciate the debate on all sides. I hope we are going to be coming to a conclusion shortly so that we can move on and actually implement and share information for consumers about how to access very important information not only about GMO ingredients and labeling, but I believe there are other important pieces of information for consumers to have as well. I think we should be looking for ways to make sure consumers get all of the kinds of information they are interested in as it relates to their food.

Thanks again for everyone's hard work and patience this evening as we have held everyone later this evening.

I would finally say one thing, if I might, and that is that I have worked in the last 24 hours to do everything I can to help my friends on the other side of this issue be able to get the votes they are interested in as it relates to amendments. Unfortunately, there was not agreement on how to do that. There was an offering two different times on amendments, to have an amendment vote on an important amendment, and folks opposed to the bill did not feel they wanted to do that, that that was enough. I respect that, but we now are at a point where we really need to come to a close and move forward on this important bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this evening, both sides will have an opportunity to take the next step and begin debate on the fiscal year 2017 Defense appropriations bill.

President Obama's announcement yesterday about our troops in Afghanistan only underscores the Senate's need to take up and pass the Defense appropriations bill right now. Although I support a high level of force to train and equip the Afghan forces and conduct counterterrorism operations, the President's announcement reminds us of the need for this bill.

The President made a commitment to our allies, and Senate Democrats

must join us in meeting our commitment to the force. The training to prepare forces for deployment to Afghanistan, the weapons they will carry, the spare parts and fuel consumed in training, and operations and the ammunition needed to execute their missions, not to mention their basic pay, is funded through this bill.

Our all-volunteer force does not shrink from this commitment, and this Senate shouldn't fail our duty to provide for them. This funding is for current operations, for combat readiness, and for the commitment announced just yesterday by President Obama.

Last month, the Secretary of Defense made a long-term commitment, stating that ''the United States will remain the most powerful military and main underwriter of security in the [Asia Pacific] region for decades to come.'' He made that commitment knowing our allies and the Chinese were listening to analyze our Nation's intentions and our plans. These promises cannot be upheld if we fail to fund the weapons systems, munitions, training, and personnel required to balance against China's plans to expand its sphere of influence in the region.

We have a near-term and long-term need to pass this bill, and commitments like these made by the administration cannot be met—cannot be met—if our Democratic friends block this critical funding.

I would remind everyone that at a time when we face an array of terror threats around the globe, we cannot afford to put politics above support for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines or our efforts to move the appropriations process forward. So I was troubled by a letter I received earlier today from Democratic leaders implying they might actually block this bipartisan bill and, with it, critical funding to provide for our warriors and provide for our national defense.

They called for regular order, but I will remind my colleagues this bill is the epitome—the epitome—of regular order. The Senate passed the authorizing legislation—the National Defense Authorization Act. The bipartisan bill respects the budget caps in place. And it was reported out of the Committee on Appropriations with the support of every single Democrat and every single Republican on the committee.

As the top Democrat on the Defense Subcommittee himself has said, ''This defense bill takes a responsible approach to protecting our country—honoring the bipartisan budget deal in place,'' and the senior Democrat on the committee said of this bill that she is ''happy to support'' the bill.

There is no excuse to filibuster this bill. Everybody in the committee supported it. It is consistent with the budget agreement reached last year. So I would urge all my colleagues to support moving forward to debate this important legislation they say they are in favor of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are as patriotic as the Republicans. We support our military just as much as the Republicans do. We are led by a number of stalwart people, not the least of which is the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services, JACK REED. JACK REED is a West Point graduate, a man who everyone respects—Democrats and Republicans—and he is a man of integrity. He is going to vote against moving forward on this bill. BARBARA MIKULSKI, the matriarch of the Senate, someone who is respected worldwide for her integrity and the work she has done in the Senate, will vote no.

We need a strong defense, and we acknowledge that, but we also understand that a strong defense is more than the Pentagon. The Pentagon would tell you that. They do not like the OCO funding that is being talked about, whispered about. To have a strong defense means more than the Pentagon, I repeat. It means making sure the Department of Homeland Security is well financed. We want to make sure the Drug Enforcement Administration is strong and well financed. We want to make sure the FBI is an agency that we take good care of. There are a lot of other entities we are concerned about.

The Republican leader, I am stunned, is concerned because we sent him a letter yesterday; four Democratic leaders sent him a letter. We simply said that it is important we not be given a little dance step on this matter. We all know what they are trying to do here. We have a defense bill, it is an appropriations bill, and once that is done, the appropriations process will be wiped out, and we will be at the mercy of the Republicans in some form or fashion. With the defense bill done, everything else will be pushed away someplace else.

I want to read just a few things. Time doesn't run out until 10:22, and I understand that, but I want to read a few things from the letter we wrote to the Republican leader. The letter was sent by me, DURBIN, SCHUMER, and MURRAY. Here is what we said, among other things:

> Without strong, public assurance that you are committed to honoring the core tenets of the bipartisan compromise—including fair funding, parity, and a rejection of poison pill riders—through the completion of the full appropriations process, we will no longer be able to support proceeding to new appropriations bills.
>
> For example, the House has passed a Defense Appropriations Bill that uses a budget gimmick to hand out extra taxpayer dollars for the Pentagon, with no equivalent support for domestic security and other initiatives important to the middle class. Similarly, during consideration of the fiscal year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, Senator MCCAIN offered an amendment to authorize an additional $18 billion in overseas contingency operations—

This is the gimmick—

> funding only for the Pentagon, a clear violation of the parity principle. Senators Reed of Rhode Island and Mikulski offered a competing amendment to increase OCO funding by $18 billion and provide a matching $18 billion to invest in security at home by providing funding for law enforcement and the Department of Homeland Security, invest in job creating infrastructure and scientific research, and address national emergencies like Zika, opioids, and access to clean drinking water. However, the amendment fell on a largely party-line vote.
>
> The willingness of Republicans to consider the McCain amendment and to reject the Reed-Mikulski amendment, combined with the reported desire of Senate Republicans to offer an OCO amendment to the Defense appropriations bill sends a deeply troubling signal about your willingness to appropriate by the parity principle. Further, this unbalanced approach does not truly keep Americans safe or protect our interests abroad. Without sufficient funding for the vital national security work done by local law enforcement agencies, enforcement of sanctions and cutting off terrorist financing, and counterterrorism, we hinder a coherent national security policy.

And here is the last paragraph of this letter.

> We urge you to publicly give your word that all appropriations bills considered in both chambers and sent to the President for his signature will comply with the principle of fair funding, parity, and a rejection of poison pill riders. If you cannot give us such assurance, we will be forced to oppose proceeding to future appropriations bills until you agree to keep your promises and honor our agreement.

This is signed by REED, DURBIN, SCHUMER, and MURRAY.

So Mr. President, we really want to do the appropriations bills. We have had a little trouble, as you know. We have had this situation with the veterans bill. It brings back a Zika bill that has been formulated not here. We passed a very good Zika bill. It wasn't as much money as I wanted—$1.1 billion in emergency funding. It passed here by 89 votes. What do we get back from the House? What do we get back from the House? They whack Planned Parenthood. They have to do that. That is the only thing they can get out of the House Republicans. They cut $500 million from veterans, and that money is to be used for processing claims. We really need help with those. There is $500 million they take from ObamaCare, money from Ebola. And, of course, they have to do something about the EPA. You have to do something there or let's do something with the Clean Water Act.

So that is all in this bill. What we sent to the House you wouldn't recognize in what we have back here. The Zika mosquitoes are still out floating around. And then, to make this bill even more strange—what we got back from the House—they stuck in a provision that said we can fly the Confederate flag in veterans cemeteries. How about that.

So is there any reason we should be suspect about what is going on around here? Of course we are. And unless we hear something publicly from the Republican leader today, just as I indicated, that he publicly give his word that all appropriations bills considered

in both Chambers and sent to the President for his signature will comply with what we have talked about—fair funding, parity, and a rejection of poison pill riders—if we don't get that assurance, we are going to have move to go to a different plane, and it is just unfair to do anything else.

All we need is the one example of what we have just been through—Zika funding—which has all the craziness I just talked about. So if we want to talk about political games, this is a picture-perfect example of what happened on the veterans bill, and we are concerned the same thing would happen on what we are doing right now.

So I am going to recommend to all my Senators that, until we have a public assurance from the Republican leader, we should vote no on this cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, one thing my good friend the Democratic leader always used to remind me of when he was the majority leader is the majority leader always gets the last word. So I will take advantage of that tonight.

For anyone who may still be watching C–SPAN 2 at this late hour, let me suggest the Democratic Party ought to be renamed the ''dysfunction party.'' When they were in the majority they didn't function and when they are in the minority they do not function.

Let's just take a look at the last couple of weeks. A Zika MILCON bill goes through here with every Democrat supporting it, and then all of a sudden they do not like it. A CARA bill goes through here with not a single Democrat opposing it, and then they refuse to sign the conference report. And now what the Democratic leader is saying is that the Republican Senate needs to guarantee what the democratic House will do as a condition for passing a bill through the Senate that every single Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations supported. It came out of committee unanimously.

This is the definition of dysfunction. So, apparently, what we will witness here shortly is our Democratic friends, all of whom on the committee supported the bill, preventing us from taking it up because they want us to get a guarantee from the House as to what the House result will be. That is not the way it works. The way you pass a law is the Senate passes a bill, the House passes a bill, and you negotiate with each other and with the administration.

So the hour is late and the die seems to be cast. It is my understanding that when I yield the floor, we will be going to a vote; is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 7 minutes remaining postcloture.

Mr. MCCONNELL. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that Senator MERKLEY——

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I don't know how long the Democratic leader wants to go on with this, but let me remind him of what he always reminded me—that I will have the last word.

Mr. REID. I have no doubt that is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when we finish our remarks, Senator MERKLEY be recognized for up to 2 minutes to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I do have to say this. To call the Democratic Party the party of disunity—look at what is going on with my Republican colleagues. Look at what is going on. They are the party of Trump. So don't call us dysfunctional.

The example given by my friend the Republican leader that we supported the bill dealing with Zika—we sure did. We had 98 votes. I mentioned that in my remarks. Of course we did, because it was emergency funding. It wasn't as much money as we wanted, but we accepted it because of the work done by Senators MURRAY and BLUNT. But what have we gotten back from the House? It isn't even in the same category of the world. It is something totally different.

So I say to my friend the Republican leader and to all of his colleagues: Please don't try this—that the Democratic Party is the party of disunity—when you are being led by Donald Trump.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I see the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee on the floor. I would recount to everyone that I said to her weeks and weeks ago that we will devote as much time as it takes to try to get back to a regular process and move appropriation bills across the floor. So we have devoted an enormous amount of time to try to get the appropriations process functioning again here in the Senate.

I don't understand why the Democratic leadership refuses to honor what I think are the wishes of the majority of the Democrats on the committee who have been supporting these bills—most of which have come out of committee on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis and this particular defense bill, unanimously. They don't even want to go to it and let the Senate function.

But I know the hour is late. That is the final observation I intend to make tonight.

I understand Senator MERKLEY is going to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, we have had a lively debate over this bill. I have argued today that it is deeply flawed in several key ways. This was emphasized in an editorial in the New York Times this morning. It said:

> The biggest problem with the Senate bill is that—instead of requiring a simple label, as the Vermont law does—it would allow food companies to put the information in electronic codes that consumers would have to scan with smartphones or at scanners installed at grocery stores. The only reason to do this would be to make the information less accessible.
>
> Another problem is that the bill might not cover some kinds of genetic engineering. The Food and Drug Administration warned that the bill ''would result in a somewhat narrow scope of coverage''—for example, food that includes oil made from genetically engineered soybeans might not need to be labeled.

We have amendments to fix these things. If one really believes in a mandatory GMO labeling bill, these amendments would be allowed to come up and be debated. We offered to agree for every Republican amendment filed to be debated and voted on. We asked, simply, for three amendments on the Democratic side, in balance to all the Republican amendments being considered, and that was objected to by the majority leader.

So let me just close by saying that I will offer a motion to take away the roadblock to amendments put in place, and that is McConnell amendment No. 4936. I will move to table that amendment so that amendments—Republican amendments, Democratic amendments, six amendments, three on each side—can be considered so we can truly debate and fix the problems that are in this bill.

I also want to close by thanking my colleague from Michigan, who has done an incredible effort. She will be so relieved to have this bill completed. We have debated many, many times. Really, there is so much we agree on—a single national standard that will work across this country, a single national GMO standard. She has made the case that we are achieving that. I responded: Not quite, and we need to still fix the bill. That is the type of debate we should have on the floor of the Senate, and it is why we should allow amendments.

AMENDMENT NO. 4936

Mr. President, I move to table McConnell amendment No. 4936, and ask for the yeas and nays, so that we could consider amendments such as those presented by my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the

Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—-yeas 31, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 122 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Blumenthal	Markey	Sanders
Booker	Menendez	Schatz
Cantwell	Merkley	Schumer
Cardin	Mikulski	Sullivan
Durbin	Murkowski	Tester
Gillibrand	Murphy	Udall
Heinrich	Murray	Warren
Hirono	Nelson	Whitehouse
Kaine	Paul	Wyden
King	Reed	
Leahy	Reid	

NAYS—62

Alexander	Donnelly	McConnell
Ayotte	Enzi	Moran
Baldwin	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Feinstein	Peters
Bennet	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Franken	Roberts
Brown	Gardner	Rounds
Burr	Grassley	Rubio
Capito	Hatch	Sasse
Carper	Heitkamp	Scott
Casey	Hoeven	Sessions
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Stabenow
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Daines	McCaskill	

NOT VOTING—7

Boxer	Graham	Vitter
Coats	Heller	
Coons	Lee	

The motion was rejected.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 122, I voted nay. It was my intention to vote yea. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 4936

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4936.

The amendment (No. 4936) was rejected.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4935

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 764 with amendment No. 4935.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—-yeas 63, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Ernst	Menendez
Baldwin	Feinstein	Mikulski
Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Bennet	Franken	Nelson
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Peters
Brown	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Capito	Hirono	Roberts
Carper	Hoeven	Rounds
Casey	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Kaine	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Stabenow
Cotton	Klobuchar	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Wicker

NAYS—30

Blumenthal	Leahy	Sasse
Booker	Markey	Schatz
Cantwell	Merkley	Schumer
Cardin	Murkowski	Sessions
Collins	Murphy	Sullivan
Durbin	Murray	Tester
Flake	Paul	Udall
Gillibrand	Reed	Warren
Heinrich	Reid	Whitehouse
King	Sanders	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Boxer	Graham	Vitter
Coats	Heller	
Coons	Lee	

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 524, H.R. 5293, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Jerry Moran, Richard C. Shelby, John Hoeven, Lamar Alexander, Orrin G. Hatch, Daniel Coats, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Bill Cassidy, John Thune, John Boozman, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 5293, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Donnelly	Murkowski	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Booker	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Markey	Shaheen
Carper	McCaskill	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Heinrich	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Graham	Lee
Coats	Heller	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 44.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN BIRTHPLACE NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Kentucky is proud to be the birthplace and boyhood home of one of our Nation's greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. We commemorate this great man's humble origins with the Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Park, in Hodgenville, KY.

On July 17, 1916, this park site was donated to the American people and became part of the National Park Service, and so this year, we celebrate the centennial anniversary of this most historic and revered park being in the care of the American people.

At the center of the park stands the Memorial Building, constructed to commemorate the life and accomplishments of the 16th President of the United States. The Memorial Building—built before the iconic Lincoln Memorial on the National Mall here in the Nation's Capital—was the first Lincoln memorial built in America.

It was built by the American people, with over 100,000 citizens, young and old, both in the north and the south, donating sums as small as 25 cents. Fifty-six steps lead up to the building, representing the 56 years of Lincoln's life. The 16 windows symbolize Lincoln's status as the 16th President.

Inside the Memorial Building is the Symbolic Birth Cabin, a replica of the single-room log cabin Lincoln was born in on February 12, 1809. The original cabin that Lincoln was born in and lived in until age 2 was apparently dismantled sometime before 1865. The Symbolic Birth Cabin reminds us of the rural, hardscrabble life the future President faced on the Kentucky frontier, a life that would eventually take him to the Oval Office.

The Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Park also includes the Knob Creek site, the area where Lincoln lived from age 2 to the age of 7. Lincoln himself recalled that his earliest memories were of Knob Creek. Here, he helped his family with planting the garden, carrying water, and collecting wood for fires.

More than 200,000 people every year visit the Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Park in central Kentucky to see the origins of our leader and President. The park has received visitors from as far away as Mongolia, China, Russia, and Australia, among other places, who come to this tiny town to see proof that the ideals of America really are true, that even one born into the most modest means can rise to become a great nation's President.

I know my colleagues join me in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Park. It is an important milestone to mark, both for Kentucky and our country, and the National Park Service will celebrate it later this month. The Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Park is a lasting tribute to Abraham Lincoln and to how the Bluegrass State shaped and formed him.

For 100 years, the National Park Service has kept careful watch over this sacred ground. I want to congratulate and extend my gratitude to all those National Park Service employees and volunteers who have contributed to this important effort. Kentucky is proud of them, and we are proud to be the birthplace of America's 16th President. This park reminds us that one our Nation's greatest leaders emerged from the hills of the Kentucky countryside.

TRIBUTE TO ALLEN GILBERT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to recognize the achievements and contributions of a remarkable advocate and distinguished leader in my home State of Vermont.

This summer, Allen Gilbert will be stepping down from his position as executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Vermont. For more than 12 years, Allen has inspired Vermonters and many others as an advocate for personal freedoms.

When Allen began at the ACLU–VT, the office had three staff members, only one of whom was full time. Under Allen's leadership, the office has grown to a staff of five, with two lawyers committed to the State's legislative activities. Allen has become widely known for expanding the work and visibility of the ACLU–VT. Those who have had the privilege of working with Allen cite his boundless wisdom and passion for civil liberties among his many notable qualities.

