



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2015

No. 64

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 30, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

IT IS TIME TO STOP STALLING ON THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, a looming deadline, the highway trust fund extension expires. I actually could have dusted off the speech I gave last summer, arguing against this ill-advised measure to slide it into this spring.

As I pointed out then, we will be right back in the same spot. We will be stuck. We won't have a long-term pro-

posal. We won't have a short-term proposal. We will look at another extension.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stop the stalling. Everyone ought to make a commitment that this will be the last extension that we take before we give America what it needs, a robust 6-year reauthorization of the critical highway trust fund.

Please focus on making sure this does not slide beyond the end of this Federal fiscal year because Congress doesn't act absent some sort of deadline, and do instead what we do best: stall, study, and sidestep.

If we would actually start working now, the 5 months until the expiration of this Federal fiscal year, we can actually give the people legislation they deserve. It is not that hard; except if you never start, if you don't know how big the program is going to be, if you don't get down to business, it is difficult.

Now, I hear that the simplest approach, the most direct approach—raising the gas tax for the first time in 22 years—is somehow too hard, too difficult for Congress. It has been pronounced dead on arrival. It is off the table, according to our distinguished majority leader and the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Why exactly is it off the table? Why is this too hard for Congress? If it was good enough for Dwight Eisenhower to start the Interstate Highway System, if it was good enough for Ronald Reagan to call Congress to come back during his Thanksgiving Day speech, November 29, 1982, to more than double the gas tax, if it is good enough for 19 States—including, this year, five Republican States—to raise the gas tax, why is it too hard for us? Maybe it is because we have never given the people who care deeply about this a chance to make their case.

The Republicans have been in charge for 52 months. We have not had a single hearing on Ways and Means on trans-

portation finance. What if we allowed the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, the American Trucking Association, contractors, local governments, engineers, environmentalists, mayors to come in and make the case why they support raising the gas tax?

Maybe if Congress did its job, if it listened to the people, if it allowed the broadest coalition you have seen on Capitol Hill on any major idea to come in, take a couple days, work with Congress, explain the issues, dive into the details, actually show politicians that even the public supports it, maybe we could do our job, maybe we could have a 6-year reauthorization, maybe we could put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs all across America, making our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

Deadline, September 30—get down to work; have some hearings; do our job; produce the bill, and America will be better off.

SALUTING LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a matter that is, frankly, getting out of hand. It is more than a matter; it is a problem. This is a problem that has expanded beyond the borders of individual American cities and into the international spotlight. It is a problem that is no longer a localized issue, but a national one that is spiraling out of control.

This week, we watched in horror as Baltimore burned. We watched in disgust as lowlifes destroyed their own communities as local government helplessly stood by. We watched in anger that some could even think to justify this sort of behavior. I applaud President Obama for calling those responsible for the destruction who they really are, criminals and thugs.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2659

Mr. Speaker, everyone has the right to participate in peaceful demonstrations, and I thank and respect those in Baltimore who exercised their constitutionally granted right, but, when the actions of a few infringe on the rights of others, we have a problem. When the actions of a few violent protesters dominate the 24-hour news cycle, it takes away from the importance of the message, and it tears apart already fragile communities.

When businesses are trashed, those responsible must be brought to justice. When a national chain pharmacy is set aflame, we ask if they will ever risk doing business in that community ever again.

As a businessowner, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it would take a whole lot of convincing to get me to invest my sweat, energy, and treasure in a city that has demonstrated the type of lawlessness we have seen in recent days, and that is a tragedy. It is a tragedy because these communities so desperately need structure, stability, support, and jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is law enforcement that will help reassure businesses that they will be able to safely operate in these communities. It is law enforcement that will reduce the risk that is currently holding back job creators from setting up shop. Mr. Speaker, communities must have law and order to succeed and prosper. I applaud those in law enforcement who have worked so hard to ensure that.

In God we trust.

PUT A WOMAN ON THE TWENTY ACT

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, what would it be like if the Chamber and this government reflected the diversity of the American people? There would be a lot more portraits of women alongside all the portraits of committee chairmen of the past decades.

In 2015, it wouldn't be newsworthy when a competent, intelligent person who happens to be African American is hired for a job for which she is supremely qualified, which happened this week when Loretta Lynch was sworn in as our 83rd Attorney General. We wouldn't still be talking about unequal pay for equal work.

I believe that, if there is a country that truly believes in equality, that it is time to put our money where our mouths are, literally, and express that sense of justice on the most widely used currency in international transaction.

Last week, I introduced the Put a Woman on the Twenty Act to build on the grassroots campaign known as Women on 20s, working to bring gender equality to our currency. Their public campaign has garnered more than half a million votes in support of putting a woman on a \$20 bill. I loved the idea,

and it was brought to me by a smart, young woman on my staff, Kate Johnson. To me, this isn't just a women's issue; it is an American issue.

My bill simply directs the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to solicit recommendations from the public for a woman to be placed on the \$20 bill. Women have inspired generations of Americans for their courage by challenging this Nation to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

Women have advocated for voting rights and equal protection under the law and for programs that serve the most vulnerable members of our communities. Women led us out of slavery on the Underground Railroad, taught us what the phrase "all men are created equal" really means by fighting for women's suffrage and civil rights and have led in all sectors in society.

When I go to the bank, when I use an ATM, when I travel overseas, the \$20 bill is already widely used and in the purses and wallets of hundreds of millions of Americans. We all know that the almighty dollar speaks; but what if it had a woman's voice?

Consider for a moment the powerful message that would be sent to a young girl in Chicago if she saw a portrait celebrating Rosa Parks or Harriet Tubman when she reached into her wallet to make a purchase. What about the young man in a country far away who maybe is still hearing damaging messages about the role of women in his country?

The portrait of Wilma Mankiller or Eleanor Roosevelt on the United States bill that represents power and success to him provides a new opportunity to show our common values about equality and inclusion in faraway places.

The organization Women on 20s has put forward four exceptional female leaders for this honor: Rosa Parks, Wilma Mankiller, Harriet Tubman, and Eleanor Roosevelt. That is a great list, but there is no reason to stop there. The initiative has sparked conversations about the many great women who have contributed in significant ways to strengthening our Nation.

I have certainly benefited from the passionate advocacy of women who have fought for civil rights and equality, as have my daughters and constituents in Chicago, many of whom are debating and weighing in on the candidates for this incredible honor.

Roosevelt University in Chicago has launched a campuswide campaign to champion Eleanor Roosevelt for the honor and not just because they were named after her. As a result of the campaign, students are participating in a national dialogue about her work advocating for child labor laws to protect kids and all workers from unsafe conditions and long hours, for gender equality, and safe housing.

Now, I don't know who will be chosen. She could be one of the women suggested already or any one of many other talented, impressive women in

our country's history. My mother, who is an amazing woman, would probably get my personal vote, but she is out of the running because, thankfully, she is still alive.

I believe the time has come to have our currency represent the contributions of women throughout our history. A woman's place is in the boardroom, chairing the committee, in the laboratory, in the Oval Office, and, yes, even on our currency.

□ 1015

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is said that, when the plan for the ancient city of Alexandria was presented to the great Alexander, his master builder pointed with pride to an ingenious way to honor the city's namesake. All of the city's water supply would be channeled to one great central fountain featuring a giant statue of Alexander and then flow from it to the surrounding city.

When Alexander seemed unimpressed, his architect explained the symbolism. Water, the life's blood of the city, would flow from Alexander to Alexandria. Alexander replied, "But water is not the life's blood of a city. Commerce is the life's blood of a city." The statue of Alexander was placed, instead, at the entrance to the port.

As it is with city-states, it is with nation-states. Every nation that engages in trade prospers from it; every nation that fails to trade, fails to prosper.

Today, international trade agreements are the means by which nations establish the terms of their commerce. This often requires intricate negotiations with trading partners, and our trading partners must be confident that the United States is bargaining in good faith and that what is decided at the bargaining table will not be revoked or redefined later at a congressional table.

The Constitution gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with other nations. Congress, thus, has the final say over any trade agreement, but trading partners have to have confidence that, once the agreement has been reached, it represents the last best offer of both sides, a meeting of the minds that won't be repeatedly altered after the fact.

That is why, since the 1930s, Congress has chosen to exercise its responsibility by establishing the broad terms of the agreement that it seeks and then giving explicit instructions to our negotiators at the beginning of the process. If—and only if—these objectives are advanced in the agreement, Congress will then consider it as a whole package and either approve it or reject it.

That process is called trade promotion authority. It stood the test of time. It has been used to the great benefit of our Nation in the past and has never been controversial until now.

From the left, opposition comes from protectionist special interests. They fail to learn from the painful lessons of history. Protectionism is the fastest way to destroy an economy, as this Nation has learned repeatedly, including during the Jefferson administration and, again, in the Hoover administration.

From the right, opposition comes from a mistrust of this President's judgment and competence, a mistrust I completely and unequivocally share. It is precisely because of this mistrust that the trade promotion authority sets forth some 150 objectives that must be advanced before Congress will even consider the resulting agreement. Once those objectives are attained, a majority of the Congress must still approve it.

This measure does not empower the President to do his own thing; it binds the President to faithfully execute the will of Congress. Trade promotion authority simply continues a time-proven process through which Congress exercises its authority to regulate commerce at the beginning of negotiations so trading partners can have a reasonable expectation that their painstaking negotiations, compromises, and concessions won't be ripped asunder and reopened when Congress acts.

Indeed, the successful Base Closure and Realignment Commission process worked on exactly the same principle.

Let me repeat, this gives the President no new authority. It binds him to Congress' will at the outset of negotiations and promises only that, if the objectives set by Congress are advanced, will the Congress agree, not necessarily to approve the agreement, but simply to vote on it without opening new issues or causing unnecessary delays.

The statue at one of our greatest ports is not of a person, but of an ideal, liberty. It is freedom that produces prosperity, the free exchange of goods between people for their mutual betterment—the greater the freedom, the greater the prosperity. Trade promotion authority is the means by which this freedom is advanced among nations.

Mr. Speaker, freedom works. It is time that we put it back to work.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF NEPAL

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, along with a good many of my colleagues, are on a mission of mercy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a circumstance that has impacted the people of Nepal. A 7.8 magnitude earthquake has hit this country. It happened on April 25. More than 5,000 people have lost their

lives; 10,000 have been injured; 2.8 million people are displaced, and 8 million people have been affected. Four Americans are confirmed dead.

There is a little bit of good news. The United States of America has committed \$12.5 million in relief for the country of Nepal, but that is not enough. I believe we can do more because \$415 million will be needed for humanitarian purposes alone, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud to say that a good many organizations are pitching in. One such organization is in my district in Houston, Texas, the Nepalese Association of Houston. The chairperson and president of that association, Mr. Ghimirey, has called a meeting; and I was honored to be in attendance, along with the secretary Mr. Nepal, and about 100 or more other people.

They are doing what they can to make sure they do their share to help in this time of need, and I want you to know that we in the Congress want to make sure that we do our share to help in this time of need.

Yesterday, we heard from the Prime Minister of Japan. One of the things that he said that stuck in my mind is that America provides hope for the world. America is emblematic of hope for people who are hopeless, help for those who are helpless.

America is always there for the rest of the world. We cannot allow this situation to become anything less than what America has always been for the rest of the world.

To have the hope that they need, help has to be on the way. There has to be the help that can engender the hope that people so desperately need. To give them the hope they need, there is a bill that we have filed in the Congress of the United States of America, H.R. 2033.

This bill provides temporary protected status for the people of Nepal who happen to be in the United States of America under a legal status. If they are here legally, they will be allowed to stay for an additional 18 months. They won't be sent back to harm's way in a time of crisis.

This is what America can do. This is to provide hope. By providing help and allowing those people to stay in this country, they can continue to work. They can continue to send money home. We have found from our research that \$248 million in remittances were sent to Nepal in 2014. That is \$248 million.

We need to allow the Nepalese people to continue to work in this country and send that money back to their countrymen and women. America can do this. This is not a heavy lift. This is not immigration reform. This is something that we have done before.

We did it in 1998, under the Clinton administration, for the people of Montserrat after the volcanic eruption. We did it in 1998, under the Clinton administration, for the people of Honduras and Nicaragua after the hurri-

cane. We did it in 2001, under the Bush administration, for the people of El Salvador after two earthquakes. We did it in 2010, under the Obama administration, for the people of Haiti after a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. We can do it for the people of Nepal.

This is not a heavy lift. It does not give anyone any kind of permanent immigration status. It does not change the law as it relates to immigration. It only says we will do what we can to help people acquire the hope that they need by allowing people here to continue to work, send money back to their home country, and not put them back there in harm's way, having to live in the circumstances that might be detrimental to them.

The United States has sent in many relief teams. These relief teams are bringing with them some temporary housing, which is important; this is important, but the real hope that we can help provide would be to pass H.R. 2033, so that people who are here can continue to stay.

THOMAS FRANK JOHNSON

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of an important man of America's Greatest Generation, Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson. He faced life's challenges head on, and, throughout all of this vast change, he always saw America's promise above all else.

Dr. Johnson, a military veteran and influential economist, passed away last December at the age of 94 and was recently buried at Arlington National Cemetery. He served as a lieutenant commander in the Navy in the Pacific from 1943 to 1945 and remained in the Navy Reserve until 1980.

He was born September 27, 1920, in Lynchburg, Virginia, and was a child of the Great Depression, which affected his economic and personal outlook. His philosophy was simple—as he would tell his children—time marches on, so must we.

Dr. Johnson was extremely proud of his military service. However, as a humble man, he only displayed one picture of himself, on his patrol craft 1191 in the Pacific, escorting aircraft carriers and destroyers into battle. After the war, he remained in the Navy, traveling by train, bringing soldiers and sailors home—some to their families, some to hospitals, and some to their final resting places.

While very proud of his service, he rarely ever spoke of his time there. He simply moved on to the next phase of his life in post-World War II America. After concluding Active Duty, Dr. Johnson completed studies in economics at the University of Virginia and was a member of the Thomas Jefferson Society.

He moved to Washington, D.C., in 1949 and began his professional career

at the Department of Agriculture, specializing in the sugar beet industry, followed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In the mid-1950s, he served as the assistant commissioner of the Federal Housing Authority, in charge of research and legislation. He concluded his tenure at the Federal Housing Authority as acting commissioner. He then joined the American Enterprise Institute, where he influenced economic thought and public policy for another three decades.