During his time with the ACLU–VT, Allen has been a champion of free speech, government transparency, and privacy rights, not just in Vermont but nationwide. I have long counted him as an ally in my own work. I was proud to invite him to testify before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee in 2007 about the REAL ID Act. More recently, Allen's contributions were extremely helpful as I developed reforms to curtail government surveillance powers, culminating in the enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. Allen and I have also worked together to end Federal vehicle checkpoints near White River Junction.

Among many successes, Allen is well-known in Vermont for his work on cases to protect students' rights to freedom of speech and political expression and the rights of the LGBT community. More recently, Allen and the ACLU–VT have worked to create more consistency among Vermont law enforcement agencies regarding the use of force. And Allen's work highlighting automated license plate readers, cell phone tracking devices, facial recognition technology, and the use of domestic drones has helped to educate Vermonters and its policymakers about the need to address these evolving technologies. In doing so, Allen has once again demonstrated his leadership in protecting Vermonters.

I am not alone in recognizing Allen's talents and tenacity. In 2012, the Vermont Press Association awarded him with the Matthew Lyon Award for his lifetime commitment to the First Amendment and protecting the public's right to know. The award is named after the Vermont Congressman who won reelection from jail in 1798, while serving time for violating the Sedition Act because he challenged the power of the Presidency. Matthew Lyon is considered one of our Nation's earliest free speech heroes.

Allen's commitment to freedom of speech and equality extends far past his 12 years at the ACLU–VT. In earlier years, Allen was a reporter and editor at the Rutland Herald and the Barre-Montpelier Times Argus. He also taught writing at a number of Vermont colleges and served as chair of the Worcester, VT, School Board while it supported a case for equal education opportunity. That 1997 Vermont Supreme Court case ultimately changed the way we fund public education in Vermont.

Although Allen is leaving ACLU–VT, I know he will remain a lifelong advocate for the freedoms and liberties we hold dear. As Allen has said, ''There's a saying that civil liberties are never permanently won; you have to continue to fight for them constantly.'' He is an exemplary Vermonter, and I know he will continue that fight.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service and 100 years of national parks.

Often called the land of ''Great Faces, Great Places,'' South Dakota's differing landscapes and abundance of outdoor activities mean there is something for everyone to enjoy. As a result, spending time outside with our family and friends is one of our favorite pastimes.

This August marks the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service. South Dakota is fortunate to be home to six national parks located throughout the State. Among them are the desolate but beautiful Badlands and one of our country's oldest national parks: Wind Cave. Jewel Cave in Custer, the Lewis & Clark Trail, the Minuteman Missile Site, and Mount Rushmore are all maintained by the National Park Service as well. The sixth national park, the Missouri River, cuts the State in half and provides energy and entertainment to people across the State. Few realize that a 100-mile stretch of the Missouri River is part of both the National Park System and the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The world's first national park, Yellowstone, was established by Congress in 1872, before Montana or Wyoming were official States. Following that, the Organic Act of 1916 created the National Park Service as an agency under

the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The Organic Act was signed into law by President Woodrow Wilson on August 25, 1916. The purpose of the National Park Service was to ''conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.'' The National Park Service has continued to fulfill this mission for the past 100 years.

There is no better place to spend quality time with friends and family than the great outdoors of South Dakota, and there is no better time to celebrate the great outdoors than this year.

BOYCOTTING THE BDS

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, last week we were reminded of the tragic history of the 20th century and the reemergence of the State of Israel from the embers of the Holocaust. Elie Wiesel, Holocaust survivor and the voice of the unconquerable human spirit, died.

Wiesel summed up his mission and what should be the driving creed of American Foreign Policy in 1986 when accepting the Nobel Peace Prize: ''Whenever and wherever human beings endure suffering and humiliation, take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented.'' On the cornerstone of the Holocaust Museum here in Washington are his words: ''For the dead and the living, we must bear witness.''

Wiesel defended Soviet Jews, Cambodian refugees, the Kurds, and the victims of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia. He was Israel's most vocal supporter, although he was criticized by the left for his friendship with and support for Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. When Mr. Netanyahu spoke to Congress last year, denouncing President Obama's appeasement of the Iranian mullahs, Wiesel was the guest of honor.

Elie Wiesel's passing comes at a time when the specter of anti-Semitism is gaining new life across the globe and sadly within the United States. On many campuses, including some in my State, we have seen the advancement of the ''Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions'' Movement—an orchestrated campaign to delegitimize the State of Israel, shun Jewish academics, boycott Jewish goods, and disrupt Jewish commerce.

Israeli flags and books are burned on campuses in the United States and Western Europe, recalling the words of the German Jewish poet Heine, who warned that ''where one first burns books, one then burns people.''

We have seen this all before, and we know where it can lead.

Formally launched a decade ago, BDS advocates divestment by companies with holdings in Israel and boycotts by academics and artists. In May 2013, Cambridge Physicist Stephen Hawking pulled out of a conference hosted by then Israeli President Shimon Peres. Strangely, Professor Hawking has been all too happy to pay visits to Iran and China and praise the tyrants who rule those countries.

Musicians Elvis Costello and Annie Lennox have refused to perform in Israel. It now makes news when a performer shows up in Israel. Two years ago, Sir Elton John courageously stood up to the mob and proudly shouted from an Israeli stage, ''Shalom! We are so happy to be back here! Ain't nothin' gonna stop us from comin', baby!''

Our own Department of Education has awarded millions of dollars to so-called Middle East Studies National Resource Centers, NRC, on 16 college campuses. According to published reports, fully half of the directors of these federally funded centers have called for support of the BDS Movement and six signed a letter calling for a boycott of Israeli universities and scholars. The open promotion of anti-Israeli boycotts by academic officers is a direct violation of Title VI of the Higher Education Opportunity Act and is an open assault on fundamental rights to freedom of association and expression.

BDS is not a typical act of political correctness, undertaken by radical academics whose usual prey is the youth of America. This is a worldwide movement designed to destroy the one democracy in the Middle East and the hopes of people who have occupied that land for over 3,000 years.

Indeed if the BDS Movement was isolated to a few tenured college outliers, that would be easy enough to handle. Unfortunately, it is not. Iran has pledged to wipe Israel off the map. It has tipped its missiles with the warning ''Death to Israel'' written on the cones in Hebrew. Hamas and Hezbollah shower missiles upon Israeli schools and villages. If Israel did not exist, the United Nations would go out of business. Last year, the General Assembly adopted 25 resolutions against particular countries; 22 were aimed at Israel—the others at Bashar Assad's regime in Syria and Kim Jong-un's prison state in North Korea. All of this for the 153rd largest country in the world, a place that is one four-hundredths the size of the United States.

Enough is enough. We can't remain silent. As Elie Wiesel said, ''we must bear witness.'' The Obama administration must end its indifference. It must cut off and defund those organizations that promote the hate that fuels anti-Semitism. Standing up for Israel at home validates those fundamental principles of freedom enshrined in our Constitution.

I will close with the words of John F. Kennedy:

> Israel was not created in order to disappear—Israel will Endure and flourish. It is the child of hope and the home of the brave. It can neither be broken by adversity nor demoralized by success. It carries the shield of democracy and the sword of freedom.

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS THALER

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, each year, Senator ENZI and I have the pleasure of introducing outstanding individuals who have been selected as inductees to the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame for their invaluable contributions to agriculture and the Wyoming community. This year, Dennis Thaler, a third-generation Wyoming rancher, will be honored as one of these individuals during the 104th Wyoming State Fair.

Selection as a member of the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame is not just about the quality of a calf crop or environmental improvements on the ranch, though both of these are important. This award also considers the involvement and dedication to the local communities that make Wyoming such a special place to live. I am happy to say that Dennis and his family embody the Western values that guide life in Wyoming. The Thalers raise crops like oats, millet, and wheat; run a cow-calf and yearling operation; and operate a backgrounding feedlot. Still, Dennis finds the time to be involved in the Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts, the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, and the National Cattlemen's Beef Association. The Thalers share their knowledge and experience with local students, fellow ranchers, and University of Wyoming researchers through the many field days, open houses, and workshops they host at their ranch. Dennis's dedication to his community is evident in the high praise he receives from his family, neighbors, and his many agency partners.

Dennis has been described as a ''leader,'' a ''mainstay,'' and a ''driving force'' in his community. He has been recognized for both his innovative nature and his pursuit of an inclusive, well-rounded ''teamwork approach'' in making land management decisions. These characteristics make for both a hearty rancher and a healthy landscape. Dennis and his family were recognized for their hard work in 2006 when their ranch, the Thaler Land and Livestock Company, was selected to receive the Environmental Stewardship Award. The award considers management of water, air, soil, and wildlife resources, as well as the recipient's leadership qualities and the business's sustainability. Dennis and his family exceed expectations in each of these categories.

For nearly five decades, Dennis has been at the helm of his family ranch in southeast Wyoming. He and his family have worked to improve the land and water resources to ensure a future for livestock, wildlife, and the next generation. Together with his family, I have no doubt that Dennis will lead the Thaler Land and Livestock Company into the next 100 years with the same mind for growth and conservation the ranch has experienced since 1916.

I am honored to recognize this outstanding individual and his family. It

is because of people like Dennis that agriculture continues to play such a significant role in Wyoming and across the United States. My wife, Bobbi, joins me in congratulating Dennis Thaler as one of the 2016 inductees into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:42 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 1252. An act to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 2845. An act to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1270. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

H.R. 2646. An act to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4361. An act to amend section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for enhanced security of Federal information systems, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4369. An act to authorize the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 8:12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1252. An act to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 2845. An act to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

H.R. 3766. An act to direct the President to establish guidelines for covered United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4361. An act to amend section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for enhanced security of Federal information systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4369. An act to authorize the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3079. An act to take certain Federal land located in Tuolumne County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1270. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6055. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6056. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Transition Assistance Program (TAP) for Military Personnel'' (RIN0790–AJ17) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6057. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6058. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6059. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers'' (RIN3235–AL53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6060. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Bureau for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6061. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986'' (RIN2590–AA76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6062. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts'' (RIN3235–AL94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6063. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorization in the People's Republic of China; Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.'' (RIN0694–AG91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6064. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary General License: Extension of Validity'' (RIN0694–AG82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6065. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment'' (RIN3133–AE59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6066. A communication from the Deputy Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustment and Table'' (RIN1506–AB33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6067. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment'' (RIN1014–AA30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6068. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6069. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Department of Energy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6070. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Department of Energy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6071. A communication from the Director, Office of Technology Transitions, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Technology Transfer and Related Technology Partnering Activities at the National Laboratories and Other Facilities for Fiscal Year 2014''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6072. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines'' (FRL No. 9948–65–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6073. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Technical Correction'' ((RIN2070–AB27) (FRL No. 9947–33)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6074. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; TN; Redesignation of the Sullivan County Lead Nonattainment Area to Attainment'' (FRL No. 9948–68–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6075. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Neurological Disorders'' (RIN0960–AF35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6076. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge'' (RIN0960–AI02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6077. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Holiday Events; Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2015–0786)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6078. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priorities and Definitions—Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad Program—Short-Term Projects and Long-Term Projects'' (Docket No. ED–2015–OPE–0134) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6079. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6080. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6081. A communication from the Deputy Special Master, Civil Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''James Zadroga 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund Reauthorization Act'' (RIN1105–AB49) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6082. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Agency Response for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6083. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustments for Ethics in Government Act Violations'' (RIN3209–AA00 and RIN3209–AA38) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6084. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Review of Sustainable Energy and Energy Assistance Trust Funds''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6085. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6086. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2015 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6087. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to a vacancy for the position of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, received in the office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 921. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a nonregulatory program to build on and help coordinate funding for restoration and protection efforts of the 4-State Delaware River Basin region, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–294).

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–196. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to preserve the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NUMBER 7

Whereas, A fundamental principle of tax-exempt financing is the ability of local governments to issue bonds that are free from federal taxation in order to raise capital to finance infrastructure projects that are vital to our nation, such as road, bridge, hospital, school, and utility system projects; and

Whereas, The exclusion of interest on state and local obligations from federal gross income is an important financing tool at a time when building and rebuilding infrastructure is required to meet federal mandates, promote community growth, and support economic development programs that are critical to the state and local economies of our nation; and

Whereas, The federal tax exemption is part of a more-than-century-old system of reciprocal immunity under which owners of municipal bonds are not required to pay state and federal income tax on the interest they receive from municipal bonds; and

Whereas, The federal tax exemption provides a significant difference between public sector and private sector debt financing; and

Whereas, The benefits of lower capital costs attributable to tax-exempt financing include reduced property tax rates for taxpayers, greater local investments, or both; and

Whereas, From time to time the President and the Congress of the United States have proposed legislation to tax or alter the federal exemption of interest earned on municipal bonds;

Now therefore be it *Resolved*, That we, the members of the 131st General Assembly of the State of Ohio, oppose any effort to eliminate or limit the federal tax exemption on interest earned on municipal bonds, and urge the President, and any future administration, and the Congress of the United States, to retain the current tax-exempt status of municipal bonds;

and be it further *Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, each member of the Ohio Congressional delegation, and the news media of Ohio.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 3137. A bill to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test the efficacy of providing Alzheimer's Disease caregiver support services in delaying or reducing the use of institutionalized care for Medicare beneficiaries with Alzheimer's Disease or a related dementia; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3138. A bill to prevent Iran from directly or indirectly receiving assistance from the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the energy credit for certain high-efficiency linear generator property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3140. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 3141. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to improve the monitoring of mental health and substance abuse treatment programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3142. A bill to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 3143. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to strengthen debt collection exemptions to protect debtors and their families from poverty or bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 3144. A bill to enforce the Sixth Amendment right to the assistance of effective counsel at all stages of the adversarial process, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide declaratory and injunctive relief against systemic violations of such right, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 3145. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a corporation to advocate on behalf of individuals in noncaptial criminal cases before the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3146. A bill to require servicers to provide certain notices relating to foreclosure proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 3147. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 3148. A bill to establish the John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3149. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 3150. A bill to use certain revenues from the outer Continental Shelf to reduce the Federal budget deficit; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 3151. A bill to enhance investment in education and employment programs by eliminating duplication, cutting red tape, and increasing flexibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 520. A resolution reaffirming the strong relationship, both in defense and trade, between the United States and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 521. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2016 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 522. A resolution designating July 30, 2016, as ''National Whistleblower Appreciation Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 523. A resolution relating to the death of Elie Wiesel, Holocaust survivor, powerful advocate for peace and human rights, and award-winning author; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 386, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 498

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S.

774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 827

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 2006

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2006, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents.

S. 2066

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2066, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. 2595

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2598

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2598, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 2612

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2612, a bill to ensure United States jurisdiction over offenses committed by United States personnel stationed in Canada in furtherance of border security initiatives.

S. 2823

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the section 45 credit for refined coal from steel industry fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 2830

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2830, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for a school and child care lead testing grant program.

S. 2912

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2912, a bill to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes.

S. 2927

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2927, a bill to prevent governmental discrimination against providers of health services who decline involvement in abortion, and for other purposes.

S. 2932

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2932, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 2989

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2989, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 2996

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2996, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phase out tax preferences for fossil fuels on the same schedule as the phase out of the tax credits for wind facilities.

S. 3039

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3039, a bill to support programs for mosquito-borne and other vector-borne disease surveillance and control.

S. 3060

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3060, a bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements.

S. 3070

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3070, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to address the increased burden that maintaining the health and hygiene of infants and toddlers places on families in need, the resultant adverse health effects on children and families, and the limited child care options available for infants and toddlers who lack sufficient diapers.

S. 3083

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3083, a bill to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3111

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3111, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the 7.5 percent threshold for the medical expense deduction for individuals age 65 or older.

S. 3129

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3129, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016.

S. 3132

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3132, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide service dogs to certain veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder.

S. 3135

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3135, a bill to prohibit any officer or employee of the Federal Government who has exercised extreme carelessness in the handling of classified information from being granted or retaining a security clearance.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval

under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to ''Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act''.

S. CON. RES. 36

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution expressing support of the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to that goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 3144. A bill to enforce the Sixth Amendment right to the assistance of effective counsel at all stages of the adversarial process, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide declaratory and injunctive relief against systemic violations of such right, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Clarence Gideon Full Access to Justice Act, Gideon Act, and the Equal Justice Under Law Act of 2016, two bills aimed at addressing the access to justice crisis. Today, America's broken justice system is riddled with deficiencies in our indigent defense system and gaps in legal services to the poor. To repair those shortcomings, these bills would improve the justice delivery system that serves people who are unable to afford counsel.

Gaps in legal services to the poor exist at all levels of our justice system. To fill in those gaps in the highest court of our land and better balance the scales of justice between the government and the defendants, the Gideon Act would establish an independent federal public defender office charged with representing poor defendants before the United States Supreme Court. To address the indigent defense crisis in the states, the Equal Justice Under Law Act would create a private right of action that allows a class of indigent defendants to sue in federal court when systemic violations of their Sixth Amendment rights to counsel occur.

In 1963, the Nation's highest court ruled that Americans have a Sixth Amendment right to an attorney in a criminal case, even if they cannot afford one. In Gideon v. Wainwright, the Supreme Court declared it an ''obvious truth'' that ''any person hailed into court, who is too poor to hire a lawyer, cannot be assured a fair trial unless counsel is provided to him.'' By clarifying that counsel must not only be present, but be ''effective,'' Gideon marked a landmark shift towards creating a justice system that safeguards equal justice under law for all.

Nearly 5 decades after Gideon, its promise of equal justice remains unfulfilled. Today, the federal government has no entity dedicated to furnishing legal counsel for criminal defendants in Supreme Court cases. Rather, lawyers in private practice who volunteer their services or public defenders who often have never argued before the High Court are often tasked with delivering competent legal representation to the poor in Supreme Court criminal cases.

The prosecution, however, has highly specialized lawyers from the U.S. Department of Justice who represent its interests. With a small cadre of lawyers from the Solicitor General's Office dedicated solely to Supreme Court litigation, the government amasses considerable appellate experience before the Court. As the most frequent advocate before the Court, the Solicitor General routinely files writs of certiorari and argues criminal cases each term. With this experience, the government has the opportunity, foreclosed to defendants with private attorneys, to establish familiarity and, ultimately, credibility with the Court.

The structural imbalance between prosecutors and defendants at the Supreme Court has a profound impact on our justice system. Without counsel trained and experienced in Supreme Court advocacy, the likelihood that cases are decided against criminal defendants increases. In addition, the development of criminal precedent can far too often tilt in favor of the government and against the civil rights of ordinary Americans seeking justice in criminal cases.

To address these structural deficiencies, I am introducing the Gideon Act. This bill would establish a Federal corporation called the Defender Office for Supreme Court Advocacy, which would be dedicated to Supreme Court advocacy on behalf of criminal defendants. The bill aims to breathe life into the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of effective assistance of counsel and to help level the playing field at the Supreme Court between prosecutors and defendants.

The Gideon Act would empower the office with critical tools to zealously represent indigent defendants at the front end, middle, and back end of the Supreme Court advocacy process.

At the front end, known as the writ of certiorari stage, the office would have authority to monitor noncapital Federal and State cases seeking Supreme Court review for Federal law issues. By allowing the office to file cert petitions in criminal cases, the office could have critical input into which criminal cases the Supreme Court accepts to hear and decide. By empowering the office to consult with lawyers representing criminal defendants seeking the High Court's review, the office can serve as a resource to lawyers inexperienced in Supreme Court advocacy.

During the middle of the process, known as the merits stage, the office would be empowered to zealously represent the poor. From filing merits and ''friend of the court'' briefs to responding to the Court's ''call for views'' on complex criminal law issues to participating at oral argument in criminal cases, the office could provide all forms of advocacy on behalf of the poor. As such, the office would provide a necessary counter-weight for defendants to prosecutors' specialized Supreme Court expertise within Solicitor General's Office. It would also provide a centralized resource for defenders to develop uniformity on federal criminal case law.

On the back end, after a Supreme Court case is completed, the office could help train other defenders throughout the nation on the unique experience of practicing before the Supreme Court. In addition, the office would have the power to participate in appellate advocacy before the highest State courts in our land, if resources permit. This tool is necessary to help develop criminal case law nationwide since most criminal cases that the Supreme Court hears a term come Federal criminal law issues arising from State courts, rather than from Federal courts.

Today, I am also introducing the Senate companion to H.R. 5124, the Equal Justice Under Law Act. This bill aims to address America's public defense crisis, and I thank Rep. PATRICK MALONEY for his leadership on this bill in the House of Representatives.

Today, many State and local governments have failed to provide the funding necessary for public defenders to keep pace with the flood of criminal cases. Without resources, many public defenders lack the staff, training, or time to investigate each case adequately and prepare a robust legal defense. As a result of being underpaid and overworked, they are simply unable to provide the accused with their right to effective assistance of counsel.

Ample evidence exists that shows the state of public defense in America is in crisis. According to the American Bar Association, anywhere from 60 to 90 percent of criminal defendants need publically funded attorneys. Yet, due to a lack of resources, far too many public defenders are unable to meet this demand. In fact, a 2013 report from the Brennan Center for Justice concluded that public defense offices are so overworked and underfunded that clients are not getting the legal representation they need. Citing a funding disparity between the prosecution and public defenders, the report found that State prosecutors' office budgets were $5.8 billion in 2007, while State and local public defender expenditures were only $2.3 billion.

Excessive caseloads are another example of how Americans' right to counsel is defective. In 2009, the Constitution Project's National Right to Counsel Committee—comprised of current and former judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and law enforcement officials—released a report entitled ''Justice Denied: America's Continuing Neglect of Our Constitutional Right to Counsel.'' The report found that all too often indigent defendants were provided counsel late or not at all. Even when a public defender represented a defendant, the report showed that lawyers' excessive caseloads made effective representation simply not possible. In conclusion, the report recommended ''litigation to remedy such deficiencies should be instituted.''

To help fix the indigent defense crisis, the Equal Justice Under Law Act of 2016 would implement this commonsense recommendation into action. The bill would create a federal cause of action that allows indigent criminal defendants to file a lawsuit against states and localities for systemic failures to provide effective assistance of counsel in felony cases. Litigation to be a useful tool to remedy systemic failures when indigent defense systems require defense attorneys to represent more clients than they can competently represent or otherwise fail to assure legal representation in compliance with the Sixth Amendment's right to counsel.

The bill would require states to consult with representatives from the public defender community prior to distributing Byrne JAG funds. Currently, Federal defenders are eligible for Byrne JAG funds. Yet, in practice, Federal defenders may not get the same proportion of these funds as prosecutors and law enforcement. So this provision would ensure that defenders are consulted before critical Federal funds are distributed.

This access to justice legislation has the support of numerous civil rights groups, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Innocence Project.

Our public defender system is broken. It is time we fix it. I am proud to introduce the Gideon Act and the Equal Justice Under Law Act and I urge their speedy passage.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 520—REAFFIRMING THE STRONG RELATIONSHIP, BOTH IN DEFENSE AND TRADE, BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 520

Whereas the United States and the United Kingdom have a special relationship grounded in the rule of law, democratic principles, a common language, and a strong commitment to peace and security;

Whereas, on August 14, 1941, President Franklin Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill issued the Atlantic Charter, which defined American and British war aims and laid the foundation for a post-war international system founded on free trade and freedom of the seas that persists to this day;

Whereas, on March 5, 1946, Winston Churchill delivered his ''Iron Curtain Speech'' in Fulton, Missouri, stating, ''Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organization will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples . . . a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States'';

Whereas the United States and United Kingdom have stood side by side through two World Wars, the Korean War, the Cold War, the Gulf War, and the Global War on Terror with Americans and Britons fighting and dying together to defend our common interests and principles;

Whereas the United States and the United Kingdom have played central roles in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and are critical to maintaining its future strength;

Whereas senior military officers from the United Kingdom have served in advisory or command positions in United States headquarters, including combatant commands such as CENTCOM, and officers from the United States have served in similar roles in the British military;

Whereas the United States and United Kingdom made immense contributions in personnel and resources to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), the NATO-led effort to train the Afghan National Security Forces, and to assist the Afghan people in rebuilding their country;

Whereas the Defense Trade Cooperation Treaty between the United States and United Kingdom, which was signed in 2007, ratified by the Senate on September 29, 2010, and entered into force in April 2012, introduces greater cooperation and access in order to meet the requirements of mutual defense frameworks;

Whereas both nations continue a close strategic partnership in developing and maintaining an effective nuclear deterrent, including developing the next-generation of nuclear ballistic missile submarines and the continued deployment and modernization of a submarine-launched ballistic missile;

Whereas the close and expanding economic ties between the United States and United Kingdom, including the world's largest bilateral foreign direct investment partnership, have greatly contributed to the continued prosperity of both nations; and

Whereas, on June 23, 2016, the United Kingdom held a European Union membership referendum, and the British people voted to leave the European Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms that the special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom will not be affected by the outcome of the June 23, 2016 referendum or by changes to the United Kingdom's relationship with the European Union;

(2) recognizes that continued defense and intelligence cooperation between the United States and United Kingdom is vital to the national security of both countries;

(3) supports the continued political and military leadership displayed by both nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) since it was founded 67 years ago; and

(4) urges the President to commence discussions with the Government of the United Kingdom, at their request, to ensure the continuance of our current bilateral trade relationship and as necessary, negotiations for the development of a free-trade agreement between our two countries.

SENATE RESOLUTION 521—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2016 AS NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 521

Whereas ovarian cancer is the deadliest of all gynecologic cancers;

Whereas ovarian cancer is the fifth leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States;

Whereas in 2016, approximately 22,280 new cases of ovarian cancer will be diagnosed, and 14,240 women will die of ovarian cancer in the United States;

Whereas the mortality rate for ovarian cancer has not significantly decreased since the ''War on Cancer'' was declared more than 40 years ago;

Whereas a quarter of women will die within 1 year of diagnosis with ovarian cancer and over half will die within 5 years;

Whereas there is the mammogram to detect breast cancer and the Pap smear to detect cervical cancer, there is currently no reliable early detection test for ovarian cancer;

Whereas the lack of an early detection test means that approximately 80 percent of cases of ovarian cancer are detected at an advanced stage;

Whereas all women are at risk for ovarian cancer, and approximately 20 percent of women diagnosed with ovarian cancer have a hereditary disposition for ovarian cancer, which places them at even a higher risk;

Whereas scientists and physicians have uncovered changes in the BRCA genes that some women inherit from their parents, which may make them 30 times more likely to develop ovarian cancer;

Whereas the family history of a woman has been found to play an important role in accurately assessing her risk of developing ovarian cancer and medical experts believe the family history of a woman should be taken into consideration during her annual well woman visit;

Whereas many experts in health prevention now recommend genetic testing for young women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer;

Whereas women who know they are at high risk of breast and ovarian cancer may undertake prophylactic measures to help reduce the risk of developing these diseases;

Whereas the Society of Gynecologic Oncology now recommends that all women diagnosed with ovarian cancer receive counseling and genetic testing;

Whereas many people are unaware that the symptoms of ovarian cancer often include bloating, pelvic or abdominal pain, difficulty eating or feeling full quickly, urinary symptoms, and several other symptoms that are easily confused with other diseases;

Whereas awareness of the symptoms of ovarian cancer by women and health care providers can lead to a quicker diagnosis;

Whereas in June 2007, the first national consensus statement on ovarian cancer symptoms was developed to provide consistency in describing symptoms to make it easier for women to learn and remember the symptoms;

Whereas each year during the month of September, the Ovarian Cancer Research Fund Alliance and the partner members hold a number of events to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer; and

Whereas September 2016 should be designated as ''National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month'' to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2016 as ''National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month''; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 522—DESIGNATING JULY 30, 2016, AS ''NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY''

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 522

Whereas, in 1777, before the passage of the Bill of Rights, 10 sailors and marines blew the whistle on fraud and misconduct harmful to the United States;

Whereas the Founding Fathers unanimously supported the whistleblowers in words and deeds, including by releasing government records and providing monetary assistance for reasonable legal expenses necessary to prevent retaliation against the whistleblowers;

Whereas, on July 30, 1778, in demonstration of their full support for whistleblowers, the members of the Continental Congress unanimously enacted the first whistleblower legislation in the United States that read: ''*Resolved*, That it is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge'' (legislation of July 30, 1778, reprinted in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789*, ed. Worthington C. Ford et al. (Washington, D.C., 1904–37), 11:732);

Whereas whistleblowers risk their careers, jobs, and reputations by reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to the proper authorities;

Whereas, when providing proper authorities with lawful disclosures, whistleblowers save taxpayers in the United States billions of dollars each year and serve the public interest by ensuring that the United States remains an ethical and safe place; and

Whereas it is the public policy of the United States to encourage, in accordance with Federal law (including the Constitution, rules, and regulations) and consistent with the protection of classified information (including sources and methods of detection of classified information), honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, and other crimes to the appropriate authority at the earliest time possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 30, 2016, as ''National Whistleblower Appreciation Day''; and

(2) ensures that the Federal Government implements the intent of the Founding Fathers, as reflected in the legislation enacted on July 30, 1778, by encouraging each executive agency to recognize National Whistleblower Appreciation Day by—

(A) informing employees, contractors working on behalf of United States taxpayers, and members of the public about the legal rights of citizens of the United States to ''blow the whistle'' by honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, or other crimes to the appropriate authorities; and

(B) acknowledging the contributions of whistleblowers to combating waste, fraud, abuse, and violations of laws and regulations in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 523—RELATING TO THE DEATH OF ELIE WIESEL, HOLOCAUST SURVIVOR, POWERFUL ADVOCATE FOR PEACE AND HUMAN RIGHTS, AND AWARD-WINNING AUTHOR

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 523

Whereas Elie Wiesel was born in Sighet, Transylvania (now Romania), in 1928 to Shlomo Wiesel and Sarah (Feig) Wiesel;

Whereas Elie Wiesel was deported to Auschwitz concentration camp by the Nazis when he was 15 years old;

Whereas Elie Wiesel suffered the loss of his mother, father, and younger sister, who died in Nazi concentration camps;

Whereas Elie Wiesel was freed when Buchenwald concentration camp was liberated in April 1945;

Whereas Elie Wiesel published his famous memoir, Night, in 1958, which detailed the horrors of Nazi death camps and gave a voice to their victims and survivors;

Whereas Elie Wiesel became an American citizen in 1963;

Whereas Elie Wiesel married his wife in 1969, with whom he raised one son;

Whereas Elie Wiesel was appointed Chairman of the President's Commission on the Holocaust in 1978;

Whereas Elie Wiesel served as Founding Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council;

Whereas Elie Wiesel was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1986;

Whereas Elie and Marion Wiesel established the Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity to promote human rights and tolerance around the world;

Whereas Elie Wiesel received numerous awards throughout his life for his human rights activism and literary works, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the Congressional Gold Medal;

Whereas Elie Wiesel served as the Andrew W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities at Boston University until his death;

Whereas Elie Wiesel received more than 100 honorary degrees;

Whereas Elie Wiesel authored dozens of literary works;

Whereas Elie Wiesel was a passionate advocate for the State of Israel and the Jewish people and a tireless defender against anti-Semitism;

Whereas Elie Wiesel dedicated his life to teaching the world ''never to be silent whenever wherever human beings endure suffering and humiliation'' and to uphold the promise ''never again'';

Whereas Elie Wiesel served as an inspiration and example of the triumph of the human spirit over unimaginable horrors;

Whereas Elie Wiesel was a lifelong advocate for the protection of human life, dignity, and freedom for all people, regardless of race, religion, or political views;

Whereas Elie Wiesel passed away on July 2, 2016, at 87 year of age;

Whereas the Nation is deeply indebted to Elie Wiesel, who has inspired and challenged the world with his message, legacy, and example:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends its deepest condolences and sympathy to the family of Elie Wiesel;

(2) recognizes that Elie Wiesel, as an award-winning author, helped the world understand the true horrors of the Holocaust and gave a voice to the millions who suffered and perished in Nazi death camps;

(3) honors the legacy of Elie Wiesel for his lifelong commitment to advancing human dignity, freedom, and respect throughout the world;

(4) reiterates its continued support for human rights and protection of religious liberty throughout the world; and

(5) expresses admiration for Elie Wiesel's legacy as an example and advocate of the enduring power of the human spirit in the face of evil.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 7, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 7, 2016, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''An Assessment of U.S. Economic Assistance.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 7, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SH–219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 7, 2016, at 2 p.m., in room SH–219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow who has worked on this issue, Dave Keahey, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nick Howard and Mark Owens, congressional fellows in Senator HATCH's office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 114–187, and in consultation with the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and with the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Finance, appoints the following individuals as members of the Congressional Task Force on Economic Growth in Puerto Rico: the Honorable BILL NELSON of Florida (Energy and Natural Resources) and the Honorable ROBERT MENENDEZ of New Jersey (Finance).

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1270

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE SO-CALLED ISLAMIC STATE IN IRAQ AND AL-SHAM (ISIS OR DA'ESH) IS COMMITTING GENOCIDE, CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, AND WAR CRIMES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 447, S. Res. 340.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 340) expressing the sense of Congress that the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS or Da'esh) is committing genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes, and calling upon the President to work with foreign governments and the United Nations to provide physical protection for ISIS' targets, to support the creation of an international criminal tribunal with jurisdiction to punish these crimes, and to use every reasonable means, including sanctions, to destroy ISIS and disrupt its support networks.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title.