For those three decades, Dr. Johnson held senior leadership roles at the American Enterprise Institute, including director of economic policy studies. In his last year, he was the acting CEO.

A man who did not seek the limelight, he had an uncanny ability to recruit and cultivate the foremost economic thinkers of our Nation. Dr. Johnson fostered the talent of at least three Nobel Prize winners in economics, including Milton Friedman, Jim Buchanan, and Gary Becker.

Dr. Johnson influenced economic policy during seven Presidential administrations. He established a lunchtime forum for informal discussions with Cabinet Secretaries, financial leaders, and ambassadors. Even President George H.W. Bush would attend the forum.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson was a humble and very forward-looking man. While engaging with many world leaders and policymakers, he was always a very private person, seldom talking about himself. He also taught economics nearly his entire professional life at the University of Virginia, George Mason University, and George Washington University.

Throughout his career, Dr. Johnson was active in professional societies such as the National Association of Business Economists, serving as chapter president in 1971; Institute for Social Science Research; Royal Economic Society; National Tax Association; American Finance Association; Southern Economic Association; and the Cosmos Club here in Washington, where he often took his children to meet important policymakers and leading economists of the Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson was also deeply engaged in his local community, serving on the Alexandria Hospital board of directors, including a term as its president. He also proudly served on the Alexandria school board and the vestry for St. Paul's Episcopal Church and Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill Episcopal Church in Alexandria.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with his wife of 63 years, Margaret Ann; three children, Thomas, William, and the Reverend Sarah Nelson; and seven grandchildren.

Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson will surely be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD an additional account of Dr. Johnson's life.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of an important man in

American life. Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson was part of the "Greatest Generation", a time now referred to as the "American Century". He, like other nonagenarians, saw so much change during his life and faced life's challenges head on. He witnessed a World War, a dozen presidents, the beginnings of commercial aviation and lunar landings, the construction and collapse of the Berlin Wall, the rise of China and India as world powers and other wonders. Throughout all of this vast change, he always saw above all else, America's promise.

We commend Dr. Johnson—an influential economist shaping this nation's public policy and a veteran—who died December 28, 2014, at 94 years of age. He served as a Lt. Commander in the Navy in the Pacific from 1943 to 1945. He remained in the Navy Reserve until 1980.

For nearly 30 years, Dr. Johnson held senior leadership roles at the American Enterprise Institute (1958–87), including director of economic policy studies and in his last year Acting CEO. A man who did not seek the limelight, he had an uncanny ability to recruit and cultivate the foremost economic thinkers. Dr. Johnson mentored numerous AEI scholars—providing the ideas and discourse—and then editing the publications of the nation's pre-eminent economists and public policy planners including Jean Kirkpatrick, Carla Hills, Irving Krystal, Herb Stein, and Murray Wiedenbaum. Dr. Johnson fostered the talent of at least three Nobel Prize winners in Economics including Milton Friedman, Jim Buchanan, and Gary Becker—well-known members of the Chicago School of Economic Thought. Because of Dr. Johnson's guidance and mentoring, other colleagues and assistants have also gone onto remarkable careers.

Dr. Johnson was known as the "Dean of AEI" and influenced economic policy during seven presidential administrations—John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard M. Nixon, Gerald R. Ford, Ronald W. Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Dr. Johnson established the AEI cafeteria, a lunchtime forum for informal discussions with cabinet secretaries, financial leaders, and ambassadors. George Herbert Walker Bush was a regular.

Dr. Johnson published numerous articles of his own in professional journals and books such as *Renewing America's Cities*. He served on the commission for urban renewal under three Virginia Governors—Linwood Holton, Miles Godwin and Bob Dalton. In 1980, Virginia enacted a law that implemented most of commission's work with a \$150 million appropriation—an enormous sum at the time—to renew Virginia's cities.

He was a humble and very forward-looking man. While engaging with many world leaders and policymakers, he was always a very private person seldom talking about himself. He mused why anyone would want to know about his past. He and his generation just didn't boast—they just faced life every day and moved into the future.

Over 94 years, Dr. Johnson achieved significant professional, community, and personal accomplishments. He was born Sept 27, 1920, in Lynchburg, Virginia, and was a child of the Great Depression which affected his economic and personnel outlook. His family had several reversals of fortune, including the loss of their tobacco farm near Farmville, Virginia. As a result, he didn't believe in debt and paid cash

for everything, including his home. His philosophy was simple. As he would tell his children, "time marches on, so must we."

Dr. Johnson was extremely proud of his military service to our nation. However, as a humble man, he only displayed one picture of himself—on his "Patrol Craft 1191" in the Pacific escorting aircraft carriers and destroyers into battle. After the war, he remained in the U.S. Navy travelling by train bringing soldiers and sailors home: some to their families; some to hospitals; and some to their final resting places. While very proud of his service, he rarely ever spoke of that time. He simply moved onto his next Phase—the post World War II America.

His generation witnessed terrible tragedies and atrocities. Because of these experiences, Dr. Johnson respected people of all origins recognizing their fate could have easily been his. He often told his children about friends and colleagues who experienced incredible war-time escapes and journeys from Eastern Europe and Asia to America. He helped many of these immigrants, refugees go onto successful lives in the United States. These harrowing experiences are why he never lost sight of America's promise.

After concluding active duty, Dr. Johnson completed studies in economics at the University of Virginia (B.A. 1943, M.A. 1947, and Ph.D. 1949) and was a member of the Thomas Jefferson Society. He also attended Lynchburg College (1939–41).

Dr. Johnson moved to Washington, D.C. in 1949 and began his professional career at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (1949–51)—specializing in the sugar industry—followed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (1951–54). In the mid-1950s, he served as Assistant Commissioner of the Federal Housing Authority (1954–58) in charge of research and legislation during the implementation of the urban renewal provisions of the National Housing Act of 1954. He concluded his tenure at the Federal Housing Authority as Acting Commissioner. This was a time of incredible American renewal in which he played such an important role in shaping. He then joined AEI where he influenced economic thought and public policy for another three decades.

Dr. Johnson taught economics nearly his entire professional life at the University of Virginia, George Mason University, and George Washington University. He also lectured at dozens of campuses throughout the country. He was responsible for bringing scholars to George Mason and helping to establish its economics and law schools.

Throughout his career, Dr. Johnson was active in professional societies such as the National Association of Business Economists, serving as chapter president in 1971, Institute for Social Science Research, Royal Economic Society (U.K.), National Tax Association, American Finance Association and the Cosmos Club in Washington, D.C., where he often took his children to meet important policymakers and leading economists.

Dr. Johnson was also deeply engaged in the local community serving on the Alexandria Hospital Board of Directors from 1965 to 1971, including a term as its president (1970–1971). As a patient, he never mentioned his leadership on the hospital board—even when getting a new pacemaker on his 90 birthday! He also proudly served on the Alexandria School Board (1974–1976) and the vestry for St.

Paul's Episcopal Church and Emmanuel Church on the Hill Episcopal Church in Alexandria.

As we remember Dr. Johnson, with his family present today in the Well of the House Chamber, it was this humble member of the Greatest Generation and his contributions that made the American Century possible. He is survived by his wife of 63 years Margaret Ann (Emhardt); three children Thomas Emhardt (Julianne Mueller), William Harrison (Tracy Schario), and the Rev. Sarah Nelson; and seven grandchildren—Gaelen, Caleb, Eliza, Keegan, and Maren Nelson and Natalie and Garrett Johnson.

We owe Dr. Johnson and his peers deep gratitude for their achievements and their courage—facing down incredible challenges. We live in the greatest country in the world because of men like Dr. Johnson—ones that always believed in America's promise for the future.

ECONOMIC CLIMATE IN BLACK AMERICA

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus will present eight or nine speakers on the Democratic side in just a few minutes. I am the first of many who will be speaking.

We come to the floor today to express our deepest sympathy and support to the family of Freddie Gray and to the citizens of Baltimore, Maryland.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, the events in Baltimore are not just about police misconduct. It is about pervasive poverty. It is about unemployment, lack of opportunity, hopelessness, and despair.

Since the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson nearly 9 months ago, more than 25 bills have been introduced by members of the CBC that address the need for law enforcement accountability. Today, I call on my House and Senate colleagues to put aside partisanship and take up some or all of these bills. This issue has an impact on all of us.

We must address economic disparities that face Black communities all across the Nation. Baltimore, Mr. Speaker, is not unique.

The economic climate in Black America and the divide that has persisted for generations is due largely to our country's history of disparate treatment of African Americans and lack of opportunity.

While much of the country has experienced an economic recovery over the last 6 years, it has not reached the African American community.

Recently, the CBC and the Joint Economic Committee released a report on the economic challenges facing African Americans. African Americans are struggling and continue to face high rates of persistent poverty, unemployment, long-term unemployment, as

well as significantly lower incomes and slower wealth accumulation.

More than 400 counties in the United States suffer poverty rates greater than 20 percent. These rates have persisted now for more than 30 years. The median income of African American households is \$34,000, \$24,000 less than the median income of households. The median net worth of White households is 13 times the level for Black households. Black Americans are almost three times more likely to live in poverty.

At 10.1 percent, the current unemployment rate for Black Americans is double the rate for White Americans. Black Americans currently face an unemployment rate higher than the national unemployment rate reached during the recession.

African Americans are less likely to obtain education beyond high school than White students. They are less likely to earn a college degree. Even among college graduates, Blacks face worse job prospects than Whites. The unemployment rate for Black workers with at least a bachelor's degree is 5.2 percent, compared to 2.9 percent for White workers.

Forty-four percent of Black Americans own a home, compared to 74 percent of Whites.

In my home State of North Carolina, the unemployment rate for African Americans is 9.9 percent, based on an unemployment rate of 3.2 percent for Whites. The poverty rate for African Americans is 27.5 percent, while for Whites it is 12.6.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, in the District of Columbia, the median household income for African Americans is \$38,300 for Blacks and \$115,900 for Whites, a gap of \$77,000. The D.C. poverty rate is 27.4 percent for African Americans, compared to 7.6 percent for Whites.

Colleagues, these statistics tell the story. These numbers are staggering, troubling, and problematic. It is time for a renewed focus on Blacks in America and a need for real solutions on issues that have persistently plagued our communities.

I will end, Mr. Speaker, by quoting some excerpts from President Johnson's 1964 State of the Union Speech. And he said: "Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope—some because of their poverty, and some because of their color, all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity."

"This administration today," he said, "here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America. I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort," he said.

"It will not be a short or easy struggle, no single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won."

President Johnson said: "The richest Nation on Earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it. One thou-

sand dollars invested in salvaging an unemployable youth today can return \$40,000 or more in his lifetime."

President Johnson said: "Poverty is a national problem, requiring improved national organization and support. But this attack, to be effective, must also be organized at the State and local level and must be supported and directed by State and local efforts."

He said: "For the war against poverty will not be won here in Washington. It must be won in the field, in every private home, in every public office, from the courthouse to the White House."

"The program I shall propose," he said, "will emphasize this cooperative approach to help that one-fifth of all American families with incomes too small to even meet their basic needs."

President Lyndon Baines Johnson, January 8, 1964, from this Chamber.

IT IS SILLY SEASON IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is silly season again in Washington. It is that time of year when we have our annual budget debates and when we realize that only in Washington can an increase actually be considered a decrease.

Later today, we will vote on a bill to fund the Department of Veterans Affairs. That bill increases the Department's funding in real dollars from last year by 5.6 percent, and yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim it is a decrease, when, in fact, it is the highest level of VA funding ever provided to the Department.

But even worse, we have a Secretary of Veterans Affairs who is peddling this same intellectually dishonest line as well, the Secretary of a department in which negligence in the past year contributed to the deaths of veterans. Those are the words confirmed by the Office of the Inspector General.

And yet, despite the failure of the Department, the Secretary, earlier this week, had the audacity to go behind closed doors with members of only one party and claim that somehow the 6 percent increase being provided by our committee will, in fact, further the VA's failures of the past.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary has exhibited a level of audacity only seen in Washington. If we are honest, it is an audacity that reflects a style of leadership likely to fail—fail the VA, but most importantly, it is going to fail veterans across the United States because, you see, here is the real story.

We still have hundreds of thousands of veterans waiting for health care and for benefits. We know there is malfeasance in VA construction, and we know the VA continues to declare veterans and dependents dead when they are, in fact, alive. But here is the most important and the most offensive part of the

Secretary's messaging: in the midst of all this, this body has actually continued to trust the Secretary.

You see, when the VA Secretary came before our subcommittee, I asked him, point blank: What will it take to clear the veterans' benefits backlog? And he said: Resources. We need over 700 more employees. We need an increase in resources.

Now, I question that. I will be honest. I think there is a culture that has changed. I think we need infrastructure and IT that has to change. But he said resources, and so we trusted him. Our bill provides full funding for his request to clear the backlog, and yet he continues to say that our side of the aisle somehow, in providing the request that he made of our subcommittee, is going to fail his administration.

It is a despicable display of partisanship at the helm of a department that has no place for partisanship. And so a department that last year was defined not by its successes but by its failures is now needlessly defined by its politics.

And you know the one thing the Secretary did not ask for? Additional funding for the Office of the Inspector General, the office that uncovered the negligence, that reported to Congress on the negligence. Zero increase in funding was requested. So our subcommittee stepped in and we provided an additional \$5 million for that office.

Now, very importantly, we have to acknowledge that this gamesmanship, this leadership failure, should not reflect on the men and women who serve our veterans on the front lines every day. We have great men and women who serve in the VHA and the VBA. I have had the opportunity to visit with them.

Just last week, at our local VA hospital, an elderly veteran was brought to tears telling me how much he appreciated the loving care he was receiving from the employees of the hospital. We must acknowledge their service, their contribution, every day, just as we acknowledge the failure of leadership in Washington, D.C.

So you see, this week's dysfunction, this week's intellectually creative dishonesty, this week's audacity is just Washington "small ball" peddled by this administration, but with real consequences that undermine the confidence of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, only in Washington is a 5.6 percent increase actually a decrease. It is appropriations season. It is, indeed, silly season again in Washington, D.C.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend and chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, in offering condolences

to the parents and family members of Freddie Gray.