S. RES. 340

Whereas Christians and other religious and ethnic minorities have been an integral part of the cultural fabric of the Middle East for millennia;

Whereas the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL or Da'esh) and associated extremists are committing egregious atrocities against ethnic and religious minorities in Iraq and Syria, including Christians (among them Assyrian Chaldean Syriac, Armenian, Evangelicals, Antiochian and Greek Orthodox, Maronite, Melkite, and Roman Catholic communities), Yezidis, Turkmen, Shi'a, Shabak, Sabaean-Mandeans, and Kaka'i, among others;

Whereas ISIL specifically targets these religious and ethnic minorities, intending to kill them or force their submission, conversion, or expulsion;

Whereas religious and ethnic minorities have been murdered, subjugated, forced to emigrate, and subjected to grievous bodily and psychological harm, kidnapping, human trafficking, torture, and rape;

Whereas ISIL engages in, and publicly argues in favor of, the sexual enslavement of non-Muslim women, including prepubescent girls;

Whereas the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) and the United Nations Human Rights Office (OHCHR) said in a January 2016 report that it believes ISIL is holding around 3,500 slaves, predominantly women and children, ''primarily from the Yezidi community, but a number are also from other ethnic and religious minority communities'';

Whereas ISIL specifically targets religious and ethnic minorities, and has reportedly kidnapped, forcibly displaced, killed, raped, electrocuted, and crucified members of ethnic and religious groups, including Christian, Shabak, Turkmen, and Shia of all ethnicities;

Whereas ISIL has deliberately destroyed and looted numerous cultural sites, religious shrines, places of worship, monasteries, and museums in order to eradicate the cultures of ethnic and religious minorities;

Whereas these atrocities have been undertaken with the specific intent to bring about the eradication of those communities and the destruction of their cultural heritage;

Whereas ISIL operations have in fact driven minority religious and ethnic communities from their ancestral homelands;

Whereas under applicable domestic and international law codified in section 2441 of title 18, United States Code, murder, torture, mutilation, rape, cruel treatment, and hostage taking of non-combatants constitute war crimes;

Whereas crimes against humanity, as defined by the International Military Tribunal convened at Nuremberg in 1945, include murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, as well as persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds in connection with such crimes;

Whereas the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, signed and ratified by the United States, defines genocide as ''any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group'';

Whereas according to the United Nations Commission of Inquiry, in February 2014, ISIL ordered Christians in Raqqa, Syria to either convert to Islam, pay jizya, a tax specifically applied on the basis of religious belief, and accept serious curbs on their faith, or face execution;

Whereas according to the Department of State, in August 2014, as ISIL began to expand beyond Mosul, an estimated 450,000 Yezidis, 300,000 Turkmen, and 125,000 Christians, as well as Iraqi Arabs, Shia Muslims, Sunni Muslims, Shabak and other ethnic and religious groups, were forced from their communities;

Whereas in areas controlled by ISIL, churches, monasteries and other places of worship have effectively been shuttered and do not publicly conduct worship services;

Whereas, on August 7, 2014, Secretary of State John Kerry declared that ''ISIL's campaign of terror against the innocent, including Yezidi and Christian minorities, and its grotesque and targeted acts of violence bear all the warning signs and hallmarks of genocide'';

Whereas, in August 2014, the United States conducted targeted airstrikes and humanitarian assistance operations to help break the siege of Mount Sinjar, saving the lives of

thousands of Yezidi men, women, and children;

Whereas His Holiness, Pope Francis, has noted that ''entire communities, especially—but not only—Christians and Yezidis, have suffered and are still suffering inhuman violence because off their ethnic and religious identity'' and stated that, for Christians being killed for their faith in the Middle East ''a form of genocide—I insist on the word—is taking place, and it must end'';

Whereas a March 13, 2015, report by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights detailed ''acts of violence perpetrated [by ISIL] against civilians because of their affiliation or perceived affiliation to an ethnic or religious group'' and stated that ''[i]t is reasonable to conclude that some of these incidents, considering the overall information, may constitute genocide'';

Whereas, on December 7, 2015, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom called on the United States Government ''to designate the Christian, Yezidi, Shi'a, Turkmen, and Shabak communities of Iraq and Syria as victims of genocide by ISIL'' and urged world leaders ''to condemn the genocidal actions and crimes against humanity of ISIL that have been directed at these groups and other ethnic and religious groups'';

Whereas, on February 3, 2016, the European Parliament expressed the view that ISIL ''is committing genocide against Christians and Yezidis, and other religious and ethnic minorities''; and

Whereas, on March 17, 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry issued a declaration stating, that in his judgement, ''Da'esh is responsible for genocide against groups in areas under its control, including Yezidis, Christians, and Shia Muslims,'' and is ''also responsible for crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing directed at these same groups and in some cases against Sunni Muslims and Kurds and other minorities'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the atrocities perpetrated by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) against Christians, Yezidis, Shi'a, and other religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(2) all governments, and international organizations should call ISIL atrocities by their rightful names: war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(3) the member states of the United Nations should coordinate urgently on measures to prevent further war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide by ISIL in Iraq and Syria, and to punish those responsible for these ongoing crimes, including by the collection and preservation of evidence and, if necessary, the establishment and operation of appropriate tribunals;

(4) the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Lebanese Republic, the Republic of Turkey, and the Kurdistan Regional Government in Iraq are to be commended for, and supported in, their efforts to shelter and protect those fleeing the violence of ISIL and other combatants until they can safely return to their homes in Iraq and Syria; and

(5) the protracted Syrian civil war and the indiscriminate violence of the Assad regime have contributed to the growth of ISIL and will continue to do so as long as this conflict continues.

S. RES. 340

Whereas Christians and other religious and ethnic minorities have been an integral part of the cultural fabric of the Middle East for millennia;

Whereas the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL or Da'esh) and associated extremists are committing egregious atrocities against ethnic and religious minorities in Iraq and Syria, including Christians (among them Assyrian Chaldean Syriac, Armenian, Evangelicals, Antiochian and Greek Orthodox, Maronite, Melkite, and Roman Catholic communities), Yezidis, Turkmen, Shi'a, Shabak, Sabaean-Mandeans, and Kaka'i, among others;

Whereas ISIL specifically targets these religious and ethnic minorities, intending to kill them or force their submission, conversion, or expulsion;

Whereas religious and ethnic minorities have been murdered, subjugated, forced to emigrate, and subjected to grievous bodily and psychological harm, kidnapping, human trafficking, torture, and rape;

Whereas ISIL engages in, and publicly argues in favor of, the sexual enslavement of non-Muslim women, including prepubescent girls;

Whereas the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) and the United Nations Human Rights Office (OHCHR) said in a January 2016 report that it believes ISIL is holding around 3,500 slaves, predominantly women and children, ''primarily from the Yezidi community, but a number are also from other ethnic and religious minority communities'';

Whereas ISIL specifically targets religious and ethnic minorities, and has reportedly kidnapped, forcibly displaced, killed, raped, electrocuted, and crucified members of ethnic and religious groups, including Christian, Shabak, Turkmen, and Shia of all ethnicities;

Whereas ISIL has deliberately destroyed and looted numerous cultural sites, religious shrines, places of worship, monasteries, and museums in order to eradicate the cultures of ethnic and religious minorities;

Whereas these atrocities have been undertaken with the specific intent to bring about the eradication of those communities and the destruction of their cultural heritage;

Whereas ISIL operations have in fact driven minority religious and ethnic communities from their ancestral homelands;

Whereas under applicable domestic and international law codified in section 2441 of title 18, United States Code, murder, torture, mutilation, rape, cruel treatment, and hostage taking of non-combatants constitute war crimes;

Whereas crimes against humanity, as defined by the International Military Tribunal convened at Nuremberg in 1945, include murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, as well as persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds in connection with such crimes;

Whereas the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, signed and ratified by the United States, defines genocide as ''any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group'';

Whereas according to the United Nations Commission of Inquiry, in February 2014, ISIL ordered Christians in Raqqa, Syria to either convert to Islam, pay jizya, a tax specifically applied on the basis of religious belief, and accept serious curbs on their faith, or face execution;

Whereas according to the Department of State, in August 2014, as ISIL began to expand beyond Mosul, an estimated 450,000 Yezidis, 300,000 Turkmen, and 125,000 Christians, as well as Iraqi Arabs, Shia Muslims, Sunni Muslims, Shabak and other ethnic and religious groups, were forced from their communities;

Whereas in areas controlled by ISIL, churches, monasteries and other places of worship have effectively been shuttered and do not publicly conduct worship services;

Whereas, on August 7, 2014, Secretary of State John Kerry declared that ''ISIL's campaign of terror against the innocent, including Yezidi and Christian minorities, and its grotesque and targeted acts of violence bear all the warning signs and hallmarks of genocide'':

Whereas, in August 2014, the United States conducted targeted airstrikes and humanitarian assistance operations to help break the siege of Mount Sinjar, saving the lives of thousands of Yezidi men, women, and children;

Whereas His Holiness, Pope Francis, has noted that ''entire communities, especially—but not only—Christians and Yezidis, have suffered and are still suffering inhuman violence because off their ethnic and religious identity'' and stated that, for Christians being killed for their faith in the Middle East ''a form of genocide—I insist on the word—is taking place, and it must end'';

Whereas a March 13, 2015, report by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights detailed ''acts of violence perpetrated [by ISIL] against civilians because of their affiliation or perceived affiliation to an ethnic or religious group'' and stated that ''[i]t is reasonable to conclude that some of these incidents, considering the overall information, may constitute genocide'';

Whereas, on December 7, 2015, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom called on the United States Government ''to designate the Christian, Yezidi, Shi'a, Turkmen, and Shabak communities of Iraq and Syria as victims of genocide by ISIL'' and urged world leaders ''to condemn the genocidal actions and crimes against humanity of ISIL that have been directed at these groups and other ethnic and religious groups'';

Whereas, on February 3, 2016, the European Parliament expressed the view that ISIL ''is committing genocide against Christians and Yezidis, and other religious and ethnic minorities''; and

Whereas, on March 17, 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry issued a declaration stating, that in his judgement, ''Da'esh is responsible for genocide against groups in areas under its control, including Yezidis, Christians, and Shia Muslims,'' and is ''also responsible for crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing directed at these same groups and in some cases against Sunni Muslims and Kurds and other minorities'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the atrocities perpetrated by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) against Christians, Yezidis, Shi'a, and other religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(2) all governments, and international organizations should call ISIL atrocities by their rightful names: war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(3) the member states of the United Nations should coordinate urgently on measures to prevent further war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide by ISIL in Iraq and Syria, and to punish those responsible for these ongoing crimes, including by the collection and preservation of evidence and, if necessary, the establishment and operation of appropriate tribunals;

(4) the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Lebanese Republic, the Republic of Turkey, and the Kurdistan Regional Government in Iraq are to be commended for, and supported in, their efforts to shelter and protect those fleeing the violence of ISIL and other combatants until they can safely return to their homes in Iraq and Syria; and

(5) the protracted Syrian civil war and the indiscriminate violence of the Assad regime have contributed to the growth of ISIL and will continue to do so as long as this conflict continues.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the committee-reported title amendment be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 340), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported title amendment was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the atrocities perpetrated by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) against religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria include war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.''.

MEGABYTE ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 533, S. 2340.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2340) to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue a directive on the management of software licenses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016'' or the ''MEGABYTE Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. OMB DIRECTIVE ON MANAGEMENT OF SOFTWARE LICENSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(2) the term ''Executive agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) OMB DIRECTIVE.—The Director shall issue a directive to require the Chief Information Officer of each Executive agency to develop a comprehensive software licensing policy, which shall—

(1) identify clear roles, responsibilities, and central oversight authority within the Executive agency for managing enterprise software license agreements and commercial software licenses; and

(2) require the Chief Information Officer of each Executive agency to—

(A) establish a comprehensive inventory, including 80 percent of software license spending and enterprise licenses in the Executive agency, by identifying and collecting information about software license agreements using automated discovery and inventory tools;

(B) regularly track and maintain software licenses to assist the Executive agency in implementing decisions throughout the software license management life cycle;

(C) analyze software usage and other data to make cost-effective decisions;

(D) provide training relevant to software license management;

(E) establish goals and objectives of the software license management program of the Executive agency; and

(F) consider the software license management life cycle phases, including the requisition, reception, deployment and maintenance, retirement, and disposal phases, to implement effective decision-making and incorporate existing standards, processes, and metrics.

(c) REPORT ON SOFTWARE LICENSE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each of the following 5 fiscal years, the Chief Information Officer of each Executive agency shall submit to the Director a report on the financial savings or avoidance of spending that resulted from improved software license management.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—The Director shall make each report submitted under paragraph (1) publically available.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2340), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

KENNETH M. CHRISTY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4960 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4960) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4960) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BARRY G. MILLER POST OFFICE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4372 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4372) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4372) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 522, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. Res. 522) designating July 30, 2016, as ''National Whistleblower Appreciation Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 522) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RELATING TO THE DEATH OF ELIE WIESEL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 523, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 523) relating to the death of Elie Wiesel, Holocaust survivor,

powerful advocate for peace and human rights, and award-winning author.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 523) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 11, 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, July 11; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators should expect the next roll-call vote to occur before lunch on Tuesday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 11, 2016, AT 4 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:27 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 11, 2016, at 4 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS

JOHN M. HUFF, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS FOR A TERM OF ONE YEAR. (NEW POSITION)

ROBERT P. SUGLIA, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS FOR A TERM OF ONE YEAR. (NEW POSITION)

LORI K. WING–HEIER, OF ALASKA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

EXPORT–IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

KIMBERLY J. WALKER, OF IOWA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, EXPORT–IMPORT BANK, VICE OSVALDO LUIS GRATACOS MUNET, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S. C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

MICHAEL P. LINDSAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

BRANDO S. JOBITY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

DAVID C. MARTIN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

GREGORY A. VERLINDE

To be lieutenant commander

LARRY D. BLOODSAW, JR
ALLAN A. HOWARD
SHAWN D. TEASLEY
DAVID T. WRIGHT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be lieutenant colonel

EROL AGI

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO LARGO KINDERCARE

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the Largo KinderCare Learning Center for receiving national accreditation.

The KinderCare Learning Center has recently been granted accreditation by the National Accreditation Commission for Early Care and Education Programs, a leading professional organization in the early education industry for children, between two months old and five years old.

Accreditation is distinct from licensing as the latter only ensures a basic threshold level of a center's ability to provide whereas accreditation enables the center to provide high quality early learning programs. Less than ten percent of programs receive accreditation in the nation, which makes this very important for Pinellas County.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the Largo KinderCare Learning Center for the education they provide to our children. A national accredited center is very important to Pinellas and I ask that this body join me in recognizing them for their efforts.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NEWARK CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL TEAM

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Newark Catholic High School for winning the Division IV Ohio High School Baseball State Championship.

An achievement such as this certainly deserves recognition. The Ohio High School Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn state titles since its founding in 1907. Throughout this time, the champions of OHSAA state level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in Ohio. Each year these elite competitors join the ranks of those who embody Ohio's proud history of athletic success.

Newark Catholic's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. They have set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Newark Catholic High School can be extremely proud of their performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate the Newark Catholic Baseball Team on their state championship. I wish their team continued success in their future athletic endeavors.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESS TO ACT TO END OUR COUNTRY'S GUN VIOLENCE EPIDEMIC

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give voice to the millions of Americans across this country who are tired of this body's leadership being held hostage by the Gun Lobby. The dilatory response by House Republicans, a response directly linked to the fact that they are so closely intertwined with the nefarious Gun Lobby, is as shameful as it is reckless.

Over 33,000 people lose their lives every year to the gun violence epidemic. What does Republican Leadership do in the face of these deaths? Nothing. That is not negligence, it is gross negligence and those who stand firmly in the way of those of us trying desperately to make this country a safer place for our children and grandchildren are increasingly culpable in the deaths that most certainly and tragically lay ahead.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans have a right to make their communities safe from the onslaught of gun violence this country witnesses year after year. They have a right to demand that felons and domestic abusers cannot buy a gun without any questions asked. They have a right to demand that dangerous loopholes allowing terrorists to buy weapons are closed. They have a right to demand that an end is put to the unbelievable number of military-style firearms flowing through their streets. And demanded they have, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, a majority of Americans support ensuring that a husband with a proven history of violent acts committed against his wife should not have access to a firearm. A majority of Americans think it is absolutely ridiculous that we do not stop felons from purchasing firearms. And a majority of Americans think it is beyond comprehensible that members of this body would stand in the way of us working to ensure that terrorists do not have access to weapons of mass murder.

Mr. Speaker, the time has well since passed when we should have enacted these common sense reforms. The time has well since passed since we ought to have taken action to protect our communities—to make those communities safer for our children and grandchild. There is bipartisan legislation in this House that will address these pressing issues and it is time for the Republican Leadership to bring this legislation to the House Floor for a vote immediately. Any further delay is a shameful dereliction of duty on the part of House Republican Leadership.

HONORING DAVID GANN OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I honor my constituent, Colonel David R. Gann, on his retirement upon more than 40 years of service with the United States Air Force, United States Army Reserve and the Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

Since December 2004, Colonel Gann has served as Commander of the 193rd Special Operations Medical Group of the 193rd Special Operations Wing, Pennsylvania Air National Guard. He previously served as a medic and emergency medical technician in the active Air Force and as chief warrant officer/physician assistant in the Army Reserve. Colonel Gann deployed on numerous occasions in direct medical support of Operations Desert Storm, Uphold Democracy, Joint Guard, Desert Thunder, Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. He has earned numerous awards and decorations for his service.

Colonel Gann's tireless dedication, professionalism and sacrifice touched the lives of countless people and challenged all with whom he served to be the best. He's left an enduring legacy of service to our Nation.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, with great pride I commend and congratulate David R. Gann upon his retirement after more than 40 years of selfless service to the United States of America.

DEL LATTA, A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

SPEECH OF

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across a short poem called "The Dash," and I'd like to submit the first few lines:

I read of a man who stood to speak
at the funeral of a friend.
He referred to the dates on the tombstone
from the beginning . . . to the end.

He noted that first came the date of birth
and spoke the following date with tears,
but he said what mattered most of all
was the dash between those years.

For that dash represents all the time
that they spent alive on earth.
And now only those who loved them
know what that little line is worth.

For it matters not, how much we own,
the cars . . . the house . . . the cash.
What matters is how we live and love
and how we spend our dash.

Del Latta's dash represents a life dedicated to his fellow Ohioans and his fellow Americans.

First as a state senator, and then later as a U.S. Congressman, Mr. Latta was a true public servant, a trait he passed on to his son, and my friend, BOB.

I offer my prayers and condolences to BOB, and to his family, and I thank his father for spending his dash in service to our state and our country.

EDINA GIRLS GOLF TEAM ARE CHAMPS

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the Edina High School Girls Golf Team for winning the Minnesota State High School Championship.

Not only did the Hornets win, but they won big by defeating the closest team by 36 strokes. They were led by Hannah Hankinson who shot a 149 over the two rounds and tied for second. Edina's talent did not stop there, however. Christine Portillo and Grace Kellar tied for fourth place with 150, Katie Engelking finished ninth with a score of 153 and Isabelle Ouyang got tenth with a score of 155. The combination of all of these talented players could not be beat. This is the second consecutive victory for Coach Mark Harelstad and tenth state title in team history.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to point out that these student athletes must effectively manage their time in order to excel on the course and in the classroom. It is commendable that they are able to perform on such a high level in both areas.

Golf is a game that requires incredible patience and dedication in order to achieve success. And there is no doubt the Edina High School Girls Golf Team showed both this season. Congratulations and go Hornets.

TRIBUTE TO PINELLAS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the Pinellas County Housing Authority (PCHA) for continuing to help our veterans.

The PCHA was formed in 1965 as an independent agency. They provide more than eight thousand people housing and rental assistance when they are most in need. Their current focus has been on veterans, ensuring that this important section of our community receives appropriate housing through the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program.

The PCHA has a ''veteran's preference'' for veterans who are on the waiting list for regular vouchers which has helped them find homes for 63 local homeless veterans in partnership with the C.W. Bill Young VA Medical Center.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the PCHA for their help and efforts to ensure veterans who offered their lives in service of our country can fully enjoy the homes that they truly deserve. I ask that this body join me in recognizing their efforts and accomplishments of the PCHA in serving homeless veterans in Pinellas County.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WORTHINGTON KILBOURNE HIGH SCHOOL BOYS LACROSSE TEAM

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Worthington Kilbourne High School for winning the Division II Ohio High School Boys Lacrosse State Championship.

An achievement such as this certainly deserves recognition. The Ohio High School Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn state titles since its founding in 1907. Throughout this time, the champions of OHSAA state level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in Ohio. Each year these elite competitors join the ranks of those who embody Ohio's proud history of athletic success.

Worthington Kilbourne's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. They have set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Worthington Kilbourne High School can be extremely proud of their performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate the Worthington Kilbourne High School Boys Lacrosse Team on their state championship. I wish their team continued success in their future athletic endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for votes on July 5, 2016, I would have voted the following way:

No on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 796.

No on H. Res. 796.

No on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 793.

No on H. Res. 793.

Yes on H.R. 4854.

Yes on H.R. 4855.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote Number 372 on the Blackburn of Tennessee Amendment No. 21 to H.R. 5485, Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

COMMEMORATING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF PRESIDENT J. DAVID ARNOLD

HON. DARIN LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor President J. David Arnold for his service to the state of Illinois, as well as to his students and staff during his tenure as President of Eureka College.

Dr. Arnold has served as the President of Eureka College for eleven years. His dedication to the school's vision, ''An intentional sequence of learning, service, and leadership,'' has inspired each one of his 1,676 graduating students to achieve their academic dreams.

Always eager to facilitate educational discussions, Dr. Arnold created the Reagan Forward initiative and the Ronald W. Reagan Society, which celebrates the legacy of President Ronald Reagan, a graduate of Eureka College, and encourages his vision of American opportunity. Dr. Arnold also created over thirty endowed scholarships to reward students for their hard work and dedication to their studies.

The Growth and Integrity strategic plan that Dr. Arnold established achieved record enrollment in 2010, maintained a balanced budget with consistent low tuition costs, and raised a record level of $7.3 million in 2014, the largest amount raised in the college's history. Dr. Arnold worked in conjunction with the community to complete his $30 million project to construct buildings on campus including Ivy Resident Hall, Christine Bonati Bollwinkle Arena, and Convocation Center for current and future students to enjoy.

As a result of Dr. Arnold's contributions to Eureka College and the community, he has been appointed Chancellor of the institution, where he will continue to develop new strategic initiatives and implement a leadership institute.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Arnold's remarkable tenure as President of Eureka College. Dr. Arnold's commitment to educating the next generation of leaders generated some of the most successful years in Eureka College's storied history. Dr. Arnold has set an outstanding example for educators around our nation, and I am proud to represent both him and Eureka College.

TRIBUTE TO CLEARWATER AQUARIUM

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the Clearwater Aquarium for their new sea turtle habitat.

Recently, the Clearwater Aquarium opened a new habitat designed for sea turtles. These animals are native to our community, but they are endangered animals and must be protected. The Clearwater Aquarium has one of the few sea turtle habitats in the world occupied solely by rescued turtles. Its residents are not able to be released back into the wild due to poor health or as a result of injuries they have sustained.

The habitat is a large, spacious area that gives the turtles plenty of room to maneuver and not be confined to one area.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Clearwater Aquarium for their new exhibit that provides needed protection and a better way of life for these endangered creatures. I ask that this body join me in thanking the Clearwater Aquarium for their efforts.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUPERIOR TOWNSHIP CHAPTER OF THE SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN LAND CONSERVANCY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Superior Township Chapter of the Southeast Michigan Land Conservancy.

The Superior Township Chapter (STC) of the Southeast Michigan Land Conservancy (SMLC) has protected and preserved the natural habitats of Superior Township for the last 25 years. Starting with humble origins as a committee of the Southeast Michigan Land Conservancy, this group of active citizens formed to protect what was deemed the ''last frontier'' between Ann Arbor and Detroit in order to maintain the rural character and natural ecosystems of Superior Township. Since 1991, the STC has been steadfast in its dedication to protecting this land, fostering a healthy environment, and engaging and educating the public about the need for conservation.

Started after a class lecture at Henry Ford Community College, Bill Secrest and Jack Smiley began organizing interested citizens with the goal of advancing environmental preservation. From the start of this project with the generous donation of thirty acres to establish the Springhill Nature Preserve, the STC has continued to grow and has not looked back. The STC now protects over twenty four hundred acres in our community, safeguarding this precious natural habitat and resources for future generations. Today the STC operates twelve nature preserves which are all open to the public and the new Superior Greenway Nature Trail, which is a project that leads the way in environmental maintenance, preservation, and education. The STC has implemented a long term plan for the nature preserves which will ensure that future generations will be able to enjoy them. Our natural resources are invaluable and must continue to be cherished and protected. The Superior Township Chapter has worked tirelessly with local stakeholders to ensure environmental harmony and preservation in Superior Township and beyond, and for that we owe them a great deal of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Superior Township Chapter of the Southeast Michigan Land Conservancy. We look forward to their next twenty five years of success and beyond.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANDREW JORDAN

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Andrew Jordan of Watkins Memorial High School for winning the Boys 3,200 Meter Run at the Division I Ohio High School Track and Field State Championship as well as the Boys 1,600 Meter Run during the Midwest Meet of Champions.

Since 1907, the Ohio High School Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn state titles. Throughout this time, the champions of OHSAA state level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in Ohio. The young student athletes who emerge victorious then have the privilege to compete against fellow champions from the states of Indiana and Michigan in the Midwest Meet of Champions.

Andrew's victories cap a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. He has set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Watkins Memorial High School can be extremely proud of his performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Andrew Jordan on his State and Midwestern regional championships. I wish him continued success in both his athletic and academic endeavors.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $19,327,746,021,669.98. We've added $8,700,868,972,756.90 to our debt in 7 years. This is over $8.7 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CALVIN FREDERICK ''FRED'' DAVIS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Calvin Fredrick ''Fred'' Davis of Tupelo, Mississippi. Mr. Davis was a committed husband and family man, a remarkable athlete and coach, and a pillar of the Tupelo community. For 52 years, he was married to Councilwoman Nettie Davis, and together they worked tirelessly to improve their beloved hometown of Tupelo.

When reflecting on Mr. Davis's life, his love of family, sports, and community immediately come to mind. In high school and college, he was a sports hero excelling in football, basketball, baseball, and track. He received an athletic scholarship to attend Alcorn State University and later became the university's first African-American physical education teacher. As Mr. Davis continued his legacy in education and athletics, he became the first African-American coach in the Tupelo Public School District. He is affectionately referred to as ''Coach Davis'' among his former athletes, friends, and colleagues.

While Mr. Davis is remembered for his athletic legacy, community service, and leadership within the civil rights movement, he is equally known for the loving partnership he had with his wife, Mrs. Nettie Davis. A trailblazer herself, Mrs. Davis was the first African-American woman elected to serve on the Tupelo City Council. Together, the couple fought for a better, more unified city. As a resident of the Tupelo area, my family has directly benefited from their hard work and drive to improve our community. I am honored to have known Mr. Davis and call him a friend. As we remember his remarkable life, I want to extend my deepest condolences to Mr. Davis's family and friends.

IN HONOR OF EDDY RAE'LAURIN GATES

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I rise seeking to honor the life of Eddy Rae'Laurin Gates, who passed away on June 2, 2016 in Fort Hood, Texas at the age of 20.

Ms. Gates was a passionate defender of our nation, and died serving our citizens in the tragic flood at Fort Hood, Texas. A recent graduate of Triton High School in Dunn, North Carolina, Ms. Gates eagerly joined the Army in December 2015 and was excited for her assignment to Fort Hood in May. Her dedication to serving her community was apparent in her roles as Homecoming Queen, youth leader at Kingdom Impact Global Ministries, and as a frequent volunteer with the Junior ROTC drill team at Triton High. Members of the community including her family, Triton High School principal, and ROTC Major Steve Jones, serve as witnesses to the impact she made in the lives of others.

Rae'Laurin, a beloved neighbor and family friend, is survived by her parents, Marlene J. Strongs (Benjamin) and Deacon Eddie R. Gates; siblings Darryl L. Snipe, Anstrice Epps, Quinn Williams, Dominique Robinson, Traci Strongs, and Deja R. Shaw; grandparents, Eddie and Willie Faye Gates, Ernest and Jean Carter, and Joyce Strongs. A celebration of Ms. Gate's life was held in Dunn, North Carolina, at the Veterans Park on June 7, 2016, to commemorate our hometown hero.

Rae'Laurin, like so many of our military members, made the ultimate sacrifice for her country: giving her life for the safety of others. This tragic event at Fort Hood not only impacted the Gates family, but also many others across the nation, and serves as a reminder of the sacrifices made by members of the military, both abroad and at home. Ms. Gates'

bright smile and devotion to this nation will surely never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO K–9 DOBIES AND OFFICER THANH ''TOMMY'' NGUYEN

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Dobies and Officer Thanh ''Tommy'' Nguyen for their participation in the USPCA National Detector Dog Certification and Field Trials.

The USPCA National Detector Dog Certification and Field Trials was held in Philadelphia and comprised of more than 100 police and K–9 teams throughout the United States and Canada that compete for national certification and individual awards.

The team of Dobies and Officer Nguyen received stellar marks across the board. They finished in third for the Room Search, first for the Region Team, and took home the ''Top Dog'' award for first place in the nation of narcotics detection.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the Tarpon Springs team of Dobies and Officer Thanh ''Tommy'' Nguyen for receiving high honors in this national competition. It makes me proud to hear that our K–9 team is well trained and making Pinellas County safe, and I ask that this body join me in recognizing the efforts of Dobies and Officer Nguyen.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF DELBERT ''DEL'' LATTA

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate my former colleague, retired Congressman Delbert ''Del'' Latta, who passed away this past May in Bowling Green, Ohio.

Congressman Latta honorably served the people of Ohio's 5th Congressional district for thirty years, and was a pillar of the Republican Party, while making friends on both sides of the aisle. He served as close friend and advisor to Presidents Nixon and Reagan. Del was a man of strong convictions, helping him to quietly and steadily serve as a leader of his party for nearly three decades.

Before winning his seat in the House of Representatives, Del served as a member of the Ohio Senate for five years. During his early tenure in the U.S. House he served on the Rules Committee, but after 16 years his sterling reputation for honesty and integrity earned him a spot on the Judiciary Committee in 1974.

His time on the Judiciary Committee coincided with the Watergate hearings, perhaps the most challenging constitutional period of recent history. Del Latta was steadfast and resolute during this trying time, serving as a loyal defender of a President under siege. For those of us who have been through similar periods of history in this chamber, a President truly values Members of Congress who serve as loyal defenders in public, and honest brokers in private. Del Latta was both a loyal defender, and an honest broker.

Del was eminently likeable, even if you disagreed with him on policy. He possessed a truly collaborative nature, enabling him to work with other Members to achieve landmark legislation that would shape the party's platform. In 1981 Mr. Latta shepherded passage of an economic package in the House for a new President, Ronald Reagan. He led with his amiable charm, keen wit, and resilience, all characteristics that I also see in his son, our colleague, Congressman BOB LATTA.

In 1988 the Congressman chose to end his congressional career on his own terms. At the time, he served as Dean of the Ohio Congressional delegation. Flash forward twenty years and Del's son BOB sought the same seat, Ohio's Fifth Congressional district.

Congressman Latta's passion and commitment to his country and his government deserve recognition and the utmost respect. Del was a man who served faithfully with a humble spirit that embodies the Midwest. It was my privilege to have served with him in the U.S. House at a time when there were but a handful of veteran Members. He was always respectful and of good humor.

Over the past several weeks I have thought about those weekly trips from Washington to Ohio that I would often share with Del Latta, and how often he spoke fondly about his wife Rose Mary, and his daughter Rose Ellen, and our colleague BOB. How proud he would be today of his five grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

We offer them our prayers and hope that they find comfort in the wonderful memories of our dear colleague and fellow Ohioan, Del Latta.

IN RECOGNITION OF NICK STRICKLEN

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nick Stricklen of Lexington High School for winning the Boys 3200 Meter Run at the Division II Ohio High School Track and Field State Championship.

An achievement such as this certainly deserves recognition. The Ohio High School Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn state titles since its founding in 1907. Throughout this time, the champions of OHSAA state level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in Ohio. Each year these elite competitors join the ranks of those who embody Ohio's proud history of athletic success.

Nick's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. He has set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Lexington High School can be extremely proud of his performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Nick Stricklen on his state championship. I wish him continued success in both his athletic and academic endeavors.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

SPEECH OF

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2016

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes:

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chair, this body will vote on amendments to H.R. 5485, Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017. Included in these amendments was Amendment Number 17, which would have struck language from the underlying legislation that delays the implementation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) recently proposed rule regulating payday loans. While I will not be present to vote on the adoption of this amendment, I will vote against this measure.

It is an unfortunate reality that many people live paycheck-to-paycheck in this country. For these individuals, any unexpected bill, whether it is a car repair or a medical emergency, can wreak havoc. Short-term, small-dollar loans are essential resources for those who need just a little help overcoming these types of unexpected expenses. Likewise, just as these small-dollar, short-term loans are essential to many working-class American families, protecting consumers from unscrupulous actors is also imperative.

However, I fear that in trying to protect consumers, the CFPB's proposed rule will cut off access to short-term credit without providing a necessary alternative. By some estimates, the current proposed rule will force nearly 80 percent of payday lenders to shutter their doors. Ironically, in trying to protect consumers, the CFPB's efforts to regulate payday lenders will end up hurting consumers and their ability to access much needed sources of credit.

Mr. Chair, it is for this reason that I oppose the implementation of the CFPB's proposed rulemaking at this time and will vote against the amendment preventing the rule's delay. I will continue to work tirelessly to ensure that an appropriate balance is struck: ensure working-class Americans have unencumbered access to vital short-term, small-dollar credit, while protecting consumers from unscrupulous actors in the industry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to vote on the following roll call votes. On Roll Call 351, I would have voted YEA. On Roll Call 352, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 353, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 354, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 355, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 356, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 357, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call

358, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 359, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 360, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 361, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 362, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 363, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 364, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 365, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 366, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 367, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 368, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 369, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 370, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 371, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 372, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 373, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 374, I would have voted Nay. On Roll Call 375, I would have voted Yea. On Roll Call 376, I would have voted Yea.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE EDINA ULTIMATE FRISBEE TEAM

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Edina Ultimate Frisbee team for winning the State High School Championship.

The Hornets won 13–7 in the final round last month to win their first state championship. Their hard work and dedication helped them earn their state-wide title in one of the fastest-growing sports in the nation.

Ultimate Frisbee is first and foremost a team sport and Hornet coach Nate Wohl did an outstanding job leading this dedicated and selfless team.

Every one of the players displayed perseverance, diligence, and cooperation that will aid them both on and off the field of play. I want to recognize their commitment not only to their sport, but to being leaders in the classroom as well as in their community. They are setting a great example of what all student athletes should strive to be as young role models.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent such a talented group of athletes. The coaches, parents, and fans of the Hornets team are very proud. Congratulations again to the Edina Hornets Ultimate Frisbee team.

TRIBUTE TO STACY SHELTON

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Stacy Shelton for being awarded Teacher of the Year by the Kiwanis Club of Largo and Mid-Pinellas.

The Largo and Mid-Pinellas Kiwanis, the largest and oldest leadership organization service for teens, helps teach graduating members of the Largo Key Club leadership skills, helps them with service projects, and also offers college scholarship money.

Ms. Shelton was awarded Teacher of the Year on June 9th, 2016 by the Head of the Sponsored Youth Committee of the club, Dr. Regina Bennet. Ms. Shelton is a member of the club, a faculty adviser for the Largo High School Key Club and a special education teacher at Largo High School.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. Shelton for the work she does for Pinellas County students and for the Kiwanis Club. She is a valued member of Pinellas County and I ask that this body rise in recognizing her efforts.

H.J. RES. 88

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my opposition to H.J. Res. 88, a misguided attempt to prevent the implementation of the Department of Labor's Conflict of Interest rule that will safeguard Americans by making sure financial advisors are acting in the best interest of their clients. Too many people in Oregon and across our country are struggling to get by. I know the sacrifice that is involved in each and every dollar they set aside to contribute to their retirement.

The Department of Labor didn't rush this rule. They took time, listened to perspectives from the industry as well as consumer protection groups, considered thousands of comments, and made thoughtful changes to make sure the conflict of interest rule is workable. That's a good thing. Retirement products are complex, and our constituents should be able to rely on the advice of professionals and be confident that those advisors are doing what's best for the retiree.

Instead of voting to eliminate the rule, Congress should be focused on the challenges working families have balancing their responsibilities at home and in the workplace.

That is what my home state of Oregon is doing.

In January, employees in Oregon started earning sick days they can use when they get sick, or to care for a sick child or family member. They can access sick time for preventive health care, or in cases of domestic violence.

About half a million workers benefit from this law, helping make Oregon a better place to live, work, and thrive. Workers shouldn't have to choose between paying their rent or taking care of themselves or loved ones.

Stories and personal experiences demonstrate the importance of paid sick days. I would like to tell the story of Erin, who lives in Portland, Oregon. To make ends meet, Erin works 75 hours a week at two part-time jobs as a seamstress. She said, "Before the law passed, if I missed one day of work I wouldn't get paid and I couldn't afford to pay my bills. Recently, I woke up barely able to move and was in so much pain that I knew I needed help and couldn't go to work. After a few minutes of stress and panic I realized that I had paid sick days. I called in and was able to stay home to get the care I needed to recover. It's a great relief to be able to have the safety net of paid sick days. I know that I don't have to make myself even sicker and feel worse just because I will miss out on my next paycheck. I'm so grateful for sick days because I live paycheck-to-paycheck and no longer have to worry about my finances when I am sick for a day or two."

It's time our workplace practices address the needs of our workforce. Oregon took a step toward leveling the playing field—especially for low-wage workers—to allow them to care for themselves and their families.

In Congress, we should pass the Healthy Families Act so workers across the country have the same opportunities as Oregonians like Erin. That is where Congress should be focused, not trying to dismantle important consumer protections for American's retirement savings.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.J. Res. 88 and will continue to support the implementation of this rule.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LEXINGTON HIGH SCHOOL BOYS TRACK AND FIELD TEAM

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lexington High School for winning the Boys 4 × 800 Meter Relay at the Division II Ohio High School Track and Field State Championship.