I also want to say to Ms. Toya Graham that I feel and can appreciate her anguish and the pain that she showed the world a few days ago.

I want to say to her son, Michael, that I have also felt his pain and anguish, having been on the receiving end of such discipline from my mother. But I want to say to him that he can rest assured that the love of his mother, her passion for his future, will pay great dividends if he continues to show the deference to her love and affection and her concern that he showed when he was the object of her frustrations.

Mr. Speaker, responding to the situation in Baltimore several days ago, President Obama said: "We can't just leave this to the police. I think there are police departments that have to do some soul-searching. I think there are some communities that have to do some soul-searching."

But, he went on to say: "I think, we, as a country, have to do some soul-searching."

I want to join President Obama in calling for the country to do some soul-searching.

Let's take a look at just a few of the institutions of learning in the Baltimore community.

I would like to call attention to one school, Frederick Douglass High School, a school that lists among its graduates the likes of Cab Calloway, Thurgood Marshall, a school that I understand that the father of the current mayor of Baltimore also attended.

I understand there are 789 students at Frederick Douglass High School today. Eighty-three percent of them are listed in U.S. News & World Report's index as economically disadvantaged, and only 53 percent of them are listed as proficient in English, only 44 percent proficient in algebra.

I understand that Carver Vocational Technical High is 100 percent minority, with 79 percent of the students economically disadvantaged.

Coppin Academy, 100 percent minority, with 77 percent economically disadvantaged.

Now, as we listen to all of the pundits, editorial writers reflect on what is taking place or has taken place in Baltimore, I would like to call attention to the lack of soul-searching that is taking place here in this body as we represent the people of America. We have just seen the conference report, or the budget, being proposed by the House Republicans. That conference agreement guts strategic investments in education, workforce training, public health, scientific research, advanced manufacturing, and public safety. It does nothing to help those Americans who are looking for jobs. It does nothing to boost paychecks of working Americans. It disinvests in America.

□ 1045

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF FALL OF SAIGON

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the last century, a godless totalitarian ideology moved from theory to practice when Communists took over Russia and a global war against freedom began. In the following decades, this ideology slaughtered millions across what was the Soviet Union.

In the 1940s, Communists rolled through mainland China, bringing another reign of terror that killed millions more and that still today limits freedom for the Chinese people.

Also in the 1940s, Communists moved into Vietnam. Those living in northern Vietnam were its first victims. Like other lands under communism's iron grip, Hanoi's rulers killed hundreds of thousands of their citizens. Those who desired and had the means fled to the south.

Throughout the 20th century, America fought against totalitarian ideologies that stripped people of human rights and dignity.

After defeating fascists in World War II, we recognized communism as the single greatest threat to freedom. Indeed, well into the cold war, President Kennedy proclaimed to the world that we would "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

The cold war at times flared hot, and in Southeast Asia, more than 58,000 Americans gave the last full measure of their devotion fighting for the freedoms for which their nation stands.

Today we mark the 40th anniversary of the tragic fall of Saigon. In doing so, we remember the sacrifices made by our Vietnam veterans and their families, sacrifices that continue to today, such as when a Gold Star mother or wife looks at the photograph of a son or husband who never came home, or when a veteran makes a trip to the local VA for chemotherapy for a cancer caused by Agent Orange, or when a congressional colleague notices he does not have full use of a limb because of the torture he endured as a POW, or when the 65-year-old veteran has the same repeated nightmares, or when a 40-something son or daughter envisions the father he or she never got to know. The sacrifices are noble but painful.

The cause they fought for lives on and will continue so long as humanity dreams of freedom, dreams like those of the thousands of boat people who risked their lives to escape Vietnam, including the 65 boat people President Reagan spoke of in 1982 who had the good fortune of being spotted by the aircraft carrier USS *Midway*. When they were picked up, they cried "Hello, American sailor. Hello, freedom man."

Since the last helicopter left the U.S. Embassy roof in Saigon 40 years ago, Vietnam has been under Communist control. And with Communist control has come a shameful human rights record. What was a hot spot in the cold war is now a cold spot for people aspiring to walk, to borrow a phrase from Hubert Humphrey, in "the warm sunshine of human rights."

Vietnam's postwar history began with a purge that resulted in the deaths of thousands. Hundreds of thousands of refugees escaped. Many died in the process, but many survived. Some made it to America, where they pursued the American Dream. They have undertaken diverse endeavors, from running small shops in Orange County, California, to fishing operations in Louisiana, to practicing medicine in places like Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

For those who are still living under the Communist regime, they must be ever-fearful of a government all too willing to crush freedom. Political freedom. Religious freedom. Freedom of the press. Freedom in family life.

In Vietnam, Catholics, Buddhists, Falun Gong, and other religious minorities have been harassed, imprisoned, and persecuted for their faith. In Vietnam, hundreds of political prisoners are held in jail or under house arrest. The Vietnamese Government continues to restrain the press, and they have engaged in coercive population control practices.

Never forget: our servicemembers fought, and many died, to prevent the tragedies Communist rule would impose upon the Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian people, the latter of whom suffered an outright genocide that killed millions.

We are grateful that our servicemembers were able to save thousands of Vietnamese.

To the Vietnam veterans who undertook Operation Frequent Wind 40 years ago this weekend in the chaotic days before Saigon fell, be proud you rescued 7,000 Americans and South Vietnamese. God alone knows the ripples in history that their having escaped will cause.

As we look to the future, let us have a final accounting for all our MIAs. Let us insist that if Vietnam desires to integrate further with the community of nations, then it must allow much greater freedom for its people. And let us hope that the people of Vietnam will not have to endure another four decades of repression and that one day, perhaps this decade, the freedom for which our servicemembers died will finally take root by the South China Sea.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, Congressman BARBARA LEE, for her courtesy.

I join today in standing with my chair, Congressman BUTTERFIELD of the Congressional Black Caucus. I, as well, am overwhelmed with the pain that we have seen not only in Baltimore, which we have seen most recently, but in cities like Ferguson, in North Charleston, in New York, where we have seen the convergence of poverty and the need for criminal justice reform converge.

I too want to offer my sympathy to the family of Freddie Gray. We have watched them over the past couple of days. In the midst of their mourning to be able to stand up and call for peace, nonviolence, nonviolent protests, they should be honored.

And to those in Baltimore, and particularly my colleague from Maryland—I will call him Congressman CUMMINGS with the bullhorn politics, the bullhorn leadership—he should be commended for the stunning and outstanding engagement, that he touched the hearts and minds of his constituents, walked those streets, to be able to acknowledge the pain, the poverty, but that there is a better way, that there is a way toward the stars that we all want our children to have.

And, yes, to Ms. Graham, who wanted better for her son Michael. I want him not to be embarrassed but to be proud that he had a mother with such deep love that she wanted to take him away from doing it wrongly—not against protests, not against the quiet marching of the spirit of Dr. King, but to know that engaging in violence is intolerable and will not allow him to reach the very high heights that he can reach.

Today I stand here to acknowledge the convergence of the need for criminal justice reform and the deep and abiding poverty in the African American community. One in every six Americans is living in poverty, totaling 46.2 million people. This is the highest number in 17 years. Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. It falls heavily on the African American community.

In my district, there are 190,000-plus living in poverty. It falls heavily on the African American community.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a standing invitation for the door to open and say, let's blame President Obama. President Obama has been a stellar leader on the questions of realizing the investment in people. From the stimulus that brought us out of the depths of collapse of the markets and a complete imploding of the capitalistic system, he provided the stimulus that moved us toward an economy where we were creating jobs.

But here we have in Congress this dastardly sequester that is cutting Head Start seats, not investing in infrastructure, not creating jobs or providing opportunities for our young people.

So today I say that there needs to be a call for action. That call for action is that this Congress must get rid of se-

quester and must look at the Baltimores and must look at the Fergusons and Houstons and L.A.s and New Yorks and cities across America and realize that we are coming upon a summertime. And if we don't act to invest in our children and to begin to give an agenda to release ourselves from poverty, we will have doomed ourselves.

And I would offer to say that the inertia of moving toward criminal justice reform in this Congress is unacceptable.

I call upon Members to come together collectively to be able to pass legislation, the Cadet bill that I have introduced, the Build TRUST bill. But, more importantly, I am calling upon our government to invest in our youth, to get rid of the poverty, to prepare them as they go into higher education, as they go into upper grades. We must have a program of summer jobs this summer, and we must have a collaborative effort with corporate America.

Wake up, corporate America. Wake up, corporate Baltimore. Wake up, corporate New York. Wake up, corporate Houston. There must be an investment in summer jobs, collaborating with the Federal Government to make a difference to lift families out of poverty. We do know that summer jobs with young people elevate families' ability to pay their bills and to provide resources for their families.

So if the story of Baltimore is any, it is one, don't jump to conclusions. Don't jump to conclusions that Freddie Gray tried to hurt himself. Don't jump to conclusions that these young people don't mean well. Don't jump to conclusions that they shouldn't have done what they have done. Jump to the conclusions that these are young people who are hungry and looking for leadership and are in pain, as Congressman CUMMINGS said.

Look for the opportunity for them. Help rebuild Baltimore. Help give them jobs. Help tell them that the improved relationships between police and community are going to be moved forward as a number one agenda for the United States Congress and this government that they call the United States of America.

Let us have a call to action—not of condemnation, but of action.

I want to thank the young people who nonviolently marched all over America, indicating Black lives matter and all lives matter. The Congressional Black Caucus stands to stamp out poverty, and we stand, Mr. Speaker, to bring opportunities to young people.

HONORING SANDERS-BROWN CENTER ON AGING

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Kentucky's Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, which was established in 1979 and is one of the original 10 National

Institutes of Health-funded Alzheimer's disease research centers.

The University of Kentucky Alzheimer's Disease Center, ably led by Director Dr. Linda Van Eldik and her outstanding team of scientists and investigators, supports and facilitates research with a long-term goal of enabling more effective translation of complex scientific discoveries to intervention strategies that improve the lives of patients.

The Sanders-Brown scientists are focused on understanding the mechanisms involved in development and progression of age-related neurodegenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and stroke, and are seeking new knowledge breakthroughs to combat these diseases of the elderly.

This center also promotes education and outreach, provides clinical and neuropathological diagnoses and care of patients with cognitive impairment, and runs an active clinical trials program to test potential new therapies. These activities are critical because, with the aging of the population worldwide and in this country, age-related cognitive disorders, such as Alzheimer's disease, are reaching epidemic proportions, requiring a desperate need to identify strategies for effective therapeutic intervention.

According to a recent report, an estimated 5.3 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease, and that is in 2015 alone. This includes an estimated 5.1 million people age 65 and older and approximately 200,000 individuals under the age of 65 who have younger-onset Alzheimer's disease. Barring the development of medical breakthroughs, the number will rise to 13.8 million by the year 2050.

Almost half a million people age 65 or older will develop Alzheimer's in the United States this year alone. To put that into perspective, every 67 seconds, someone in the United States develops Alzheimer's. By midcentury, an American will develop the disease every 33 seconds.

Alzheimer's disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States and fifth leading cause of death for those age 65 or older. There is an enormous cost and financial impact of this disease.

Alzheimer's is, in fact, the costliest disease to society. Total 2015 payments for caring for those with Alzheimer's and other dementias are estimated at \$226 billion. Total payments for health care, long-term care, and hospice for people with Alzheimer's and other dementias are projected to increase to more than \$1 trillion in 2050.

So when we talk about reforming Medicare, when we talk about doing the things we need to do to save Medicare and keep our promises to our seniors, we have to recognize the critical importance and the return on investment that that investment in the National Institutes of Health can have.

I say, in the debates about Medicare reform—and these are important de-

bates—let's pay attention to investment in the National Institutes of Health and particularly the underinvestment in the research that goes on in places like the Sanders-Brown Center on Aging.

□ 1100

This can have an enormous impact on our ability to keep Medicare solvent and also improve the lives of so many Americans. So I call on all of my colleagues here to join me in thanking everyone at the University of Kentucky Sanders-Brown Center on Aging for their contributions to continue the fight against Alzheimer's and other diseases of the elderly.

IMPACTS OF PERSISTENT POVERTY IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise first to send my thoughts and prayers to the family of Freddie Gray and the entire city of Baltimore. Today, another family is grieving another young life needlessly cut short; and, again, a community is searching for answers in the face of tragedy and injustice.

My own community knows this all too well. On New Year's Day 2009, Oscar Grant, a bright young man, was murdered on the Fruitvale Bay Area Rapid Transit platform in Oakland. Our community took to the streets demanding justice.

Freddie Gray, Oscar Grant, Mike Brown, Tamir Rice, and Trayvon Martin and the list goes on, all lives cut short. Today, their stories compel us to come to the House floor to join millions of Americans around our Nation in saying that, like all lives, Black lives also do matter.

Make no mistake, the issues rocking many communities are not a new phenomenon. These tragedies, yes, are a part of a dark legacy of injustice born in the sufferings of the Middle Passage, nurtured through slavery, and codified in Jim Crow.

On April 14, 1967, at Stanford University, Dr. King described these issues in his "Two Americas" speech. He said, "There are literally two Americas. One America is overflowing with the milk of prosperity and honey of opportunity. Tragically and unfortunately, there is another America. This other America has a daily ugliness about it that constantly transforms the ebullience of hope into the fatigue of despair."

The ugly fact is that two Americas still exist nearly five decades later. An African American male is killed by a security officer, police officer, or a self-proclaimed vigilante every 28 hours in the United States. One in three Black men will be arrested in their lifetime, a reason why men from communities of color, unfortunately, make up more than 70 percent of the United States prison population.

Sadly, our laws have made having a criminal justice record a lifetime barrier to the "honey of opportunity" Dr. King described. A formerly incarcerated individual who has paid his or her dues to society and is out of jail is still denied access to Pell grants, closing off the opportunity for higher education and a better job. Ten States enforce lifetime bans on receiving food assistance, SNAP benefits, for drug-related felonies—only drug-related felonies.

Mr. Speaker, these limitations are components of a system that continues to punish someone for life for having made a mistake. This system maintains cyclical and systemic barriers that keep generations of African Americans from building pathways out of poverty.