For over a century, the Ohio High School Athletic Association has provided Ohio's finest student athletes with the opportunity to earn a state championship. Each year young men and women spend countless hours practicing and training in an effort to join the ranks of Ohio's elite athletes. Although many strive to earn the title of state champion, only a select few will achieve this honor.

Lexington's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement stands as a testament to their hard work. Nick Stricklen, Bailey Stach, Ryan Johnston, and Forest Volz have set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Lexington High School can be extremely proud of their performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Lexington High School's Boys Track and Field on their state championship. I wish their team continued success in their future athletic endeavors.

RECOGNIZING WADE HENDERSON OF THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize Wade Henderson for his leadership and decades-long commitment to civil and human rights. I have been privileged to know Wade for over 30 years, having worked together on immigration and refugee issues when I was a congressional aide with Congressman Joe Moakley (MA). He has always been an advocate for and champion of the most vulnerable among us, and he was a generous mentor to me on the importance of protecting and advancing human rights.

On July 19th, the Coalition on Human Needs will honor Wade for his years of extraordinary leadership, advocacy and organizing. He is a giant of the civil rights movement, mentioned—rightfully so—alongside

Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, and my friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS. Since 1996, Wade has led the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (later named The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights), and he has made it one of the most effective advocacy organizations for civil rights and human rights in America.

During my years in office, I have been proud to work with The Leadership Conference under Wade's leadership on many issues of mutual interest and concern. Under his tenure, The Leadership Conference has worked to secure the rights of women, communities of color, ex-offenders, people with disabilities, and the LGBTQ community. He has fought tirelessly to meet the needs of low-income people, recognizing that freedom from want is a human right. He believes and fights to make sure that everyone is included in the rights and benefits of our democracy, that all have a place at the table. So much of this is now possible today because of Wade, his commitment and dedication.

As the President and CEO of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Wade has been a constant source of trusted leadership, an unending recipient of our admiration, and an enduring guide on our path toward making this a more just and equal nation for all. It is my honor today to recognize Wade Henderson for his dedication and skill and to thank him for all he has done on behalf of justice and on behalf of our nation. I thank him for his service, and I wish him nothing but the best in his well-deserved retirement.

IN CELEBRATION OF MAYOR DAVID N. DINKINS 89TH BIRTHDAY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 89th Birthday of Mayor David N. Dinkins. Let me congratulate my beloved Brother and partner in government and in life and colleague for his dedication and commitment to New York City and for all of his great accomplishments over the many years that I have known him. He has truly made a historic imprint on the city that we know and love today.

To speak of all his accomplishments and in recognition of his birthday on July 10, 2016, it is only right to begin with the day of his birth, on July 10, 1927, in Trenton, New Jersey. After graduating from high school, he enlisted in the Marine Corps at 18 and served briefly in World War II. My fellow veteran was the recipient of The Congressional Gold Medal for his service as a Montford Point Marine in the United States Marine Corps, during World War II. After the war, he attended Howard University, graduating with a B.A. in Mathematics in 1950. David then moved to New York City and received a law degree from the Brooklyn Law School in 1956.

My esteemed colleague's political career began when he joined the Carver Club headed by J. Raymond Jones, known as the Harlem Fox. At that time, David befriended three up and coming New York politicians: Basil Paterson, Sr., Percy Sutton, and me. We later became known as the "Gang of Four" and together we were able to significantly shape the African-American presence in New York's political landscape.

Along his professional journey, he won his first electoral office, a seat in the New York State Assembly in 1965. Shortly afterwards, David was offered the position of Deputy Mayor of New York by then Mayor Abraham Beam. He then secured the position of City Clerk which he held for ten years from 1975 to 1985. On his third run for the office, my cherished colleague was elected as Manhattan's Borough President in 1985. In 1989, David ran for Mayor of New York and became the 106th Mayor of the City of New York.

My valued friend was the first African-American Mayor of New York City. He was truly a peacekeeper amid the racial tensions that erupted throughout the city, testing his ability as a municipal leader. He presided over a decrease in crime in the city, balanced the city budget by turning a $1.8 billion dollar deficit into a $200 million surplus and maintained racial peace after the Rodney King verdict sparked rioting in a number of cities across the nation. Under his watch, New York City had many great successes including the historic New York City Tribute to Nelson Mandela—"Safe Streets, Safe City: Cops and Kids," the revitalization of Times Square, and the historic agreement which has kept the US Open Tennis Championship in New York City. His administration created Fashion Week, Restaurant Week, and Broadway on Broadway, which are events that New Yorkers and tourists continue to enjoy. In 2015, The Municipal Building was renamed in his honor to the David N. Dinkins Municipal Building.

My highly respected colleague's accomplishments lie not only in politics but also through his educational career. David accepted a professorship at Columbia University's Center for Urban Research and Policy at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs in 1994 after his role as Mayor. He serves on the school's advisory board and has hosted the David N. Dinkins Leadership & Public Policy Forum for nearly 20 years. In 2003, the David N. Dinkins Professorship Chair in the Practice of Urban & Public Affairs was established at Columbia University. The David Dinkins Archives & Oral History collection was opened by Columbia University Library in December 2015 in his honor. In 2013, he released his memoir A Mayor's Life: Governing New York's Gorgeous Mosaic, which chronicles the life of this devoted public servant as a New Yorker who remains in love with this city.

David, my fondest comrade and greatest supporter, is also involved with many organizations and a board member of several nonprofit and charitable groups. He is a proud member of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity. He is a founding member of the Black & Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus of New York State, the Council of Black Elected Democrats of New York State and The One Hundred Black Men. He was also vice president of the United States Conference of Mayors, and is a member-at-large of the Black Leadership Forum. David serves as Chairman Emeritus of the National Black Leadership Commission on AIDS and the Constituency for Africa (CFA), and serves on the steering committee of the Association for a Better New York and the New York Urban League Advisory Council. He is on the board of New York City Global Partners and is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the National Advisory Board of the International African American Museum.

It is noteworthy that David's birthday celebration will take place at Ellen's Stardust Diner, formerly Ellen's Cafe, which was located across from City Hall for over 20 years and was a popular gathering place for many NYC mayors. Ellen's started a ritual where the Mayors would come in on their birthdays and Ellen's would donate their favorite pie to charity. In honor of this long-standing charitable tradition, Stardust Diner owner Ellen Hart-Sturm will be donating pies to David's favorite charity the Association to Benefit Children.

Mr. Speaker, with great love and admiration for my brother loyal friend and outstanding public servant, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 89th Birthday of David Dinkins, in recognition of all of his accomplishments.

MARWAN ALTAWEEL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Marwan Altaweel for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Marwan Altaweel is an 8th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Marwan Altaweel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Marwan Altaweel for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2016

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of Congressman GRAYSON's amendment number 12 to the FY 2017 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations legislation. This pro-woman amendment would strike a long-standing and unfair policy rider from the underlying legislation that restricts abortion coverage for those ensured under the Federal Employees Health Benefits

Program (FEHBP). Restricting access to this constitutionally protected right sets women working for the federal government apart as a separate class.

FEHBP provides health insurance to federal employees and their dependents. Like employees in the private sector, federal employees contribute to the cost of their health insurance through co-pays and deductibles. Unlike other employees in the private sector, however, federal employees are unable to access health plans that cover abortion.

Since 1983, Congress has adopted language through the Financial Services Appropriations bill to eliminate abortion coverage from FEHPB except in narrow circumstances when the pregnancy would endanger the woman's life or the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest. I rise in support of this amendment because it is time to end this prohibition.

Every woman in the United States is entitled to access the constitutionally-protected full range of pregnancy-related care, including abortion. No employer—including the federal government—should be allowed to dictate how an employee uses health care coverage or interfere in the benefits an employee chooses to access. Congress should respect the health care decisions of each federal employee and treat women with the dignity and compassion they rightly deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment to protect the rights of federal employees and their right to access constitutionally-protected medical services. For too long, this body has interfered with the difficult decisions women should make with their families, their doctors and whomever they choose. It's time that Congress lifts this ban and all bans on abortion coverage not just in FEHBP.

TRIBUTE TO DAWN FOUNTAIN

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Dawn Fountain for the care and kindness she provides to victims of domestic violence.

Ms. Fountain is a founder of Purses and Love, a non-profit organization in aid of the victims of domestic violence; but first and foremost, she is also a survivor. Alongside her mother and other volunteers, she helps the victims and their children by providing them with essential items when they arrive at shelters after leaving their home. The sad reality exists that these victims often come to shelters empty-handed, as many have to flee their homes in a hurry. Ms. Fountain provides, among other things, clothing, kids' toys and medical supplies for the victims of abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Ms. Fountain for the work she does for these survivors. I thank her for her efforts and I ask that this body join me in recognizing her for all that she provides to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF EMILY RICHARDS

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Emily Richards of Ohio Northern University for winning the Women's 800-Meter Run in the NCAA Division III Outdoor Track and Field Championships.

An achievement such as this certainly deserves recognition. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn national titles since its founding in 1906. Throughout this time, the champions of NCAA national level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in the country. Each year these elite competitors join the ranks of those who embody the nation's proud history of athletic success.

Emily's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. She has set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Ohio Northern University can be extremely proud of her performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Emily Richards on her National Championship. I wish her continued success in both her athletic and academic endeavors.

2016 CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, the House of Representatives hosted the reception for the 2016 Congressional Art Competition. I was honored to serve as the Republican co-chair for the competition, alongside Congresswoman KYRSTEN SINEMA of Arizona.

For the past 34 years, the Congressional Art Competition has inspired and encouraged young artists around the country. The competition was very personal to me. With my mother being an artist, I understand how important it is to give proper recognition to these talents who are making a difference in society through arts.

I was grateful to invite local artist Yvonne Kinney, from North Augusta, to Washington to speak to the students about her work and highlight the importance of giving back to your community.

The winner from the Second District was Mary Aufuldish from Cardinal Newman High School in the Midlands. I look forward to seeing her winning piece, America the Beautiful, every day for the next year as it hangs in the Cannon tunnel. I am humbled to represent all of the young talent in the Second Congressional District.

In conclusion, God Bless Our Troops and may the President by his actions never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 2016, I was unavoidably detained and missed one vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on Roll Call No. 368.

DECODING DYSLEXIA GROUP VISITS CAPITOL HILL

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 through 13th, 2016 youth leaders and families from Decoding Dyslexia will be hosting and participating in programs on Capitol Hill to raise awareness, encouraging our nation to #SayDyslexia. Congress extends a warm welcome.

POLICE SERGEANT TERESA DOUGHERTY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Federal Heights Police Sergeant Teresa (Terry) Dougherty for her decades of service to the City of Federal Heights, Colorado. For over thirty years, Sergeant Dougherty has been active within the community and the police department serving constituents of Federal Heights.

Sergeant Dougherty started her career in 1985 in the dispatch center within the Federal Heights Police Department. From there she served in various parts of the department including service in records and code enforcement. She worked her way up to a patrol officer and detective, finally ending a stellar career at her current rank of Sergeant. The police chief of Federal Heights credits her with a rare ability to bring calmness to chaos in a variety of circumstances. Sergeant Dougherty continuously brought passion to her job and made a personal investment in the employees within the police department. Her hard work and dedication each and every day to making the community of Federal Heights a great place to live and work demonstrate her exemplary work as a police officer in Federal Heights.

I extend my deepest thanks to Sergeant Dougherty for her service to the community. Thank you for your continuous dedication to serving the people and the City of Federal Heights, Colorado.

CONGRATS TO EDINA RUGBY CHAMPS

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Edina Rugby Football Club for winning their fifth consecutive Minnesota High School State Championship.

The Hornets capped off their perfect season by defeating Minnetonka in the state finals by a score of 22–10. Tries scored by Nick Bloom, Evan Holm, and Will Hoff, combined with a suffocating defensive effort, helped carry the Edina side to victory. Theo Madison added to the scoring as well, contributing two conversion kicks and a penalty kick. It was truly a team effort and all of the Edina players should be proud of their accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a team can sustain success the way the Edina Rugby Football Club has over the past five seasons, but their achievement is a testament to the dedication of both Coach Mark Dalton and all of his players.

Balancing school and athletics is not an easy task and these student athletes work hard in the classroom and continually strive to improve their craft. The families, teachers, friends, and the entire community are very proud of the Edina Rugby Football Club. Way to go Hornets.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE COLUMBUS ACADEMY BOYS TRACK AND FIELD TEAM

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Columbus Academy for winning the Boys 4 × 200 Meter Relay at the Division III Ohio High School Track and Field State Championship.

For over a century, the Ohio High School Athletic Association has provided Ohio's finest student athletes with the opportunity to earn a state championship. Each year young men and women spend countless hours practicing and training in an effort to join the ranks of Ohio's elite athletes. Although many strive to earn the title of state champion, only a select few will achieve this honor.

Columbus Academy's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement stands as a testament to their hard work. Logan Baker, Michael Kusi, Kevin Boyce, and Jerome Buckner have set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Columbus Academy can be extremely proud of their performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Columbus Academy Boys Track and Field on their state championship. I wish their team continued success in their future athletic endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER FOGARTY

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Christopher Fogarty for his service to Pinellas County as a Sunstar Paramedic.

Mr. Fogarty has recently received the 2016 Commissioner Morroni Award of Excellence in EMS at the 21st annual Appreciation Luncheon for Emergency Personnel. Mr. Fogarty has worked with Sunstar Paramedics for 11 years and has been an emergency medical technician and a paramedic since 2012.

Mr. Fogarty's recent actions won him this prestigious award when he saved the life of a Clearwater resident who went into cardiac arrest in his home. Thanks to Mr. Fogarty's decisive thinking and years of medical experience the resident's rare heart condition was quickly identified and the man's life was saved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Christopher Fogarty's service and dedication to Pinellas County. He has saved one citizen, and I am sure he will save many more. I ask that this body join me in recognizing the actions of Mr. Fogarty for Pinellas County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 370 on H.R. 5485, I mistakenly recorded my vote as no when I should have voted yes.

WAYZATA BOYS TRACK AND FIELD TEAM WIN

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Wayzata High School Boys Track and Field team on winning their second consecutive Minnesota State championship.

The Trojans defended their title led by first place finishes by Jaret Carpenter in both the sixteen-hundred meter and thirty-two-hundred meter races, and strong performances from the relay teams. Wayzata used a complete team effort to win the title and I commend them for their accomplishments.

These athletes spend countless hours practicing to reach their personal bests. They understand the value of teamwork and sportsmanship to not only become better athletes and teammates, but better students, members of the community, and future leaders.

In addition, they manage their time to excel at school, as well as fulfill and exceed family and social obligations.

Mr. Speaker, the families, teachers, friends, and our entire community are very proud of these high school champs. Congratulations to the Wayzata High School Boys Track and Field team on a job well done.

DAVID HILLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud David Hiller who is retiring as the Executive Director of the Colorado Energy Research Collaboratory after years of service to the renewable energy industry in Colorado.

The Colorado Energy Research Collaboratory is a research consortium among four leading research institutions—University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Through Mr. Hiller's leadership, the Collaboratory worked with industry partners, public agencies, and other universities and colleges to develop and advance the commercialization of renewable energy technologies, energy management systems, and energy efficiency technologies. These efforts have supported tremendous economic growth in Colorado and the nation with renewable energy industries. They educate our nation's finest energy researchers, technicians, and workforce.

Mr. Hiller started his career in 1991 as a partner at the Don, Hiller & Galleher, P.C. law firm. He served in this position for twelve years and then moved to public service. In 2005, Mr. Hiller began working for then-Senator Ken Salazar as his State Issues Counsel. In 2007, Mr. Hiller became Executive Director of the Colorado Energy Research Collaboratory and focused on advanced clean energy in biofuels, solar and wind technologies. The Collaboratory also expanded research to include energy systems integration and carbon management cutting across renewable and traditional energy technologies. Through his time at the Collaboratory, Mr. Hiller continuously brought his passion, hard work and dedication each and every day to growing the renewable energy community and we will forever be grateful.

I extend my deepest thanks to David Hiller for his service to the renewable energy community and wish him all the best in his future endeavors. I thank him for his continuous dedication to serving the people and the State of Colorado.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES PREVITERA

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize James Previtera, St. Petersburg Assistant Chief of Police.

Mr. Previtera is a St. Petersburg native and recently joined the local law enforcement division. In 1983, as a senior in high school, he went on a ride-along with local law enforcement, sparking his passion for police work. Subsequently he joined the force and in 1986 he became a deputy for the Pinellas County Sheriff's Department where he would serve for 11 years.

In 1997, Mr. Previtera left the Sheriff's Office and joined the U.S. Secret Service. He

was a member for eight years and protected Vice President Dick Cheney from 2003 to 2005. In 2005, he returned to St. Petersburg and joined the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office where he served as a major in charge of the Training Divisions before becoming a colonel in command for the county's jail facilities.

It was in this role within the jail facilities that Mr. Previtera observed first-hand how mental illness can induce criminal activity and how the justice system had previously neglected this reality. He started a program to transfer mentally-ill inmates from jail into treatment centers where they could be treated effectively.

In 2014, when a new police chief in St. Petersburg gave Mr. Previtera the chance to join the police department as an assistant chief in charge of the Investigative Services bureau down there, he jumped at the opportunity. It gave him the chance to finally return to his home city and make a difference where it all started.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Previtera for the work he has done for Pinellas County and for our nation. I ask that this body join me in thanking Mr. Previtera for his continued outstanding service.

DEFAZIO AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5485

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I cosponsored this amendment today because I do not support the continuation of the Selective Service System at all—for anyone—regardless of gender. This is why I have either introduced or cosponsored legislation to do away with it every year that I have been here in Congress.

The United States military has been entirely dependent on an all-volunteer force since the end of the draft in 1973. Since then we have fostered the most professional and elite fighting force in the history of this country. We should commit to keeping it that way.