Recently, the Joint Economic Committee, under the leadership of Ranking Member CAROLYN B. MALONEY, released a report with the Congressional Black Caucus on the economic state of Black America, which Congressman BUTTERFIELD laid out the bleak finding. I hope Members recognize this is a wake-up call.

Children in African American households are nearly twice as likely to be raised in the bottom 20 percent of income distribution as children in White households; and, while African American students represent 18 percent of the overall preschool enrollment, they account for 42 percent of preschool student expulsion—these are kids ages 2 to 5 years old—expulsions. These children don't even get a start, let alone a head start.

The link between the economic inequality and our broken criminal justice system and education is crystal clear, and Congress must do more to break down these systemic barriers.

Our friend and our colleague, our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, said in his inaugural speech when he was sworn in, "America is not working for many African Americans, and we, as the Congressional Black Caucus, have an obligation to fight harder and smarter to help repair the damage."

Mr. Speaker, we must come together as never before to address the systemic, structural, and rampant racial bias endemic in our institutions and criminal justice system.

We have introduced the Half in Ten Act, H.R. 258, to create a national strategy to cut poverty in half in 10 years. By coordinating and empowering all Federal agencies, we can lift 22 million Americans out of poverty and into the middle class, but that is only one step. We must bring serious structural reforms to our broken criminal justice system.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act, H.R. 1232, because war weapons don't belong on Main Street. We also need to pass the Police Accountability Act, H.R. 1102, and the Grand Jury Reform Act, H.R. 429, to ensure accountability and that deadly force cases are actually heard by a judge.

We also need to stop the racial profiling that disproportionately affects African Americans. We need to pass the End Racial Profiling Act, H.R. 1933, because racial profiling has no place in a 21st century police force.

It is also time to pass “ban the box” for Federal contractors and agencies. I am proud to be working with our colleagues on the Senate side, Senators BOOKER and BROWN, to do just that.

We can't stop with the criminal justice system. We have got to create job training, workforce training, and economic opportunities for people of color in marginalized communities who have been, unfortunately, impacted by generations of endemic barriers rooted in discrimination.

BEWARE THE ARROGANCE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you about a brave lady named Ellie, whom I met a few years ago in Kansas. This is her story.

One Tuesday morning, back in 1973, she opened up her local newspaper to read about a U.S. Supreme Court decision that shocked her, outraged her, and saddened her. She questioned how a small group of unelected judges could reach such a tragic and illegitimate decision in the name of constitutional rights.

That case was the fateful Roe v. Wade decision that mandated abortion on demand throughout all 50 States for all 9 months of pregnancy. In response to the Court's ruling, Ellie rushed out to the nearest abortion clinic.

Expecting other outraged Kansans to already be there, Ellie found herself alone. No one else was there. It seemed that the Supreme Court, in far-off Washington, had imposed its radical decision on Ellie and an entire Nation without anyone noticing, few caring, and no one responding about the lives of the unborn.

As history does report, that seemingly deafening silence didn't stay that way. Soon, Ellie was joined by others, many others. Contrary to the expectations of the elite lawyers on the Supreme Court, their decision did not short-circuit or end the debate over abortion; rather, over the following years, it ignited the debate.

While the Court still stubbornly clings to the ruling, science has exposed its folly. Legal scholars recognize its defects. Most importantly, public opinion, from the young to the old, has passed them by. Today, an overwhelming majority of Americans oppose an overwhelming percentage of all abortions.

Today, the Supreme Court may be tempted to repeat that same mistake. They may be emboldened to impose again a so-called 50-State solution on the entire Nation. By radically attempting to redefine marriage for Ellie

and the entire country by invalidating centuries of marriage laws and by silencing the more than 50 million Americans—that is 50 million Americans—who have voted to protect marriage as between one man and one woman, this court would, once again, be repeating their arrogant mistake of misreading both the American public and our American Constitution.

Unlike 1973, I believe that Americans are already beginning to engage on this issue. This time, Ellie will not be alone. If this Supreme Court attempts to shred again another foundational aspect of our society, there will be a strong, quick, and ferocious response, for a small group of lawyers should not impose their redefinition of marriage on every single American State, every single American citizen, every single American family, and every single American church and synagogue.

Therefore, I implore this Court to learn from the Roe v. Wade mistake, do its job, read and obey the Constitution, and correctly affirm that Ellie and the citizens of every one of our united States are free to affirm or restore marriage as the union of one man and one woman.

TO BE POOR IN AMERICA

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity. I feel so proud to be an American and be in this great country where so many Members of Congress have come from families and communities that have been poor, without the dreams or hopes that they would ever be in a position to serve this great country in the most august legislative body in the world.

I know I have been through more riots than anyone else, coming from Harlem and being older than most Members; yet, throughout the world, I am so proud that people respect our country because of the opportunities we have here.

Therefore, to all Americans, it has to be painful and embarrassing to see on international news or to have our international friends think that we are a country that allow young, Black men to be shot down, murdered, and killed and that this is supposed to represent America.

It doesn't really, in my mind, represent our country; it represents poverty, but it is so hard for people to believe that the richest country in the world could have this cancer of poverty that eats away from so many things that we could be doing.

There were so many dreams and hopes when President Obama came in and recognized how much you can accomplish if you have access to education. I was among those who recognized that a bum from Lenox Avenue in Harlem, being given an opportunity with the GI Bill, can go to New York University, go to law school, become a

Federal prosecutor, and come here in Congress.

I knew, Mr. Speaker, the President understood the power of being exposed to education and what it has done to make America all that she is today, but I had no idea of the problems he would face as our President, the depth of people who wanted to prevent him from making a contribution to our country, the partisanship that exists today, and the pain that I feel now when you talk about education, whether or not you support traditional public schools or charter schools, when the greatest thing that we can do and the obligation we have as Members of Congress is to invest in the education of our young people for the future of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, poverty is more than lack of self-esteem. Poverty means that there is a degree in the connection between poverty and hopelessness, poverty and joblessness, poverty in not being able to send your kids to school, poverty in not even knowing how to take care of yourself in terms of health. Poverty can cause people not to be able to make the contributions that they can make to the country.

The disparity between the wealthy people that we have in this country and those who work hard every day and don't have enough money for disposable income, poverty and near poverty reduces the ability of the middle class to have disposable income, to be able to purchase, to support jobs through small businesses.

Poverty is so costly, Mr. Speaker, not only in the prestige, the power, and the expectation of our great country; but how much do we pay to put poor folks in jail? How much, really, do we pay to subsidize earned income tax credits, low-income housing credits, children tax credits, subsidies, not because these things don't pay off, but subsidies because we don't have programs for them? We have to do everything we can. These are costly; but who can deny the return on these types of investments?

The trillions of dollars that we have invested in our defense has little or no return, but the investment that we can have in people and the talent of our minds can make this country all that she can be.

Let's increase education and decrease poverty.

□ 1115

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, which I chair, conducted a hearing to review the National Forest System and active forest management.

The health of our national forests is an issue of vital importance for rural America. Not only are national forests a source of immense natural beauty, but they provide us with natural resources, healthy watersheds, recreational opportunities, and wildlife habitat.

Perhaps more importantly, they serve as economic engines for the surrounding local communities. Our national forests are capable of providing and sustaining these economic benefits, but they need proper management in order to do so.

The U.S. Forest Service manages more than 193 million acres of land across 41 States. Within those 41 States are over 700 counties containing national forestland. These counties and communities within them rely on us to be good stewards of these Federal lands, and there is a direct correlation between forest health and vibrant rural communities.

The people living in these rural areas depend on well-managed national forests to foster jobs and economic opportunities. These jobs come from diverse sources, such as timbering, energy production, or recreation. However, if those jobs disappear, so do jobs that support those industries. It is a snowball effect from there, threatening school systems and infrastructure in these rural communities.

As a result, effective management and Forest Service decisions have significant consequences on our constituents who live in and around national forests. Healthier, well-managed national forests are more sustainable for generations to come due to the continual risks of catastrophic fires and invasive species outbreaks. Especially with the decline in timber harvesting and the revenue to counties from timber receipts over the past two decades, rural economies will benefit immensely from increased timber harvest.

We can continue supporting a diverse population of wildlife through active land management practices, such as prescribed burns. Our national forests are not museums. They were never intended to sit idly. I say it frequently, but national forests are not national parks.

When Congress created the National Forest System more than 100 years ago, it was designed so that surrounding communities would benefit from multiple uses. Our national forests are meant to provide timber, oil, natural gas, wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and clean drinking water, not just for the rural communities, but these tend to be the headwaters of the waters that provide water for our cities as well.

During yesterday's hearing, members of the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee called upon Forest Service Chief Thomas Tidwell to use the tools that Congress made available in the 2014 farm bill in order to strengthen rural economies and improve the health of our national forests. One certainly complements the other.

POLICY FAILURES OF CONGRESS

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about the policy failures of this body.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at Baltimore, let me tell you why it is not a shock to me. It is because when you disinvest in education, when you provide no places for kids to play and no summer jobs, Baltimore happens. When you refuse to provide resources for job training for decent housing and you have a lack of resources to the communities of highest need, Baltimore happens.

The budget we are working on this week continues to prove that the majority of people in this House care little about the plight of the poor and underserved communities. There is a lack of concern for education.

I sit on the Education Committee as we are talking about reauthorizing ESEA, and the majority passed out of committee the ability to block grant all title I funding. So now children who are poor, disabled, or minority will be at the mercy of their State to determine what kind of education they get. Ohio has one way to do it; Indiana has another way to do it. It all depends on what your ZIP Code is anymore as to what your educational attainment may be. They, further, have reduced Federal funding for education every year of their plan.

I work in a body where the majority wants to block grant Medicaid. So State by State they will determine who qualifies, who is sick enough to qualify. I work in a body where there is no value placed on our greatest asset, which is our people. These are the people who want to reduce block grants and community funding and community policing.

Our communities are crying out every day for our attention. Did what happened in Baltimore get our attention? It should have, and it did. Was it right? No. Violence is never right. But we have to hear the cries of the people in need.

So today, I want to say to the Gray family and all of the people who are in the streets in Baltimore: I apologize. I apologize for a body that has failed you. I apologize for people who only give lip service to the poor. I apologize because we could do better to make your lives better.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility as the leaders of this Nation to take care of the people who need us the most.

Miss Gray, I apologize.

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Michael Siegel, Anshe Emet Synagogue, Chicago, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, instill within the Members of the House of Representatives the deep understanding of the potential that this day holds as they work together for the common good of all people in this great land.

Open their hearts to respond meaningfully to the voices of those who hunger for justice, hunger for equality, and hunger for opportunity.

Give them the strength and wisdom to ensure the security of this great Nation and her friends around the world.

On this day that George Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the United States in 1789, we ask You, God, to bless each and every Member of this august body with the same courage that he exhibited in his time, in order to fulfill the vision and purpose of this great land for us and all who will follow in the future.

Let us pray that together this body, together, will do their part to create a world worthy of God's presence and God's blessing.

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.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. HAHN 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.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

(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, April is Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, and I rise to support the goals and ideals we have been promoting these past 30 days.

More than 200,000 people in the United States are sexually assaulted each year. One in five women will be sexually assaulted during her college years.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. Our work is not done until the number of sexual assaults is zero. Sexual assault is an affront to our basic humanity. It threatens our individual liberty, family values, and basic human rights. Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our children to live up to those values.

We must reject the passive, quiet acceptance of sexual assault that has pervaded our society for far too long. We must refuse to accept that which is unquestionably unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, although April is coming to an end, we must remain committed to raising awareness, empowering survivors, and preventing more people from experiencing these heinous acts.

WELCOMING RABBI MICHAEL SIEGEL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend Rabbi Michael Siegel of Chicago, Illinois, for his service today as guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

As the rabbi of the congregation closest to Wrigley Field, for 30 years, Rabbi Siegel's prayers for the Cubs have gone unanswered; however, Michael, again, assures me this is the year.

More seriously, throughout his 40-year career, Rabbi Siegel has been a dedicated leader in the Jewish community, serving both locally and nationally.

Since 1873, Anshe Emet has been a center for Jewish study, cultural activity, and Israel advocacy. Under Rabbi Siegel's leadership, the synagogue has grown and truly fulfilled its commitment to the entire community of Israel—*klal yisrael*—and healing the word—*tikkun olam*. I am grateful for my punctuation and pronunciation keys. I am also grateful that my constituents can be part of a such an inspiring community—*kehila*.

Please join me in thanking Rabbi Siegel for leading us in prayer today as

guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to kick off May as National Mental Health Awareness Month.

I stand here to bring attention to the dire need to improve the awareness and dialogue surrounding mental health. Far too long, we as a Nation have neglected mental health. It is one of our most critical health problems today.

Mental illness occurs more frequently, affects more people, requires more prolonged treatment, and causes more suffering to individuals and families than most people could ever realize.

I have personally witnessed and experienced the physical and emotional burden mental illness has on the individual and the family. A close family member of mine took their life at a very young age.

Despite having major hospitals and universities in the Syracuse area, there simply are not enough mental health resources to help, especially in the pediatric realm. People in the central New York area often have to travel hours to receive inpatient care, disrupting lives, jobs, and families. Once released, the followup care is lacking, and oftentimes, the patients immediately regress.

Unfortunately, the lack of resources—in the case of central New York—is not an uncommon issue. As I acknowledge May as Mental Health Awareness Month, this Friday, May 1, I will launch a mental health task force based in New York's 24th District. The task force will be comprised of mental health leaders in the field, including hospitals and employees.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the tens of thousands of students who have been left in the lurch after their for-profit school, Corinthian Colleges, abruptly closed this week.

The closure came as a surprise. It was the middle of their semester. Many of these students are now buried in student loan debt and do not know how or if they can continue their education.

I have urged the Department of Education to make it very clear to these students that they have the option to have their loans forgiven. However, the Department of Education has been encouraging students to transfer to other troubled for-profit schools, rather than have their loans discharged.

Many of the for-profit schools on the Department's list of so-called viable

transfer opportunities are currently under State or Federal investigation. This is shocking and unacceptable.

I call on the Department to remove immediately any school currently under investigation or on heightened cash management from its list of recommended options.

Our students deserve better. Let's give them the guidance that they can trust.

NATIONAL YOUTH ORCHESTRA

(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, each summer, Carnegie Hall's Weill Music Institute brings together some of the brightest young musicians from around the country to form the National Youth Orchestra USA.

The members of the orchestra spend the first 2 weeks in residency at Purchase College, taking master classes from the best. They have the chance to perform at the world famous Carnegie Hall, where their performance is heard live around the world; then they go on tour.

This summer, the orchestra will make a historic visit to China. It is an incredible experience, and I am extremely proud that, among the 114 amazing young people, two are from the district I am privileged to represent, Ms. Jasmine Lavariega, a horn player from Astoria; and Laura Michael, an oboist from Manhattan.

Congratulations to them both. Please let your parents know they were right; all that practice, practice, practice paid off. It was worth it. You are performing at Carnegie Hall and in China.

Congratulations.

F/A-18 SUPER HORNET

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to thank my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee—in particular, Chairman MAC THORBERRY and Ranking Member ADAM SMITH—for all the hard work they have put into crafting our country's national priorities for the upcoming year, way into the wee hours of the morning.

Specifically, I want to thank them for responding to a critical Navy shortfall and a national security need by including the authorization for funding of 12 F/A-18 Super Hornets in the National Defense Authorization Act.

The Super Hornet is truly the workhorse of naval combat operations against the Islamic State and is playing an important role in protecting our warfighters abroad. Twelve additional Super Hornets will help keep a critical production line open that will allow for

additional strike fighter jets and electronic warfare attack in the future.

However, our work isn't finished. I look forward to supporting the NDAA when it comes to the House floor and fighting for Super Hornets to be included during the appropriations process.

□ 1215

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say that the budget resolution being moved through Congress right now will help America's middle class.

I wish I could say that this budget will help provide opportunities for struggling Americans and security for our seniors.

I wish I could say that this budget will help raise stagnant wages, help our kids attend college, and help our businesses create jobs.

I wish I could say all of that, but I can't.

What I can say is that the budget being pushed through the House today would make hard-working Americans work even harder and take home even less, while benefiting special interests and the ultrawealthy.

I ask my Republican colleagues to partner with us in a bipartisan fashion to create a budget that will benefit all Americans.

FIXING THE ISSUES AT THE VA

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are working through a bipartisan Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill that contains a lot of good measures, that keeps the VA under the magnifying glass, and helps guarantee top-notch care for our Nation's heroes, our veterans.

Continuing to fix the issues at the VA needs to remain our top priority, but the solution is not throwing more money at it, Mr. Speaker. We spend more now on the VA than at any point in our history, but too much money is wasted on the bureaucracy here in Washington and doesn't get down to the caregivers and to our veterans who need the care.

My constituents and veterans across the Nation are waiting months for routine exams, while others who need special care are stuck in backlogs. Mr. Speaker, it simply isn't fair, and it is not tolerable.

Our veterans deserve the best, and we can deliver that by breaking up this bureaucracy in the VA. We should give our veterans the option to get health

care at the VA if they choose, or to go to a private healthcare provider in their local community and have the VA pay for it.

Until we move to that system, Mr. Speaker, the VA at the top is going to continue to soak up the money, and the veterans at the bottom are going to continue to not get the care that they deserve.

I ask my colleagues to continue to work with me so that we provide the best health care in the world to our veterans, that we keep the promises we made.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET'S IMPACT ON ACCESS TO SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget we are going to consider later today is a step in the wrong direction for students. At a time when student loan debt is at an all-time high, we need to be doing more to help students, not less.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget will make students work harder for less. It will hurt low-income students by cutting \$89 billion for Pell grants. It will dramatically cut back the loan repayment programs that help all student loan borrowers pay affordable rates. And for Americans in job training programs, more than 2 million may be turned away from the critical training programs they need to change careers or secure advancement at work.

Students of all types deserve access to quality, affordable education, but this Republican budget cuts critical programs that help our students get ahead. Mr. Speaker, our young people are 25 percent of our population and 100 percent of our future. We can and must do better.

ENHANCING VETERANS ACCESS TO TREATMENT ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Enhancing Veterans Access to Treatment Act, legislation that eliminates bureaucratic hurdles so veterans using the VA can continue to receive the same lifesaving mental health medication they access while on Active Duty.

Currently, the VA requires a veteran to switch their medication when that drug is not included in the VA's drug formulary, regardless if the drug is working. Instead, the VA will put the veteran on different medication and requires them to fail first before they are switched back, or the vet must go through an appeals process to remain on the current medication.

Instead, this bill simply says, if it works, keep it. This bill allows seam-

less continuity of medication and leaves any decision to change up to the doctor.

It is not enough to just have the DOD and VA share a limited medication list, because when it comes to psychotropic medication, the doctor needs to have available the full spectrum of choices.

With 22 veterans dying each day by suicide, these veterans don't have time to wait to get their medication for their depression or anxiety.

I ask all Members to please join me in cosponsoring the Enhancing Veterans Access to Treatment Act so we can solve this problem.

GOOD NEWS FROM NIGERIA

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week we received good news. On Tuesday, 200 girls and 93 women were rescued from Boko Haram camps by the Nigerian military in the Sambisa Forest. Yesterday, another group, 160 women and children, was rescued in the same forest.

These reports bring me great hope. My heart goes out to these women, girls, and their families, who have experienced their worst nightmare.

I am hopeful that the Chibok girls, who were kidnapped over a year ago, are a part of these ongoing rescue missions by the Nigerian Army.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked my fellow Congresswomen to wear red in honor of the missing girls and vote together in of the well of the House of Representatives. Together, we called attention to the atrocities by Boko Haram, called for the return of all of the kidnapped girls, and called for Nigerian leaders to be held accountable by the world.

It takes the political will of the Nigerian Government and the conviction to do what is right to eradicate Boko Haram and end their tragic reign of terror.

We hope to wear red every Wednesday. I will not stop speaking, stop tweeting and fighting on behalf of these girls, their families, until the girls are safely returned.

Tweet bringbackourgirls and tweet #joinrep.wilson.

THE STAPLE ACT

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, students from around the world come to the United States to access our high-quality education and universities and colleges. And many of these students obtain doctoral degrees in science, technology, engineering and math, and have job offers from numerous employers that need their expertise and their skills.

However, too often, our immigration rules send these graduates, some of the

best and brightest minds who will be highly skilled workers and entrepreneurs, back to their home countries to become our competitors rather than helping grow and create jobs right here.

Today, I am introducing bipartisan legislation, the STAPLE Act, with my colleague, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY, to help fix this problem and keep America on the forefront of innovation. The STAPLE Act will exempt recent STEM graduates with a Ph.D. with pending job offers from H-1B visa quotas.

Mr. Speaker, our immigration system is broken, and we must take action to ensure that the system is fair and that it keeps America competitive, and passing the STAPLE Act is a good step in the right direction.

THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Office of Technology Assessment, the OTA.

For 22 years, the OTA was a key non-partisan resource for Congress as it dealt with scientific and technical policy issues. The OTA was overseen by a Technical Advisory Board composed of six Senators and six Representatives, evenly split between the two parties.

The OTA was able to provide easy-to-understand explanations of complex scientific issues. For example, in 1988, the OTA provided a study called "Healthy Children: Investing in the Future," showing that infants with low birth weights were more susceptible to a variety of physical and mental disabilities. This study helped change Medicaid eligibility rules by expanding access to prenatal care to millions of women, saving lives and taxpayer money. This, and other reports, provided the information needed to make reasonable policy based on scientific results.

This Congress needs scientific guidance, and I urge my colleagues to join me in calling for the reestablishment of the Office of Technology Assessment.

SUPPORTING THE PTC ELIMINATION ACT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about making the Tax Code simpler and fairer, then we have to get rid of deadweight handouts. The PTC Elimination Act, which I have authored with Congressman POMPEO, is a step in that direction. The bill scales back and repeals the wind production tax credit.

The PTC was created over 20 years ago to help new forms of energy get on their feet. Today, it is a largely bloated

subsidy for the fully grown multi-million-dollar wind industry. The mature wind industry shouldn't be spooned by taxpayers any longer. The PTC needs to end.

By taking this no-longer-needed tax credit off the books, the PTC Elimination Act brings fairness to our Tax Code and enhances competition. That is the kind of tax simplification we need to reinvigorate the American economy.

TRANSPACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Japan's Prime Minister addressed Congress.

Each U.S. President has their Japan opening initiative. All fail, as will President Obama.

Soothing words are what Prime Minister Abe gave Congress yesterday. But here is the scorecard for U.S. trade with Japan:

There hasn't been a single year of trade surplus for our country, not even balance. Rather, over the last 20 years, we have had \$1,963,654,100 trillion lost dollars; U.S. dollars that have gone to Japan from us buying their products, but their markets remain closed to ours.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is not a trade deal. It should be debated as a treaty. It is a foreign policy arrangement that is part of the shift to Asia.

As for the trade portion of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, it facilitates the movement of more U.S. jobs and corporations into Vietnam and other nations in the region. Labor costs there are chasing cheap labor a third of that of China now, and will ease the movement of those goods back into—guess where—our country again.

We have seen it before. It is time for Congress to stand up for the workers and communities of the United States of America. Let us start building back our middle class rather than keep shipping it out every place but here.

CELEBRATING NEW HAMPSHIRE'S EDUCATORS

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and give thanks to all New Hampshire's educators as we celebrate National Teacher Appreciation Day.

Oftentimes our teachers don't get the thanks or credit that they deserve. Granite State teachers devote their lives to providing our children with the tools, the resources, and the attention necessary to be the very best that they can be.

It is our teachers who listen to our children, challenge them, and inspire them to dream the impossible. They

spend countless hours devoted to preparing our kids for the next challenge, whether that be passing a test or navigating conflict. They don't simply prepare them for the grammar quiz on Friday; they prepare them for the events that will test them throughout their lives.

So to all those who teach our kids that anything is possible with hard work and dedication, thank you. To all those who encourage our students to shoot for the stars, I say, thank you. It is because of you that our Nation remains the world leader of innovation, ideas, and excellence.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP SCHOOL

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the National Outdoor Leadership School.

NOLS was founded in Wyoming by Paul Petzoldt. NOLS has taught thousands of Americans and people worldwide about the responsible use of the outdoors and an appreciation for outdoor activities, recreation, hiking, that is unsurpassed.

NOLS is headquartered in Wyoming, in Lander, and we are proud that NOLS's mother ship is in our dear State. NOLS is a wonderful organization that provides stewardship of our natural resources in a way that teaches people how to enjoy and appreciate the outdoors.

Congratulations, NOLS, the National Outdoor Leadership School, on 50 years.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1732, REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 43, DISAPPROVAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 231

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities

with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-13 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025. 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 one hour of debate.

SEC. 3. Section 604(g) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act shall not apply in the case of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally

divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend (if otherwise in order).

POINT OF ORDER

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 231 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 1732, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I was sworn into this Congress, there was quite a bit of fanfare about how many women now serve in this body. But even with all of these women, this body is still 80 percent male.

Men are running the show, and the sideshow that they have used to distract us from the real reasons each of us was elected has been a persistent, absurd, arrogant, and ignorant effort to impede upon a woman's right to make her own choices about her health.

We have wasted—absolutely wasted—taxpayer dollars and valuable time here on the floor of the House again and again and again trying to legislate away something our highest Court confirmed years ago.

We could have spent that time talking about the recent rash of police brutality cases that have long plagued communities of color, an issue that has now caught fire in the streets of Baltimore, just a few miles north of us.

We could have discussed the lack of job training programs preparing workers for careers in technology and health, the fastest-growing professions in an economy doing nothing for the long-term unemployed.

We could have used this time to work on protecting our seniors by expanding Social Security, keeping even more older Americans out of poverty.

We could have debated any issue that would offer better opportunities for our constituents, which is what each of us was elected to do.

Instead, we put Members of Congress one place we have no right to be; and

that is, in a woman's uterus. Women are the only ones who have the right to make the inherently private health choices that they are faced with.

Mr. Speaker, when the legislation we are preparing to debate came before the House Oversight Committee, I was particularly disturbed. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle gave us a slew of well-meaning arguments about why we so desperately needed to violate the self-rule of the District of Columbia.

One of these men, a former minister, explained employers, who are moved by faith to judge and persecute their employees, should be free to do so. He went on to say that employers should have every right to freely exercise their faiths and that the District's effort to ensure employees don't lose their jobs because of in vitro fertilization or birth control or any other reproductive healthcare choice was part of a "continued attack" on religion.

One thing that is particularly wonderful about this great Nation is that we offer everyone a right to have an opinion.

As a mother, a grandmother, and a devoted woman of God, I couldn't help wondering how men, who are so very adamant about forcing mothers to have these babies, could refuse to ensure they have access to care.

The same folks calling for bills like this one have called for cuts to programs across the spectrum that will give their children and their mothers access to education, access to healthy meals, and all kinds of tools to assure they are not stuck in the cycle of poverty. So once they have funneled women into the path that brings a child into the world, my colleagues would prefer to say, "God bless you," and walk away.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation this rule would force us to consider is absolutely wrong. It violates the will of the District's voters; it violates the privacy and the rights of women; and most relevant to this point of order, it violates rules of this body for interference in State and local governments.

It is now my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), someone who recognizes just how awful this legislation is and the only Member whose constituents will have to deal with the outcome.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from New Jersey for her extraordinary remarks and for her generosity in yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this rule has the high stink of both unfairness and discrimination. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee voted to overturn a valid local District of Columbia law but denied D.C.'s locally elected officials even the courtesy of defending that law, which is aimed at keeping employers from discriminating against women and men for their private reproductive health decisions, the most personal decisions Americans make off the job.

Of critical importance, the D.C. local law requires that all employees carry out the mission of the organization or business, whatever its mission is. The disapproval resolution was only added to the Rules Committee agenda yesterday, literally at the same time that the committee began its meeting. And no member of the majority showed up at the hearing to defend the disapproval resolution until I noted this unprecedented absence. The committee then hurriedly summoned the subcommittee chair, who spoke without any prepared testimony.

No wonder—how can any American defend an employer who imposes his religion or personal philosophical beliefs on an employee's private reproductive matters by sanctioning the employee because the employer disagrees, for example, with an employee's use of in vitro fertilization to become pregnant or of birth control for family planning?