Since 1973, the United States has engaged multiple operations around the world including the Gulf War and later two large-scale operations simultaneously. At the height of Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom nearly 300,000 American volunteer servicemen and women deployed to support these missions. We have done all of this without enacting a draft.

Retired General Carter Ham, Chairman of the Commission on the Future of the Army, recently said that "[A] return to the draft or other model of compulsory military service will not yield the quality Army the nation requires."

And in his testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said, and I quote, "the . . . thing I'd like to say about the Selective Service System and the draft generally is this: We want to pick our people. We don't want people forced to serve us."

I agree with General Ham and with the Secretary of Defense.

This is why I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to remove funding from this outdated system and route it instead toward payment of the national debt.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POCASSET GOLF CLUB

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Pocasset Golf Club.

In search of a place to gather, socialize and unwind during the summer months, the Club's founders purchased the Overlook House in Pocasset, Massachusetts in 1916. Initially designed as a nine-hole golf course, the founders contracted Donald Ross, widely regarded as one of the premier architects of golf courses, to outline the next nine holes. Mr. Ross' vision produced the renowned course we know today, spanning acres of Pocasset's scenic landscape.

Like so many clubs of its time, the Pocasset Golf Club was hit hard by the Great Depression. Its owners at the time made the difficult decision to sell the club in subsequent years. It was during this period that the holes along Hen Cove were converted to houses. The club persevered and, in 1951, was acquired by William Carr. Under his careful stewardship, the club began to modernize—including the construction of the clubhouse that is still in use today. The current ownership group, Pocasset Golf Club, Inc., purchased the club in 1989 and in the intervening years they upgraded the clubhouse to its current form. With over 350 members, the Club continues to provide its members with a place to recreate and relax.

The Pocasset Golf Club will remain a pillar in the community through its tireless commitment to developing the next generation of golfers. That development includes the club's junior golf program that attracts prospective players early, emphasizing the fundamentals of this life sport. The Pocasset Golf Club also offers itself as the home course for the Bourne High School golf team, where student athletes compete at the club, at no charge, against regional rivals. Finally, the membership annually supports the Massachusetts based Oiumet Scholarship Fund that provides student tuition for high school caddies to attend college.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Pocasset Golf Club on its 100th anniversary. I ask that my colleagues join me in commemorating the Club's centennial and look forward to a future of continued prosperity.

IN RECOGNITION OF LOGAN BAKER

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Logan Baker for winning the Boys 800 Meter Run in the Division III Ohio High School Track and Field State Championship.

An achievement such as this certainly deserves recognition. The Ohio High School Athletic Association has enabled talented teams and individuals to earn state titles since its founding in 1907. Throughout this time, the champions of OHSAA state level competitions have represented the highest achieving and most talented athletes in Ohio. Each year these elite competitors join the ranks of those who embody Ohio's proud history of athletic success.

Logan's victory caps a tremendous season. This sort of achievement is earned only through many hours of practice, perspiration and hard work. He has set a new standard for future athletes to reach. Everyone at Columbus Academy can be extremely proud of his performance.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I congratulate Logan Baker on his state championship. I wish him continued success in both his athletic and academic endeavors.

HONORING DR. DAVID CASH

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Dave Cash, who is retiring as the Superintendent of the Santa Barbara Unified School District after 28 years of public service as an educator.

After graduating from the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) in 1979, Dr. Cash attended law school at Willamette University where he received his Juris Doctorate in 1981. In 1990, he received his Master's Degree in Education at UCSB and in 2008, his Doctorate of Education from the University of Southern California (USC). He has served as an educator and administrator for several local schools in the Santa Barbara School District including Peabody Elementary School, Goleta Valley Junior High, and Dos Pueblos High School.

Dr. Cash's distinguished career as an educator and leader in the Central Coast of California is only preceded by his commitment to his students and the local Santa Barbara community. His leadership has helped generations of students successfully prepare for the future. Over the years, Dave's passion and tireless efforts have succeeded in closing achievement gaps and improving student outcomes at all grade levels.

During his tenure, Dr. Cash committed his career to addressing inequality in our education system by seeking to hire more Spanish-speaking teachers and invest in resources for English language learner students to ensure all Central Coast students have the opportunity to achieve. Furthermore, Dr. Cash's ingenuity and forward thinking mindset have earned the respect and admiration of so many in the educational field. His restorative justice initiative, aimed at reducing suspensions and keeping kids in the classroom, and initiatives to better integrate technology into the classroom are just two of his many accomplishments as Superintendent of the Santa Barbara School District, and they serve as a testament to his dedication to his students' success.

Dr. Cash's work and influence have been immeasurable and will continue to have an effect on his students and the entire Santa Barbara community for many years to come. I am pleased to recognize Dr. Cash's countless achievements and would like to express my upmost gratitude for his service to his students

and our community. I wish him nothing but continued success in his retirement and future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL ROBERT PREISS

HON. MARK TAKAI

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Colonel Robert Preiss, an American hero who has devoted his life to serving our country.

During his career spanning over 30 years, Colonel Robert Preiss has proven his ability to successfully manage organizations and deliver results to the most critical problems facing our nation. He began his military career with his enlistment in the Texas Army National Guard. Throughout his career, Colonel Preiss has worked on an array of important projects, from shaping our policies in Iraq as Deputy Chief in the National Guard Affairs Office of United States Forces-Iraq, to drafting recommendations for our Reserve Forces as part of the Reserve Forces Policy Board. Through his service, he has furthered U.S. military objectives both at home and abroad.

Colonel Preiss has been decorated with numerous commendations, including the Bronze Star. In September of 2013, he received the Distinguished Service Medal from the National Guard Association of the United States to recognize his research into the efficiency and efficacy of the National Guard and Reserve. Our nation is safer today in part due to the work and patriotism of Colonel Preiss.

Colonel Robert Preiss, thank you for your patriotism and selfless service to the United States. As you are surely aware, our nation is proud of all you have accomplished during your career. Thank you (Mahalo nui loa) for your service to our county, and I wish you the best in your future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BRAD KENDELL

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Brad Kendell for his tenacity and perseverance in the face of adversity.

Brad Kendell is a Pinellas County native, from Clearwater. His passion for sailing with his father at the Clearwater Yacht Club began when he was just 7 years old. However, in 2003, his life drastically changed when he lost both his legs in a horrific plane crash with his father and flight instructor.

Mr. Kendell coped with his injury by meeting with other disabled sailors and soon discovered that his disability could not stop him from pursuing his true passion of sailing. He began to sail competitively this year and has already won a world championship. This qualifies him to represent the U.S. in the 2016 Paralympic Games in Rio this summer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge Mr. Kendell's courage after a horrific accident and ask that this body join me in wishing Mr. Kendell the best of luck in the games this summer.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MINNETONKA BOYS TENNIS TEAM

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Minnetonka High School Boys Tennis team on their Minnesota State Team Championship.

The Skippers had come up just short in the previous two years, but this year they would not be denied. Although they were seeded fourth out of eight teams in the tournament, the Skippers showed grit and determination as they upset the top two teams on their way to the school's first tennis championship since 1974. They upset Rochester Century in a closely contested final, winning four matches to three.

Mr. Speaker, in a sport like tennis where success in a match is a combination of singles and doubles, it is especially noteworthy to recognize how this group of young men worked together to achieve their goal. These student athletes showed that together they were greater than the sum of their parts.

The families, teachers, friends, and the entire community are very proud of the Minnetonka High School Boys Tennis team both on the court and in the classroom. Congratulations.

HONORING THE WASHINGTON RENEGADES RUGBY FOOTBALL CLUB

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the Washington Renegades Rugby Football Club. Founded in 1998, the Renegades are the first rugby club in the United States to actively recruit gay players, and are a founding member of International Gay Rugby (IGR), an association that today is comprised of over 70 gay and gay-supportive rugby clubs worldwide.

The Renegades represent Washington, D.C. in Division III and Division IV rugby. The club's Division III side is the three-time defending champions of the Mid-Atlantic Conference Central Division, having reached the national quarter/semi-finals in 2014. The club's Division IV side has also made two consecutive playoff appearances.

Over this past Memorial Day weekend, the Washington Renegades finished the 2016 Bingham Cup Tournament in Nashville, Tennessee as the most successful club overall in attendance. The Bingham Cup is the Championship of IGR, and is named for gay rugby player Mark Bingham, of the San Francisco Fog Rugby Football Club, who lost his life on September 11, 2001. Bingham, along with fellow passengers and crew of United Flight 93, is widely credited with preventing the hijackers from reaching their intended target.

Fielding three teams in three separate divisions, the Renegades A side (the Blues) reached the final four of the main competition—the Mark Bingham Cup—losing in the semifinal 15–5 to the eventual champions, the Melbourne Chargers from Melbourne, Australia. The Renegades B side (the Reds) won their division, defeating the Boston Ironsides 56–0 in the final to take the Mark Bingham Shield. The Renegades C side—affectionately called the "Silver" side due the age of some of its players—went to the finals of its competition, losing 12–10 to the Lost Souls of Dallas, Texas in the Challenger Cup Final. The Renegades are already looking forward to another season in USA Rugby competition this fall as well as to the next Bingham Cup in 2018.

The Renegades are more than just exceptional athletes; they are also exceptional citizens. They volunteer with such programs as Food and Friends, preparing hundreds of Thanksgiving meals for people living with HIV/AIDS and other life-threatening illnesses. They have held school supply drives and holiday toy drives, and have donated Nook electronic readers to schoolchildren. They have conducted rugby clinics for youth in the District of Columbia, and were featured in a series of after-school activities dedicated to having dads or father representatives participate in sports drills and related activities with their children. The Renegades have been recognized by the D.C. Mayor and D.C. Council for their athletic achievement and charitable activities, and by the U.S. Department of the Interior for their efforts in cleaning and maintaining the original Flight 93 Memorial in Shankesville, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in commending the Washington Renegades and wishing them continued success in the important work they do of modeling sporting excellence and breaking down barriers on the field, and serving the community off the field. The Washington Renegades are amateurs in the truest sense of the word, for the word "amateur" derives from the Latin word for "love." The Renegades do what they do not for money or glory, but for love—love for their teammates, love for their game, and love for the city and country they call home.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. ROSCOE BROWN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and celebrate the life of an American hero, Dr. Roscoe Brown, who will be greatly missed by all those inspired by him. Dr. Brown flew combat missions during World War II as a member of the prestigious Tuskegee Airmen, the first African-American military aviators in the United States Armed Forces. As a proud sponsor of the bill that awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, our highest civilian honor, to the Tuskegee Airmen in 2007, I was humbled to meet Dr. Brown who embodied the best that our nation has to offer.

Our troops at home and abroad make the greatest sacrifices every day to defend our country. What makes the story of Dr. Brown

and the Tuskegee Airmen remarkable is their selflessness and devotion to a country despite the segregation and barriers they faced. These great men were willing to put their lives on the line for American values and freedoms even when discrimination compromised their own rights and liberties. Through their patriotism, the walls of segregation were finally removed from our Armed Forces on July 26, 1948. It is then when I enlisted in the Army and was able to follow in Dr. Brown's footsteps as a decorated soldier in the Korean War.

After the war and off the battlefield, Dr. Brown has left a lasting impact in my congressional district that continues to be felt today. His service to our nation took a new form after he settled in Riverdale, New York City. As a professor at New York University and City University of New York, Dr. Brown expanded African American study programs everywhere he taught, eventually becoming the President of Bronx Community College. A longtime member of the Boys and Girls Club of America and the Jackie Robinson Foundation, Dr. Brown worked tirelessly to improve the lives of everyone around him.

Dr. Brown left his indelible mark as a veteran, educator, community leader, and an activist, devoting his life to the betterment of his fellow man, community, and country. I join my constituents and rest of the nation as we say goodbye and pay tribute to a true American hero.

HONORING JOHN F. WOLFE

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. John F. Wolfe, the former publisher of my hometown paper, the Columbus Dispatch.

John passed away on June 24, 2016. He was cherished by all as a humble leader, a generous friend and an unselfish advocate for others.

I was honored and privileged to have known him. He loved our city, our state, and our nation greatly. He was a gentle giant whose legacy includes improving the quality of life in Columbus for generations to come.

His family purchased the Dispatch in 1905, and as John wrote in his farewell letter to readers last year, the world was vastly different then. The telegraph and telephone were recent inventions, and the first radio broadcast was still a year away.

Today, it is the Wolfe family legacy that the Dispatch, the very paper I grew up reading as a kid in Columbus, stands as a trusted, leading and highly respected newspaper in our region and beyond.

When John became publisher in 1975, his devotion to transform Columbus into a vibrant and booming city never wavered.

He supported the Nationwide Children's Hospital, the Ohio State University, the Columbus Zoo, the Franklin Park Conservatory, our sports teams and much more. Without a doubt, Columbus would not be what it is today without his dedication and commitment to Central Ohioans.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, let us offer our deepest appreciation for all John F. Wolfe did to serve his family, his readers and the people of Columbus, Ohio. He will not be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CORNWALL BROTHERS STORE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 150th Anniversary of the Cornwall Brothers Store in Jefferson County, New York. The Cornwall Brothers Store is the only surviving historic waterfront building in Alexandria Bay.

Built in 1866, The Cornwall Brothers Store has served the community of Alexandria Bay in many ways. This building originally opened as a store that sold everything from dry goods to fine clothing but was forced to close during the Great Depression. Since that time, the building served first as a customs house, then a United States Coast Guard station and a United States Post Office, before officially becoming the store and museum that it is today.

The restoration of the store and the development of a museum sprang from an order to demolish the building in 1973. Knowing the significance of the Cornwall Brothers Store, a band of citizens came together to form the Alexandria Township Historical Society, a group whose first priority was to protect the Cornwall Brothers Store. After launching an intense campaign to save the building, the Alexandria Historical Society was able to save the building and have it registered in both the National Registry of Historic Places in 1975 and then the New York Registry of Historic Places in 1991. The museum now holds a variety of exhibits showcasing the lifestyles of residents of the Saint Lawrence River from the 19th and 20th centuries.

Congratulations to the Cornwall Brothers Store on the 150th anniversary of your formation. I wish this business and museum continued success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ALLEN BAKER

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Dr. Allen Baker for his commitment to the Rotary Club.

This past month, Dr. Baker celebrated his 70 years of perfect attendance to the Rotary Club. He first joined the Rotary Club in 1946 in Illinois and has since attended more than 3,500 meetings over his 70 years of being a member.

He has also attended 53 foreign Rotary Club meetings, the most notable of which was in Poland where the meeting was conducted in English in his honor. He joined the Belleair club in 1991 when he moved here and has since served as secretary and on the club's board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Dr. Allen Baker for his diligence and dedicated service to the Rotary Club. He has been a faithful member, wherever his life has taken him, and I ask that this body join me in recognizing Dr. Allen Baker.

HONORING THE CAREER OF SERGEANT JOHN SAVAGE

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the esteemed career of Sergeant John Savage, who served 30 years with the City of Syracuse Police Department.

Sergeant Savage was appointed to the Syracuse Police Department on June 28, 1986 and served commendably in various units within the Department until his retirement in June of 2016. Sergeant Savage served honorably as an officer from June of 1986 and earned the rank of Sergeant in June of 1995. As a result of his excellent service throughout his 30 years of service, he received 2 Divisional Commendations, 3 Bureau Commendations, 5 Departmental Commendations, 2 Unit Citations, the John Dillon Award in 2011, the Timothy Laun Award in 2016, as well as several letters of appreciation.

During my time as a federal prosecutor I had the opportunity to serve with Sergeant Savage as part of the Syracuse Gang Violence Task Force. Sergeant Savage was an early leader of the Task Force and his work helped to drastically reduce the gang presence in some of our community's most violent neighborhoods.

For 30 years, Sergeant Savage served with great dignity, loyalty and devotion to our community. He has truly helped to make the City of Syracuse a better, safer place for its citizens. I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with such a great man and I wish him the very best in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 349 on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4854, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company, I incorrectly voted "nay" when I intended to vote "yea".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 357, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye.

CONGRATS TO MINNETONKA BOYS GOLF CHAMPIONS

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Minnetonka High School Boys Golf Team on winning the Minnesota High School State Tournament under the leadership of Coach John Coatta.

Junior Ben Sigel led the way for the Skippers, shooting five under par over two days. Sigel also won the individual state title by six strokes. Sigel was aided by Sawyer Baily and Mile McCarthy who shot 150 and 152 respectively over the two days. Minnetonka beat the nearest competitor by 13 strokes. It is Minnetonka's second championship and their first since transitioning to the AAA level.

Mr. Speaker, golf is a game of inches. It is an incredibly difficult game to master, even more so under the weight of expectation. Such a victory could not have been obtained without tireless practice and unending dedication.

Mr. Speaker, what is especially impressive is the amount of time these student athletes dedicate to exceeding in the classroom while also participating in other extracurricular activities.

Congratulations again to Skipper Boys Golf Team on being state champs. Your parents, coaches, and community are very proud of you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 6th, 2016, I was not in attendance in the House during the first series of votes due to family obligations outside of the District of Columbia. I wish to state my position on a piece of legislation that received consideration on the House floor yesterday.