The employer has no right to even know about such private matters. But if he learns of an employee's reproductive preferences, the D.C. law requires that he must not use this private matter to discriminate on the job.

Not surprisingly, we do not expect this disapproval resolution to be considered on the House floor—in the light of day—until late tonight, for fear that the American people will watch Congress sanction, for the first time ever, discrimination against women and men for their reproductive health decisions and see Republicans violate their own professed mantra for local control of local affairs by overturning the law of a local government for the first time in a quarter of a century.

I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairwoman of the Rules Committee in whose jurisdiction the unfunded mandate point of order resides.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding time.

The question before the House is, Should the House now consider H. Res. 231? While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of today's measures—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and the rules of the House.

The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina may proceed.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, while the resolution waives all points of order

against consideration of today's measures, the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is a dilatory tactic.

These measures will protect our farmers, ranchers, and business community from a massive Federal overreach being perpetrated by the EPA, approve our FY16 budget that puts us on a path to rein in reckless spending, reform entitlement programs, and protect the religious rights of D.C. employers.

As a mother, a woman, and an individual of prayer, I am very glad that we are here today defending life and our Constitution, consistent with our congressional prerogatives.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle act shocked that we are debating this issue. But what is truly shocking is that we need to be here today at all, discussing whether to grant employers in the District of Columbia the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment, but we are.

I would further like to point out to our colleagues across the aisle some of the words of the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence:

"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. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted."

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about discrimination against people here. We are discussing the protection of innocent life. As Members of Congress, we have a heightened responsibility to protect the rights of D.C. residents because the Constitution in article I, section 8 gives the Congress explicit jurisdiction over the country's seat of government.

It is under that authority that we consider H.J. Res. 43, a resolution to disapprove the action of the Council of the District of Columbia in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014, or RHND.

Our country holds as its most fundamental freedom the right to practice freely one's religion and associate with others who hold the same beliefs. It is unthinkable that we could allow the leadership—if you want to call it leadership, the people in control of Our Capital City—to infringe on that right for the millions of Americans who live or work inside its borders. But that is what RHND does.

It tells churches, religious schools, and advocacy organizations that they may not make employment decisions based on their own core principles, including the respect for precious unborn life, a principle that is central to many of these groups' entire belief system.

Cloaked in language purporting to prohibit discrimination and promote

tolerance, this law targets these organizations and tramples their rights to exercise their views on the respect for life.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, this law discriminates against and promotes intolerance of anyone who disagrees with the world view of the majority of the D.C. City Council. It is not discriminatory for a church or religious school to believe and preach that life begins at conception. It is not discriminatory to practice these deeply held beliefs; that is, unless you are in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, this law may force religious organizations to relocate outside the District of Columbia in order to protect their rights. Given the clear hostility the City Council has shown them and what we have heard on this floor today, that may, in fact, be the ultimate goal.

When we take our oath of office as Representatives, we promise to protect and defend the Constitution. That includes protection of religious freedoms, and it is why I support H.J. Res. 43 which disapproves RHND.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 174, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—240

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)
Allen	Chabot	Emmer (MN)
Amash	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Amodei	Clawson (FL)	Fincher
Babin	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Barletta	Cole	Fleischmann
Barr	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Barton	Collins (NY)	Flores
Benish	Comstock	Forbes
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Foxx
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Crawford	Garrett
Bost	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Boustany	Culberson	Gibson
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Bridenstine	Denham	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Granger
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Doggett	Griffith
Burgess	Dold	Grothman
Byrne	Duffy	Guinta
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie

Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
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
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce

Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
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

Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer

Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Black
Cardenas
Clay
Fudge
Gohmert
Hudson

Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kildee
Langevin
Lewis
Payne

Quigley
Roskam
Rush
Shuster
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1312

Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this is House Resolution 231 down here today. I have got a copy right here. It has been so long since the Reading Clerk read this to us that folks may have forgotten. This represents a lot of what I would argue is best about this institution, and I want to take a little pride and tell folks about what the Rules Committee has been working on.

It makes in order H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, the EPA and others are hard at work, I would argue, at trying to exert brand-new jurisdiction over waters currently regulated by the State of Georgia. It is the largest power grab over water I have seen in my lifetime and, I would argue, in the history of the Republic. This bill aims to roll that back. Yet, as the committee reported it, there are always other folks who have ideas, so what the Rules Committee did is to

make in order every single Democratic amendment that was offered to this resolution.

If we vote to support this rule today, we will consider this bill. The House will work its will, and it will work its will by considering every single Democratic alternative that was offered. I think that is an important step. It is going to make the legislation better when we move it to final passage, and I am glad this rule provides for that. I hope folks will support that underlying rule.

Passing this rule today will make in order S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I almost feel like I need to explain what a concurrent resolution on the budget is because, if you are like more than half the Members of this House, you have never seen one before. More than half the Members of this House have never served when the United States of America got together and passed a budget. It is outrageous, Mr. Speaker. That was yesterday that it was outrageous, and today is about the opportunity to do this.

The House worked its will on the budget. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee made in order every single budget alternative that was offered, both Republican and Democrat. The House debated. The House worked its will. We passed a product. We worked that product out with the Senate. If we pass this rule today, Mr. Speaker, it will be in order to debate the first concurrent budget in my congressional tenure—these two terms—and the first balanced budget since 2001, but only if we make this rule in order.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, is H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council, that this rule will make in order.

Now, for folks who don't follow that, we don't see it that often. In fact, since Republicans first took over Congress for the first time in 40 years back in 1994, we have never seen one of these resolutions before. It is the first one, but it comes from the District of Columbia Home Rule Act. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution delegates to Congress all of the authority for governing the District of Columbia. It is article I, section 8. All of the authority for the governing of the District of Columbia lies in this body.

In 1974, we passed the D.C. Home Rule Act, which allowed for the coordinated governance of D.C., and it included this resolution of disapproval allowing Congress to come back and reject actions that the District of Columbia has taken. Again, folks will not have seen this unless you were in Congress in 1991 when Democrats were controlling the House and Democrats were controlling the Senate. Unless you were here then, you would not have seen one of these resolutions passed. It was last passed in 1991 with folks rejecting the deliberations of the D.C. Council.

This rule makes in order the consideration of that joint resolution again today. It is exactly what was contemplated when, for the very first time in the history of the United States of America, the Congress delegated some of the power of controlling the District of Columbia to the city itself. In the language that designated that authority to begin with, it provided for this resolution of disapproval. For the first time in almost 20 years, this House is considering one of those today.

That is what you get in this rule, Mr. Speaker. It provides for debate on all of the Democratic amendments offered; it provides for debate on those bills that are exactly as the D.C. Home Rule Act anticipated; and it provides for debate on the first confereed budget that most Members in this House have ever seen. It is a shame this is the first time we have had an opportunity to do it, but, golly, is it exciting that we have an opportunity to do that together today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for the consideration of three unrelated pieces of legislation: a Republican budget conference report, an anti-Clean Water Act bill, and a resolution to interfere with the decisions of the District of Columbia's city council and a bill that limits women's reproductive health rights.

The budget conference report was filed only minutes before the Rules Committee met yesterday, only minutes before the committee formally convened. It was a 100-page conference report that was negotiated in secret by the Republicans, and it was brought before the Rules Committee before anybody had a chance to read it. What ever happened to "read the bill"? Whatever happened to the pledge for a more open and transparent Congress? It would be nice if all Members, Democrats and Republicans, had the opportunity to carefully review the legislation they are asked to vote on, especially when it comes to a document that provides a blueprint for funding the Federal Government and reforming our social safety net programs.

If that weren't bad enough, the majority claims that this budget conference report is something to be proud of. Mr. Speaker, this is nothing to be proud of. It is shameful. It is shameful in terms of process, and it is shameful in terms of substance. Budgets should be moral documents. They provide our constituents with a clear picture of who we are, of what our priorities are, how we should govern, where we want this country to go. They represent our

values, but the values that this budget represents, I would argue, are not the values of working families in this country, and they are not the values of those who are struggling to get out of poverty. They may be the values of corporate special interests or of very wealthy individuals in this country, but they don't represent the values of the majority of people in this country.

This partisan Republican budget takes us in the wrong direction. It cuts \$5.5 trillion in funding through a series of unrealistic spending cuts, math magic, and gimmicks. It asks nothing of the wealthiest among us, proposes no elimination of special interest tax breaks, and continues us down the terribly misguided path created by sequestration. In fact, to be honest, Mr. Speaker, this budget basically provides us a pathway to do not a lot of anything, really.

We already know that, unless we deal with the issue of sequestration, our colleagues in the United States Senate are going to block all of the appropriations bills. We know that the President will not sign any appropriations bills that lock us into sequestration. Maybe what we should be doing, rather than wasting time, is fixing sequestration, but my Republican friends have been very good at wasting time and at wasting taxpayer dollars, and that is what we are doing today.

The Republican budget conference report proposes to end the Medicare guarantee and turn it into a voucher program. It turns Medicaid and CHIP into a capped block grant. It eliminates \$85 million from Pell grants. It cuts investments in research and in infrastructure. The budget resolution builds upon the draconian \$125 billion cut to SNAP, which is the Nation's premier antihunger program that was contained in the House budget. To achieve a cut of that magnitude by block granting the program and capping its allotment means that States will be forced to cut benefits or kick eligible individuals and families off the program.

Boy, isn't that a nice value that we are promoting here—throwing poor people off of a food benefit. Just because the conference report is vague on some details or leaves out a few key buzzwords doesn't mean that it protects programs for the poor. Unfortunately, this Republican Congress has shown time and time again that it plans to balance the budgets on the backs of the poor and working class Americans.

The conference report also includes reconciliation instructions to repeal the Affordable Care Act without proposing an alternative to ensure the 16 million people who have gained health coverage under the ACA are able to remain insured. That is right. If the Republicans get their way, being a woman is, once again, a preexisting condition, and preventative care goes away. Simply, the progress that we have made over the past few years disappears.

Senior citizens will see their prescription costs increase. In budgetary terms, we will be worse off when repealing the Affordable Care Act because it will result in higher medical costs and sicker people. It is just that simple. It is a bad idea, but it is a good sound bite, I guess.

Despite claims by my friends in the majority, this budget does not balance. It nowhere near balances. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is filled with gimmicks and contains the very dangerous addiction Congress has for deficit spending by further increasing funds for the overseas contingency operations account, or OCO. Not only does this budget increase the OCO's war spending, but it also facilitates using the OCO as a slush fund for items that should be funded in the base budget. Everything in OCO is on the national credit card. None of it is an emergency. It is deficit spending, pure and simple.

I commend my colleagues on the Republican side who are raising a little hell about this kind of budget gimmick that is going on. This is outrageous. While we continue to pump up the deficit and to pump up the OCO account, we watch our roads and our bridges and our water systems crumble for lack of funding, and we starve our education and our job training and innovation programs.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the outrages contained in the Republican budget. We are still in the process of combing through the 100-page document that was just filed yesterday, and I am sure there will be additional issues that we will want to raise.

In addition to this awful budget, today's rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 1732 and H.J. Res. 43.

H.R. 1732, Mr. Speaker, would basically force the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to withdraw its proposed rule on Clean Water Act jurisdictional boundaries and start the rule-making process over again from scratch. Mr. Speaker, the current rule-making process should be allowed to move forward. The EPA and the Army Corps have painstakingly engaged in an extensive stakeholder outreach and public comment process. They are doing their jobs. The rule is grounded in sound science. H.R. 1732 would cause further confusion, and it would end up delaying essential clean water projects for future generations, not to mention, Mr. Speaker, that a rider in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which is being considered by this House today, would prohibit the Army Corps from spending any money to propose a new rule.

In one bill, my friends basically null and void what the bill we are going to debate today is intended to do. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in this partisan approach that the majority has taken with regard to clean water legislation and environmental protection legislation.

There is another bill in here, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to say a few

words about that. It is H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, the D.C. Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act is scheduled to take effect this Saturday. The law passed unanimously by the D.C. City Council. This would protect employees who work in the District of Columbia from workplace discrimination based on their personal reproductive healthcare decisions. The bill is about basic fairness. People should be judged at work based on their performances, not on their personal, private reproductive healthcare decisions. But House Republicans cannot pass up an opportunity to meddle in personal reproductive decisions or in D.C.'s right to govern itself.

The resolution before us, H.J. Res. 43, would prevent the law from going into effect. In doing so, it would allow an employer to fire a woman because she used in vitro fertilization or to demote an employee because she used birth control pills or because her husband used condoms or to pay an employee less because his daughter became pregnant out of wedlock.

□ 1330

In other words, we are a few months into 2015, a year-and-a-half away from the Presidential election, and the Republicans are already restarting their war on women. Sometimes it feels like this Congress is stuck in the mindset of 1815 rather than 2015.

Let my colleagues make no mistake about this: H.J. Res. 43 is about legitimizing discrimination. Enough already.

Mr. Speaker, earlier the gentlelady from North Carolina, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, came on the floor and said we in Congress need to protect the citizens of D.C. Protect them from what? From their own democratic process? Give me a break. Let me tell my Republican colleagues, the citizens of D.C. don't want your protection or your interference. They want this Congress to respect them and their decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this is another lousy piece of legislation that really shouldn't be here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on America's priorities instead of resuming the attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. TORRES) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement for the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of working men and women instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities like eliminating poverty instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of America, like jobs, jobs, jobs, instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the country instead of another attack on women's health care in Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on jobs and the economy, the real priorities of the American people, instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the American people instead of another attack on women's health.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the American people—job creation and getting a stronger economy—rather than attacking women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first make an announcement.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to

accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD, and the House should be focusing on the real priorities facing Americans: the economy. They should not be rolling back women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman will be charged.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of America instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member on the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 insert my

statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

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

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), one of our young leaders in this Chamber.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for all the work that he has done to protect life and religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong disapproval of religious discrimination in the District of Columbia's local government.

Mr. Speaker, one of the founding principles of our great country is the freedom to worship without government interference. Our forefathers fought and died for that liberty, and I stand before you today to make sure they did not die in vain.

The law passed by the D.C. City Council attacks the core religious beliefs of faith-based organizations, schools, and pro-life advocates. Under this law, these groups could be forced to pay for health services that are in direct conflict with their fundamental religious beliefs. Under this law, a D.C.-based nonprofit whose sole mission is to end abortion could be forced to pay for abortion services. This is not only unacceptable but stands in direct opposition to the Constitution and Federal law.

This is why I am proud to cosponsor Congresswoman BLACK's resolution that formally expresses Congress' disapproval of the D.C. pro-abortion law. I

stand here to defend the rights of religious institutions and pro-life companies to honor their faith and respect the sanctity of life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that life is our greatest gift. I admire the work that many of these faith-based and pro-life organizations do to change the hearts and the minds in this abortion debate, and I will not stand idly by to watch their religious freedoms trampled. I urge my colleagues to do the same and vote in favor of this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say for the record, I strongly disagree with what the gentlelady just said, and we will have some more time to talk about that, but I want to go to kind of a different subject right now.

For those who are watching these proceedings, it may be a little confusing because we are jumping around to different subjects, but my Republican friends have this new kind of ploy to limit and stifle debate, and that is pack as many bills into one rule at a time so that you can limit the amount of participation and debate, which, again, runs contrary to what the people's House is supposed to be about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask at the end of all this that we defeat the previous question, and then I will offer an amendment to the rule that would grant the House an opportunity to consider a budget that rejects the mindless sequester cuts in critical services and instead adopt a plan to put the budget on a fiscally responsible path by making responsible, targeted spending cuts, and by closing special interest tax breaks that benefit only the very wealthiest. It would make necessary investments to boost the economy and create jobs, protect national security, and preserve the Medicare guarantee.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, primarily because of the gimmickry and the coldheartedness of the conference budget. It is not just myself who has understood the tricks and gimmicks that were used to formulate this so-called balanced budget, which doesn't, of course, balance.

It is kind of like if I had gone out and said I am going to spend \$2,000 on a cheap racehorse. This is the weekend of the Kentucky Derby. I am going to go out and buy a cheap racehorse, and I am going to enter it in the Kentucky Derby. The horse is going to win the Kentucky Derby, and then I take that prize money from the Kentucky Derby—I might even be so bold as to predict it is going to win the Triple Crown, and I take all that money and put it in my budget as if I had actually done it. That is the way this budget was constructed.

But, again, it is not just me. Virtually everyone who has looked at this budget—detached, impartial observers—says this is not legitimate budgeting. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget noted that the House budget uses “several budget gimmicks that circumvent budget discipline,” adding that “the details are in some ways unrealistic and unspecified.”

□ 1345

The CRFB also observed about the Senate budget, “Disappointingly, many of the savings are unrealistic or lack specificity.”

Taxpayers for Common Sense said, “This isn't budgeting, it's gimmickry.”

The Fiscal Times noted that “there is a widely held belief among many Federal budget watchers that Republicans had to resort to budgetary smoke and mirrors to create a pathway to a balanced budget.”

While my friend from Georgia and other members of the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee are praising the fact that they were able to construct a budget that balances the first time since 2001, it doesn't balance.

For instance, what it does is it eliminates, repeals—or calls for the repeal—of the Affordable Care Act and then takes all of the savings and revenues from the Affordable Care Act and counts that as a way to add \$2 trillion to the positive side of their budget over 10 years.

That is not accurate budgeting. That is gimmickry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman from Kentucky an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague.

That is not legitimate budgeting. That is just fantasy. That is really what the budget is about.

Unfortunately, though, there is a very cruel side to this budget. As my friend from Massachusetts said, this does real damage to the American people. It does damage to hard-working families who are trying to get ahead. It actually ends up being a tax increase on hard-working American families.

It repeals the Affordable Care Act, and I just want to talk a little bit about what the Affordable Care Act has done in my State because, if this were to actually happen, here is what the impact on my citizens would be.

In Kentucky, according to the DeLoitte professional services firm that did an audit of Kentucky's experience and a projection over the next 6 years, the Affordable Care Act will contribute \$30 billion of additional economic activity in the State, create 44,000 jobs, and have a positive impact on the Kentucky State budget of \$850 million. That is in one State.

If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, not only do you do great damage to the health of Americans, taking insurance

away from 16.5 million—in my State, 550,000 who have gained insurance just in the last year and a half—but you are doing real damage to our education, to our infrastructure, to our investment in research, to our seniors. Under this bill, seniors will suffer a great financial hardship, as well as a loss of benefits.

There is real damage, as I said, to be done with this budget, but I think the most disturbing part of the entire debate is the fact that this is not a budget that balances. Yes, the numbers at the end on the plus and negative side add up.

They actually match after 10 years, but all of the bases for getting there is about as reliable as, again, if I bought that racehorse and said I am going to win the Kentucky Derby and counted those winnings before that race was ever run.

I oppose the rule on the basis of this conference report on the budget. I think it does great damage to the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank my colleague for his leadership today and every day. I really appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and, more broadly, H.J. Res. 43, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her leadership and her conviction on this issue.

We all want to protect the free speech and beliefs of all Americans, but too often, the line is drawn to discriminate against those with pro-life views. Ironically, this is often done under the guise of antidiscrimination, which is exactly what has happened in the District of Columbia.

Under the recently passed ordinance, religious institutions and other pro-life employers in our Nation's Capital could be forced to make decisions that violate their deeply held religious beliefs.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling in *Hobby Lobby*, for instance, under this ordinance, religious employers could be compelled to cover elective abortions in their healthcare coverage or face discrimination charges.

It would also prevent faith-based employers from taking actions against employees who participate in activities that run counter to the mission of that organization. For instance, a pro-life crisis pregnancy center couldn't terminate an employee who undermines their cause by volunteering at an abortion clinic.

As a strong pro-life individual myself, it boggles my mind that the government could force like-minded individuals to violate their conscience in such ways. Frankly, no American should be comfortable with such discrimination.

We must take swift action to stop this ordinance, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is founded on two simple and powerful principles, liberty and equality.

In the 18th century, our Founding Fathers saw liberty as freedom from the dictates of a tyrannical government and fought to the death to protect it. What they could not foresee is a modern form of tyranny, the tyranny of employers who seek to impose their beliefs on their employees and control their personal decisions.

I am saddened that, today, my Republican colleagues are bringing up yet another bill to enable employers to control their private, personal decisions of their employees. Today, this body may, with a single vote, strip over 650,000 American citizens of their essential liberty to make their own choices about their health care and their families.

Make no mistake, the District of Columbia's new law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, is about liberty. We are not talking about an employer who objects to paying for insurance that covers contraception.

D.C. passed this law to protect the citizens from an employer who tells a woman that she will be fired for using contraception or for using in vitro fertilization to start a family or for engaging in any other conduct that violates the employer's religious beliefs.

The D.C. law we are asked to overturn says your employer should not be able to impose his religious beliefs on you. You should not be fired because your religious beliefs differ from those of your employer. The D.C. law protects religious liberty. The disapproval resolution imposes religious coercion.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle who claim so vociferously to support freedom and liberty stand here today and say to the American people: you do not have the right to make decisions about when and how to start a family; your employer has the right to make those decisions for you.

I challenge any Member of this body to go home this weekend and explain that to their constituents and why they must now live under the yoke of their employer's tyranny. The American people will not stand for it, and we must not stand for it today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and "no" on the disapproval resolution. We must send a strong message to the American people that freedom and religious liberty still exist in this country.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a member of the class of 2010, and a public servant.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate my colleague from Georgia yielding me

time to discuss this rule and the underlying issue.

I do want to report that it was 229 years ago that the Virginia General Assembly ratified the Virginia statute for religious freedom. This was authored by Thomas Jefferson. The statute serves as the model for the free exercise clause in our First Amendment. This is what it said:

No man shall . . . suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument, to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion.

Mr. Speaker, religious freedom is a fundamental human right protected by our First Amendment. It is essential to our free and flourishing society. Our Nation was found, in part, by individuals seeking refuge from religious persecution, from religious discrimination. For these pioneers and for all to come after, America was meant to be a permanent fortress of liberty and freedom for all who live within its walls.

At its essence, the concept of religious freedom is about much more than religion. It is much more than just showing up to worship service 1 day or 1 night a week. It is about our fundamental human right to hold our own beliefs and to live out our lives according to these faiths.

Religious freedom, quite simply, is about freedom itself. This is why the very first part of the very First Amendment to our Constitution is about religious freedom. It is our first and most cherished liberty.

However, our ability to be free to live out the convictions of our faith not only in the public square, but also in the privacy of our own homes, in our churches, in our businesses, is in jeopardy right here in our Nation's Capital.

The misleading name RHND is nothing more than a legalized discrimination. If allowed to go in effect, the government would force pro-life organizations, pro-life ministries, pro-life business, pro-life churches, pro-life individuals in the District to violate the very heart of their lives and their work and be coerced into paying for abortion on demand and be forced to hire antilife individuals who actually promote abortion. As a Catholic and as an American, I am offended by such coercion.

Now is the time for Congress to stand up against this direct assault on our freedom of religion, our freedom of association, and our freedom of speech.

I encourage my colleagues to join me and honor our constitutional oath of office by adopting this rule and passing H.J. Res. 43.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the many Democrats who have rallied to

the defense of reproductive health decisions of men and women in the District of Columbia, especially since this is a resolution to overturn a District of Columbia law that everyone in this Chamber will be able to vote on, except me.

I wish to respond to a set of untruths you have heard from the other side that, for example, the D.C. law is an assault on religion. On the contrary, it protects an employer's religious beliefs. He can hold those religious beliefs if that is part of what his organization does. The employee must advocate those beliefs. Whatever the organization or business, the employee must advocate the employer's views, not his own. What the employer cannot do is to go into the employee's bedroom to find out what kind of reproductive choices he makes on his own as a private matter.

Abortion has been raised as if it were in this bill. In fact, just the opposite—the D.C. law makes it clear that insurance is not involved, paying for abortion is not involved.

Republicans have done almost the inconceivable. They have resumed, with this disapproval resolution, the war on women, by adding men.

The D.C. law protects all employees from job discrimination by the employer for their reproductive health choices. For example, if the employer discriminates against a male employee who has contributed sperm for in vitro fertilization to help his wife become pregnant, that male employee is also protected.

There has been an attempt to tie the D.C. law to abortion; but, if an employee refuses to carry out—indeed, to advocate—the mission of the organization that opposes abortion, then that employee can be fired.

In fact, you can ask that employee before that employee is hired: Will you advocate vigorously against abortion the way this organization does? That employee must say yes, or that employee may not insist on any right to be hired.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the manager of this bill never defended the bill on the merits; instead, he defended the tyranny of Federal power over local matters.

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

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

Ms. NORTON. The Home Rule Act, in its terms, Mr. Speaker, does not—and it says so—envision overturning local law, and it says so in its terms. There are only a few matters that the Home Rule Act mentions that cannot be enacted, and the matter on the floor is not one of them.

Republicans have been champions for federalism and local control; yet they are trying to impose their own preferences on a local jurisdiction whose Member cannot even vote for or against it. This is a double whammy.

Their goal here is to resume the war on women. The predicate for getting to

the Nation's women is the D.C. Home Rule Act. It goes after D.C.'s right to self-government and women at the same time.

The coming attraction in your district is that this bill or a version of it is pending all over the country. Stop it here, or it will spread throughout the United States of America.

□ 1400

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my colleague from Georgia for the great leadership he shows in the Rules Committee and on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made many comments. Some of them, I am going to do my best to refute comment by comment; others, I am just going to talk about in general.

Their one charge is that Congress should stay out of the business of governing D.C. Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress explicit jurisdiction over the country's seat of government. The extent to which Congress should oversee or intervene in the governance of the District is a debate for another day, but it is clearly our responsibility.

Current law compels congressional oversight, and we must exercise responsibly that jurisdiction. That includes acting to stop legislation that clearly violates the constitutional freedoms of the citizens of the District.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that women are protected by law, both Federal and D.C., from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy. Their personal medical decisions are also private under HIPAA protections.

This discussion is not about how someone chooses to conduct their personal affairs. It is about whether the D.C. government may force an organization to hire, retain, and promote someone who actively opposes their central mission and core beliefs.

Pro-life groups, religious organizations, and Republicans, are not the only ones to see significant problems with RHND. Even former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray cautioned that RHND goes too far, and called the bill "legally insufficient" and "legally problematic."

Whatever his position may be on life issues, he recognized that the approach taken by the City Council does not adequately protect free exercise. He further noted that the measure "raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religions Freedom Restoration Act."

The District's own attorney general also expressed concerns that "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."

The D.C. Council's cavalier attitude toward the constitutional rights protecting religious practice and belief is deeply troubling. Unfortunately, RHND is a harbinger of continued efforts to undermine the right of free exercise and association.

RHND denies these fundamental rights to pro-life organizations and religious groups who do not fit the narrow definition of "ministers" exempted from the D.C. law. Under this law, these organizations can be forced to hire, retain, and promote individuals who work actively against their central mission and core beliefs.

The clear and shameless targeting of these organizations must be opposed by anyone who values the rights guaranteed to us by the First Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, our oath of office requires us to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The Supreme Court ruled unanimously in 2012 that religious organizations have the right to hire individuals that support their mission, saying: "The interest of society in the enforcement of employment discrimination statutes 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 . . . The church must be free to choose those who will guide it on its way."

Consistent with our oath of office, I commend this rule and disapproval resolution for our support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is extreme, and it is an outrage to women everywhere. The Republican majority is saying with this resolution that they think a woman's employer has a say in the woman's reproductive healthcare choices, even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and women all across this country know that they don't.

It is bad enough that the majority party believes your boss should dictate whether your healthcare plan covers birth control. Now they want to make sure your boss has the right to fire you just for using birth control.

If that was all they were saying, that is outrageous enough, but it is not. This resolution would actually give employers the right to fire an employee for the reproductive healthcare choices of their spouses, or even their children.

Think about it. The other side is saying that it is all right to fire someone because their boss doesn't like their wife's, or even their children's, healthcare choices. Talk about restricting someone's rights.

It would take away a whole range of women's private decisions and make

them fireable offenses. In vitro fertilization, you are fired. Exercising your right to choose, you are fired. You have a daughter on birth control, you are fired.