The House voted on the ''Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis'' Act. This legislation was introduced by my friend, Rep. TIM MURPHY, and I have strongly supported this bill since its introduction. The bill will make much needed reforms to the way our nation administers its mental health programs, and will authorize a number of grant programs to improve mental healthcare in our country. Tens of millions of Americans suffer from some kind of mental illness, and far too many of them suffer in silence. I believe we must take urgent action to increase our nation's capacity to treat mental illness, to defeat the stigma that is all too often attached to mental health treatment, and to get help to those who need it. This bill will be a crucial part of this effort, and were I present for its consideration on the floor, I would have enthusiastically supported it.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 764, National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4839–S4923

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3137–3151, and S. Res. 520–523. **Page S4915**

Measures Reported:

S. 921, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a nonregulatory program to build on and help coordinate funding for restoration and protection efforts of the 4-State Delaware River Basin region. (S. Rept. No. 114–294) **Page S4914**

Measures Passed:

Atrocities Perpetrated by ISIL: Senate agreed to S. Res. 340, expressing the sense of the Senate that the atrocities perpetrated by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) against religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria include war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4920–22**

MEGABYTE Act: Senate passed S. 2340, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue a directive on the management of software licenses, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4922**

Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4960, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the "Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building", and the bill was then passed. **Page S4922**

Barry G. Miller Post Office: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4372, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the "Barry G. Miller Post Office", and the bill was then passed. **Page S4922**

National Whistleblower Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 522, designating July 30, 2016, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day". **Page S4922**

Relating to the Death of Elie Wiesel: Senate agreed to S. Res. 523, relating to the death of Elie Wiesel, Holocaust survivor, powerful advocate for peace and human rights, and award-winning author. **Page S4922–23**

Measures Considered:

Department of Defense Appropriations Act—Agreement: By 50 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 124), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 5293, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017. **Page S4910**

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4910**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 4 p.m., on Monday, July 11, 2016, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4923**

House Messages:

National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act: By 63 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 123), Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 764, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, with

McConnell (for Roberts) Amendment No. 4935, in the nature of a substitute, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S4841–S4910

Rejected:

McConnell Amendment No. 4936 (to Amendment No. 4935), to change the enactment date. (By 31 yeas to 62 nays (Vote No. 122), Senate earlier failed to table the amendment.) **Pages S4909–10**

Appointments:

Congressional Task Force on Economic Growth in Puerto Rico: The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 114–187, and in consultation with the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and with the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Finance, appointed the following individuals as members of the Congressional Task Force on Economic Growth in Puerto Rico: Senator Nelson (Energy and Natural Resources) and Senator Menendez (Finance). **Page S4920**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

John M. Huff, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers for a term of one year.

Robert P. Suglia, of Rhode Island, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers for a term of one year.

Lori K. Wing-Heier, of Alaska, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers for a term of two years.

Kimberly J. Walker, of Iowa, to be Inspector General, Export-Import Bank.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy. **Page S4923**

Messages from the House: **Page S4913**

Measures Referred: **Page S4913**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S4913**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S4913, S4920**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4913–14**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S4914–15**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4915–17**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4917–19**

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S4919–20**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4920**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—124) **Page S4910**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 11:27 p.m., until 4 p.m. on Monday, July 11, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4923.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATO, RUSSIA, AND EUROPEAN SECURITY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Russia, and European Security, after receiving testimony from General James L. Jones, USMC (Ret.), former National Security Advisor, and Atlantic Council Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security; Julianne Smith, former Deputy National Security Advisor, and Center for a New American Security Strategy and Statecraft Program; and R. Nicholas Burns, Harvard Kennedy School.

U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an assessment of United States economic assistance, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey Herbst, Newseum, Todd J. Moss, Center for Global Development, and Alicia Phillips Mandaville, InterAction, all of Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 33 public bills, H.R. 5651–5683; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 142; and H. Res. 810–814 were introduced. **Pages H4546–48**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4549–50**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Webster (FL) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4471**

Decorum Statement: The Chair made the following announcement regarding decorum in the House Chamber: ''The Chair has the responsibility under clause 2 of rule 1 to preserve order and decorum. As the Chair ruled on June 12, 2003, an exhibition involving Members trafficking the well is a breach of decorum.''. **Page H4478**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:15 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4478**

Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 809, providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 524) to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 388, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 387. **Pages H4482–97, H4522–23**

Pursuant to Sec. 2 of H. Res. 809, upon adoption of the resolution, the House was considered to have: (1) taken from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2943, (2) stricken all after the enacting clause of such bill and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, and (3) passed the Senate bill as so amended. **Pages H4482–83**

Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017: The House passed H.R. 5485, making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, by a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 398.

Pages H4497–H4522, H4523–36, H4536–44

Rejected the Peters motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 183 yeas to 241 nays, Roll No. 397. **Pages H4542–44**

Agreed to:

Duffy amendment (No. 26 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce a new regulatory action of $100 million or more; **Pages H4497–98**

Crenshaw en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in H. Rept. 114–639: Duffy (No. 27) that prohibits funds from being used with respect to the case Rainey v. Merit Systems Protection Board; Zeldin (No. 48) that prohibits funds from being used by the GSA to market or sell Plum Island, NY; Jeffries (No. 53) that precludes the relocation of an Office of Disability Adjudication and Review, of the Social Security Administration, away from the population center it mainly serves; Grayson (No. 56) that increases the minimum funding level for Tax Counseling for the Elderly by 50%; Comstock (No. 59) that increases resources for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) Program, offset by resources for GSA rental space; Speier (No. 60) that increases funding for the Federal Trade Commission by $1 million for additional enforcement of the Do Not Call Registry and education for the public about avoiding telemarketer deception and abuse; Himes (No. 61) that increases funding for the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board by $1,784,000; Rice (NY) (No. 62) that increases funding for the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) by $800,000; Lynch (No. 63) that increases funding for the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) by $3,300,000; Walberg (No. 64) that increases funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program (HIDTA) by $2 million; Connolly (No. 65) that reduces the General Services Administration's Federal Building Fund Rental of Space Account by $5 million and increases the IT Oversight and Reform Office by $5 million; Meng (No. 66) that increases funding for Small Business Development Centers by $5 million; Engel (No. 67) that prohibits funds made available by this Act from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles unless those vehicles meet the requirements of President Obama's May 24, 2011 Executive Order on Federal Fleet Performance; and Grayson (No. 69) that prohibits the government from entering into a contract with an entity that discloses, as it is required to by the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that it has been convicted of fraud or another criminal offense in the last three years in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public contract or subcontract; prohibits the government from contracting with entities that have been

notified of any delinquent Federal taxes for which the liability remains unsatisfied; **Pages H4498–H4500**

Gosar amendment (No. 30 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits the use of funds to pay a performance bonus to any senior IRS employee; **Pages H4502–03**

Hudson amendment (No. 33 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funding to propose or finalize a regulatory action until January 21, 2017; **Pages H4506–07**

Lance amendment (No. 37 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds from being used to give Iran access to the U.S. dollar; **Page H4512**

Luetkemeyer amendment (No. 39 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funding for Operation Choke Point; **Pages H4514–15**

Davidson amendment (No. 25 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that was debated on July 6 that prohibits the use of funds to change the Selective Service System registration requirements (by a recorded vote of 217 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 379); **Page H4517**

Garrett amendment (No. 28 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits the Securities and Exchange Commission from proposing or implementing a rule that mandates the use of universal proxy ballots during proxy contests (by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 180 noes, Roll No. 380); **Pages H4500–01, H4517–18**

Garrett amendment (No. 29 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits the use of funds to designate any nonbank financial company as ''too big to fail'' or as a ''systemically important financial institution'' or to make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company could pose a threat to U.S. financial stability (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 381); **Pages H4501–02 H4518–19**

Gosar amendment (No. 31 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits the use of funds made available by this Act to be used to provide financial assistance to Sanctuary Cities (by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 382); **Pages H4503–04, H4519**

Guinta amendment (No. 32 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that makes no funds available to the CFPB to enforce or administer guidance pertaining to indirect auto lending (by a recorded vote of 260 ayes to 162 noes with 1 answering ''present'', Roll No. 383); **Pages H4504–06, H4519–20**

Huizenga (MI) amendment (No. 34 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that states no funds appropriated in this Act may be used to enforce a SEC rule pursuant to Section 1502 of Dodd-Frank relating to ''conflict minerals'' (by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 188 noes, Roll No. 384); **Pages H4507–10, H4520–21**

Huizenga (MI) amendment (No. 35 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that states no funds shall be made available to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the Securities and Exchange Commission's Pay Ratio Disclosure rules (by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 385); **Pages H4510–12, H4521**

Roskam amendment (No. 45 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits any funds from being used to issue a license pursuant to any Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) memo regarding section 5.1.1 of Annex II to the JCPOA, including the OFAC memo titled, ''Statement of Licensing Policy For Activities Related to the Export Or Re-Export to Iran of Commercial Passenger Aircraft and Related Parts and Services'' and any other OFAC memo of the same substance; **Pages H4528–29**

Roskam amendment (No. 46 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits any funds from being used to authorize a transaction by a U.S. financial institution (as defined under section 561.309 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) that is ordinarily incident to the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran; **Pages H4529–30**

Zeldin amendment (No. 51 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds made available by the Act to be used to pay final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interest and costs specified in the judgments to Iran using amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or interest from amounts appropriated under such section; **Pages H4532–33**

Zeldin amendment (No. 52 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds made available by the Act to be used to circumvent the conditions of Section 104 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010; **Page H4533**

Jenkins (WV) amendment (No. 58 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that increases funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) by $2 million with an offset; **Pages H4534–35**

Messer amendment (No. 40 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds from being used by the CFPB to commence any administrative adjudication or civil action beyond the 3 year statute of limitation established by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 389); **Pages H4524–25, H4537**

Palmer amendment (No. 41 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds from being used to implement D.C.'s Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act (RHNDA) (by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 390); **Pages H4525–26, H4537–38**

Mullin amendment (No. 43 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds from being used to finalize, implement, administer or enforce CPSC's proposed rule on Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices (by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 391); **Pages H4526–27, H4538–39**

Posey amendment (No. 44 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds under this Act from being used to implement, administer, enforce, or codify into regulation, the SEC's guidance relating to "Commission Guidance Regarding Disclosure Related to Climate Change" (by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 392); **Pages H4527–28, H4539**

Gallego amendment (No. 68 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that Specifies that no funds may be used to revise any policy or directive related to hiring preferences for veterans of the Armed Forces (by a recorded vote of 409 ayes to 14 noes, Roll No. 395); and **Pages H4535, H4541**

Hartzler amendment (No. 70 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits the CFPB from implementing any contract with a vendor to provide informational messages (by a recorded vote of 242 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 396). **Pages H4535–36, H4541–42**

Rejected:

Blackburn amendment (No. 22 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that was debated on July 6 that sought to provide for a one percent across the board cut to the bill's discretionary spending levels (by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 377); **Pages H4515–16**

Buck amendment (No. 23 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that was debated on July 6 that sought to reduce the salary of the IRS Commissioner to $0 annually from date of enactment through January 20, 2017 (by a recorded vote of 197 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 378); **Pages H4516–17**

King (IA) amendment (No. 38 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that sought to defund an Executive Order which directs Federal agencies to provide foreign-language services to anyone who might seek to engage with federal, state, and local governments (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 386); **Pages H4513–14, H4521–22**

Carney amendment (No. 50 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that sought to extend the redesignation period for HUBZones to 7 years (by a recorded vote of 131 ayes to 292 noes, Roll No. 393); and **Pages H4531–32, H4539–40**

Yarmuth amendment (No. 54 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of Section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 394). **Pages H4533–34, H4540–41**

Withdrawn:

Sanford amendment (No. 47 printed in H. Rept. 114–639) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds to enforce regulations limiting the rights of Americans to travel to Cuba. **Pages H4530–31**

H. Res. 794, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) was agreed to Tuesday, July 5th.

Recess: The House recessed at 7:46 p.m. and reconvened at 8 p.m. **Page H4536**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4482.

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 38 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and nineteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4515–16, H4516–17, H4517, H4517–18, H4518–19, H4519, H4519–20, H4520–21, H4521, H4521–22, H4522–23, H4523, H4537, H4537–38, H4538–39, H4539, H4539–40, H4540–41, H4541, H4541–42, H4543–44, and H4544. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE AND NATIONAL SECURITY: ON-THE-GROUND EXPERIENCES OF FORMER MILITARY LEADERS

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Agriculture and National Security: On-the-Ground Experiences of Former Military Leaders". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a markup on the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill, FY 2017. The Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill, FY 2017, was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

GOLDWATER-NICHOLS REFORM: THE WAY AHEAD

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Goldwater-Nichols Reform: The Way Ahead". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SOUTH CHINA SEA MARITIME DISPUTES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces; and the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held a joint hearing entitled ''South China Sea Maritime Disputes''. Testimony was heard from Abraham M. Denmark, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for East Asia, Department of Defense; and Colin Willett, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Strategy and Multilateral Affairs, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State.

AN INTRODUCTION TO REGULATORY BUDGETING

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''An Introduction to Regulatory Budgeting''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5587, the ''Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act''. H.R. 5587 was ordered reported, as amended.

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGREEMENTS AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL DISPOSAL

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled ''Federal, State, and Local Agreements and Economic Benefits for Spent Nuclear Fuel Disposal''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Amodei; Dold; Hardy; and Titus; Joseph Hardy, State Senator, State of Nevada; Dan Schinhofen, County Commissioner, Nye County, Nevada; and a public witness.

EXAMINING THE ADVANCING CARE FOR EXCEPTIONAL KIDS ACT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Advancing Care for Exceptional Kids Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF U.S. AIRCRAFT SALES TO IRAN

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled ''The Implications of U.S. Aircraft Sales to Iran''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEMANDING ACCOUNTABILITY: THE ADMINISTRATION'S RECKLESS RELEASE OF TERRORISTS FROM GUANTANAMO

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Demanding Accountability: The Administration's Reckless Release of Terrorists from Guantanamo''. Testimony was heard from Lee Wolosky, Special Envoy for Guantanamo Closure, Department of State; and Paul M. Lewis, Special Envoy for Guantanamo Detention Closure, Department of Defense.

HOW PERVASIVE IS MISCONDUCT AT TSA: EXAMINING FINDINGS FROM A JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency; and Subcommittee on Transportation Security, held a joint hearing entitled ''How Pervasive is Misconduct at TSA: Examining Findings from a Joint Subcommittee Investigation''. Testimony was heard from Huban Gowadia, Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; and Andrew Oosterbaan, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 320, the ''Rapid DNA Act of 2015''; H.R. 5578, the ''Survivors' Bill of Rights Act of 2016''; and H.R. 3765, the ''ADA Education and Reform Act of 2015. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 320 and H.R. 3765. H.R. 5578 was ordered reported, without amendment.

STATE PERSPECTIVES ON BLM'S DRAFT PLANNING 2.0 RULE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''State Perspectives on BLM's Draft Planning 2.0 Rule''. Testimony was heard from Jim Lyons, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of Interior; Kathleen Clarke, Director, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, Salt Lake City, Utah; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the State Department''. Testimony was heard from James Comey, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Steve Linick, Inspector General, Department of State; and I. Charles McCullough III, Inspector General, Intelligence Community.

EXAMINING THE NATION'S CURRENT AND NEXT GENERATION WEATHER SATELLITE PROGRAMS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on the Environment held a hearing entitled "Examining the Nation's Current and Next Generation Weather Satellite Programs". Testimony was heard from Stephen Volz, Assistant Administrator, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; Ralph Stoffler, Director of Weather, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, U.S. Air Force; and Cristina Chaplain, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5638, the "Solar Fuels Innovation Act"; H.R. 5640, the "Electricity Storage Innovation Act"; and H.R. 5636, the "National Institute of Standards and Technology Campus Security Act". The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5638 and H.R. 5640. H.R. 5636 was ordered reported, without amendment.

PREVENTION OF SMUGGLING AT UNITED STATES PORTS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation; and the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security of the House Committee on Homeland Security, held a joint hearing entitled "Prevention of Smuggling at United States Ports". Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Linda L. Fagan, Deputy Commandant for Operations, Policy, and Capabilities, U.S. Coast Guard; Wayne Brasure, Acting Director, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office; Todd C. Owen, Executive Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, Customs and Border Protection; Anne Harrington, Deputy Administrator, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration; Jennifer Grover, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office; Gregory H. Canavan, Senior Fellow, Los Alamos National Laboratories; David A. Espie, Director of Security, Maryland Port Administration, Port of Baltimore; and a public witness.

DEFYING THE CONSTITUTION: THE ADMINISTRATION'S UNLAWFUL FUNDING OF THE COST SHARING REDUCTION PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled "Defying the Constitution: The Administration's Unlawful Funding of the Cost Sharing Reduction Program". Testimony was heard from John Koskinen, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service; Mary Wakefield, Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services; Mark Mazur, Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, Department of the Treasury; and Michael Deich, Senior Advisor for Budget, Office of Management and Budget.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5613, to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction of supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016; and H.R. 5523, the "Clyde-Hirsch-Sowers RESPECT Act". H.R. 5613 and H.R. 5523 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D753)*

H.R. 3114, to provide funds to the Army Corps of Engineers to hire veterans and members of the Armed Forces to assist the Corps with curation and historic preservation activities. Signed on July 6, 2016. (Public Law 114–189)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 8, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "The ACA's Cost Sharing Reduction Program: Ramifications of the Administration's Decision on the Source of Funding for the CSR Program", 9:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled "Contracting Fairness", 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Select Committee on Benghazi, Full Committee, business meeting to consider Report of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, 9 a.m., HVC–301. This meeting will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

4 p.m., Monday, July 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 5293, Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, July 8

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of the Conference Report to Accompany S. 524—Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016. Consideration of the Motion to go to Conference and the Motion to Instruct Conferees on S. 2943—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E1057
Bost, Mike, Ill., E1056
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1061
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1055, E1061
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E1054
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1055
Ellmers, Renee L., N.C., E1055
Foster, Bill, Ill., E1060
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1063
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1053, E1056
Hurt, Robert, Va., E1054
Jolly, David W., Fla., E1053, E1054, E1054, E1056, E1057, E1059, E1060, E1060, E1062, E1063
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1056
Katko, John, N.Y., E1063, E1064
Keating, William R., Mass., E1061
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E1055
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E1054
Luján, Ben Ray, N.M., E1063
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1057
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1062
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E1054, E1057, E1060, E1060, E1062, E1064
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1058, E1059, E1060
Perry, Scott, Pa., E1053
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1058, E1062
Schweikert, David, Ariz., E1059
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1058
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1063
Takai, Mark, Hawaii, E1062
Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E1053, E1054, E1055, E1056, E1057, E1059, E1060, E1061, E1063
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1059
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E1053
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1059

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.