This is outrageous, ridiculous, and totally unacceptable. It is an insult to women everywhere. And even more amazing is that this resolution is being proposed by the so-called party of states' rights.

They are not proposing a Federal law. They are taking away the rights of a locality, the District, Washington, D.C., which is larger than some States and has a population larger than most States.

This is a new low in this Congress. I urge a strong "no" vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, for folks who were just turning on the TVs back in their office, they may think we are in the middle of issue debate right now—not the case. We can get into issue debate as soon as we pass this rule to begin that debate.

What makes me so proud about the work that we do in the Rules Committee is that it makes in order the ability to have these kinds of in-depth discussions.

We can't have this kind of discussion right here—there are three topics in this bill—because these three topics in this bill will come later in the day, each being discussed individually.

I will go back to where I began, Mr. Speaker. We are exercising responsibilities of the Constitution under Article I, section 8, that require us to do oversight on the District of Columbia. Similarly, we are pushing back on executive overreach in H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. That is that big Federal grab over all the water that our States are currently regulating. And finally, we will be bringing up that balanced budget, the first reconciled budget that most in this Chamber have ever seen.

This rule makes that debate possible. It will be a free and open debate on the budget, as we allowed every single budget to be debated earlier on this floor, it is going to be an open debate on H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, where the Rules Committee made in order every Democratic suggestion that was offered there, every amendment that came before the Rules Committee. And it will be an up-or-down vote after debate on H.J. Res. 43, the resolution of disapproval, as the very 1974 act that provided for self-governance of the District of Columbia anticipated.

If we pass this rule, Mr. Speaker, we can get into that substance, and I look forward to a robust debate on all three of those topics.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN, for your leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to H.J. Res. 43. This bill would undermine the District's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, which would protect employees who work in the District from workplace discrimination based on the employee's personal reproductive healthcare decisions.

For example, this includes prohibiting an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control.

Simply put, this rule and bill is yet another Republican attack on women's access to health care and another battle in the war on women. And of course, as always, you target the women of the District of Columbia to set a standard for the rest of the country.

What in the world is the connection between your private healthcare decisions and job performance? This is so cynical. It is so wrong. No woman should have an employer or a politician interfering in her personal health decisions.

The D.C. government has a right to determine how they want to protect their workers. Employees should be evaluated at work based on their performance, not on their personal and private reproductive healthcare decisions.

The District of Columbia seeks basic fairness for its women, and this rule and this resolution are outrageous. It is undemocratic and, once again, ignores the Home Rule Act. Yes, Congress should not be dictating any policy to the District of Columbia. This debate has been held. The Home Rule Act was passed in 1973.

Instead of undermining the law that seeks to protect the citizens and women of D.C. from discrimination based on their private reproductive healthcare decisions, we should be getting back to the real business that Congress needs to address, like strengthening our economy, lifting families out of poverty, criminal justice reform, and creating job opportunities for all.

So let's defeat this. Let's support the District of Columbia and its decisions. Let's respect them. Let's respect the women of the District of Columbia. They, too, have that right.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Massachusetts I do not have any further speakers remaining, and I would inquire if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I do, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Thank you to the gentleman from Worcester for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and its assault on Americans' reproductive health rights. All women should have the right to make their own healthcare de-

cisions without fear of losing their jobs.

With reports of women being fired for undergoing in vitro fertilization and being fired for being a single mom, the City Council of Washington, D.C. passed a resolution to ban workplace discrimination based on personal reproductive healthcare decisions.

This joint resolution does not infringe on religious liberty. It ensures the freedom to practice individual religious and moral beliefs. This decision of the D.C. Council will protect women and ensure that reproductive health decisions are made by women and not their employers and not corporations.

It is 2015, and I would love for Congress to be debating women in the workplace. We should be talking about how we achieve equal pay, how we increase paid sick leave, and how to help working families make ends meet. We should not be stripping away the progress that has already been made.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ quarter minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, because I would like to correct some misstatements from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the former Mayor and the former Attorney General never detailed what their concern was, but just in case, the District passed an amendment that made it clear that insurance and abortion are not covered by this bill.

I want to be explicit.

□ 1415

A pro-life organization is not required to hire someone who advocates against abortion. An employee must carry out and must advocate whatever is the mission of the organization.

This bill has an exception for organizations' religious and political views. Both must be carried out.

The 1973 Home Rule Act has not come to this floor before because only three times in 25 years has it been taken up, and that was mostly because D.C. mistakenly wandered into Federal matters. That is why this Federal authority was retained in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, not to overturn local law whenever the other side simply disagreed with it.

I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amend-

ment in the RECORD along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and vote "no" on the rule. I just wanted to make that clear before I continue here.

Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating to come to the floor and have to squeeze into a very short period of time three different bills on one rule. These are three very controversial bills.

You have heard about the bill that essentially is a war on women in the District of Columbia, that denies women and men their privacy and their right to reproductive health care. We have a bill in here also that essentially tries to gut the Clean Water Act, which is very controversial and has a very direct impact on the health and well-being of the people of this country. And then we have this budget that was filed minutes before the Rules Committee met. Nobody read it.

I should also point out that the Rules Committee reports that, although the resolution waives all points of order against provisions in H.J. Res. 43, the committee is not aware of any point of order. Well, one of the points of order is the 3-day layover, which is being violated, so the committee is waiving a point of order with regard to that.

Look, we should be debating an immigration reform bill. We should be debating a pay equity bill. We should be debating an increase in the minimum wage. We should be debating a comprehensive long-term highway and transportation reauthorization bill to help rebuild this country. There are so many important things that we should be debating, and, instead, we are bringing these wedge issues to the floor. We are bringing an anti-environmental bill to the floor that is going nowhere, and we are bringing a budget to the floor that paves the way for a lot of nothing.

Unless we fix the sequestration problem, the Senate is not going to take up any of these appropriations bills, and neither should we.

We ought to put the American people first and put the electioneering off. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I love about this institution is my colleagues come to the floor with different life experiences. They come with different opinions. They come with a different set of bosses. The 700,000 folks that I call my boss back home in Georgia, I am sure, have very different views than those who call themselves the boss of my friend from Massachusetts.

But I tell you, the three bills that this rule makes in order—not that this

rule declares a foregone conclusion of passage. No. It just makes in order for debate on the floor of this House. These three bills are exactly the kind of thing that this House should be working on, and I am proud to bring it today.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, I don't serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. That is where this resolution of disapproval has come from. I did last cycle. I don't this cycle. I have heard colleague after colleague come to the floor and defend the rights of not being fired because your sister or your daughter or your son or your brother used birth control.

Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous. I can't imagine that someone would be fired for what their sister or their brother does in terms of their reproductive health choices. I agree. I agree. And if there is an opportunity to work together to prevent that from happening—that is apparently happening en masse here in the District of Columbia—I want to be a part of it.

But the truth is, it is not happening en masse. In fact, it is not happening at all. It is not happening at all.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind being lectured by my friends to get back to the business of the people. I do not mind. In fact, I am onboard with it every single day of the week. We can start earlier, and we can start later, and I will be here. But do not, Mr. Speaker, do not lecture me on getting about the business of the people and come down with story after story after story that is not what this legislation is about, that is not a problem, that is not something that any of us disagree on.

Mr. Speaker, we have some legitimate disagreements on this floor, and if we pass this rule, we will be able to get into the nitty-gritty of those disagreements.

But we do not disagree on the freedom of family members to make their own reproductive health choices without it impacting our own employment.

I will say to my friend sincerely: if we can find a case in the District of Columbia—I don't mean a case this year; I don't mean a case last year; I mean a case ever of that happening—seek me out as your partner, and I will help you. Because what folks seem to miss here in this conga line of frustration is that if we reject the D.C. Council's resolution, we return D.C. to the law of the land as it exists, when? Today. We don't take a single right away from anybody. We don't take a single freedom away from anybody. We are not interested in doing that whatsoever. What we are interested in doing is protecting religious freedom.

It turns out, if you live in Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, you might work for an institution that lobbies for life. You might work for an institution that focuses on faith. This is a town of ideas, Mr. Speaker.

In the rush to pass a piece of legislation—these are not my words. These are the words of Vincent Gray in his letter to the members of the council of the District of Columbia:

In the rush to push this bill through, the council did not take the time to protect this cathedral of freedom that we have here, did not take the time to make sure that that first and most important of our constitutional freedoms was protected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is the Constitution. There is nothing that the District of Columbia can do to undermine the Constitution. But they can cause a lot of problems for folks along the way. This is a resolution of disapproval to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill that is here, H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, my friends suggest that we are talking about clean water in this country, that this is about Republicans undermining clean water.

I will say again, as I said about the resolution of disapproval: if we pass this bill, we will roll the regulatory environment of clean water so far back, it will be just like it is today. That is what we are going to do. I just want to be clear about those radical ideas that my friends on the left have suggested.

If we have the will in this body to pass this bill, we are going to roll regulations so far back, it will be exactly like it is as I am standing here today.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill is about is preventing the regulatory overreach going forward.

Guess what: I live in Gwinnett County, Georgia. I challenge you to have a water treatment plant that does a better job than we do. We have a water fountain right there where the sewage gets treated, Mr. Speaker. You can go ahead and press that water fountain and have yourself a drink. That is how clean it is. We put it back into the lake cleaner than we take it out of the lake.

I will not be lectured by my friends in an executive office downtown about how to clean water in the State of Georgia. I promise you, I care more about clean water in Georgia than anyone on Pennsylvania Avenue does. We are succeeding today.

If we have a problem with State regulation of clean water, come to me. I will be your partner. We will work on that together.

The problem is not that Georgia isn't doing a good job. The problem is, the Feds are planning to get in the way of Georgia doing a good job. This bill will stop it. If we pass this rule, we will be able to have that debate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill that makes me the proudest is our concurrent budget resolution. My friends have lots to say about why it is this budget doesn't balance. Let's be clear: I believe that they are wrong.

But what is more important in this discussion, Mr. Speaker, is that my friends don't want the budget to balance. We had a free and open debate on this floor. We considered every budget that any Member of this Chamber wanted to offer, every single one.

An interesting thing happened, Mr. Speaker. Every Republican budget that was introduced balanced within 10

years and didn't raise taxes on hard-working Americans. Every single budget the Democrats introduced never balanced—not in 10 years, not in 20 years, not in 100 years—and every single one raised taxes on hard-working Americans by trillions of dollars. Trillions of dollars in new taxes, and it still didn't reach balance.

My friends, I understand we have a fundamental disagreement about how this country ought to be run, and I am glad that we have that debate here in this Chamber. We are a deliberative body. I respect the opinions of my friends. I do believe there is a common ground that we can come to. But, Mr. Speaker, this is that common ground today.

For years, the budget wasn't even passed in the United States Senate, much less try to bring it together so that the House and the Senate are working off a single page of music.

For the first time since 1991, this Chamber has done its job in concert with the Senate. It is no small thing. Far from being something to be criticized, it is something to be celebrated.

I don't know where the votes are going to be, Mr. Speaker. Conferencing something with the Senate is hard. I promise you that my bosses back home in Georgia have a much more conservative view of the world than many of the folks do in the United States Senate. But guess what, I don't get everything I want every day. But what I get is an opportunity to come together to build that bridge of common ground and agreement.

That is the agreement we have before us today—not my ideas, not Democratic ideas, not Republican ideas, but collaborative House-Senate ideas—a budget for the Federal Government for the first time in 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues: Take a look at this rule. You will be proud. Take a look at the work of the hard-working people in the Rules Committee upstairs—nine Republicans, four Democrats getting together late in the evening, trying to make the rules work—you will be proud.

Every single Democratic amendment was made in order on the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. The resolution of disapproval, brought exactly as the Home Rule Act intended: last used by Democrats to disapprove; today used by this Chamber.

And finally, that budget brought only after every single Member's ideas were debated, and the best rose to the top.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support from all of my colleagues for this fair and honest rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 231, the special rule governing consideration of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016, included a prophylactic waiver of points of order against its consideration and it was described as such in House

Report 114–98. Due to an unexpected change in the legislative schedule, the waiver of all points of order against consideration would now include a waiver of clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XXII, prohibiting the consideration of a conference report until the third calendar day on which the conference report has been available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is important to note that the text of the conference report and the joint explanatory statement were made available in electronic form on April 29, 2015.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 231 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

In section 2, strike “except one hour of debate.” and insert “except one hour of debate and one motion to recommit with instructions that the Managers on the part of the House—

(1) reject the austere and mindless sequester spending cuts in critical services and instead offer a plan to put the budget on a fiscally responsible path by making responsible, targeted spending cuts and by closing special interest tax breaks that benefit only the very wealthiest.

(2) provide equal increases in both defense and non-defense spending above the sequester cap levels to:

a. make necessary investments that boost the economy to create jobs, rebuild our infrastructure, educate our children and sharpen the nation’s competitive edge;

b. avoid another unnecessary and harmful government shutdown; and

c. protect national security, including law enforcement, homeland security, defense and international programs that help protect the nation; and

(3) protect Medicare and reject attempts to end Medicare’s guaranteed benefit by turning it into a voucher system that will increase costs for seniors and destabilize the traditional Medicare program that has served seniors well for half a century.

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. WOODALL. With that, 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Blum	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bost	Chabot
Allen	Boustany	Chaffetz
Amash	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Amodei	Brat	Coffman
Babin	Bridenstine	Cole
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barton	Buchanan	Comstock
Benishek	Buck	Conaway
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Cook
Bishop (MI)	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Byrne	Cramer
Black	Calvert	Crawford
Blackburn	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw

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

NAYS—181

Adams	Cleaver	Fattah
Aguilar	Clyburn	Foster
Ashford	Cohen	Fudge
Bass	Connolly	Gabbard
Beatty	Conyers	Gallego
Becerra	Cooper	Garamendi
Bera	Costa	Graham
Beyer	Courtney	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Cummings	Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
F.	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Hastings
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Higgins
Bustos	DeLauro	Himes
Butterfield	DeBene	Hinojosa
Capps	DeSaulnier	Honda
Capuano	Deutch	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Dingell	Huffman
Carney	Doggett	Israel
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	F.	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Kaptur
Cicilline	Engel	Keating
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Esty	Kennedy
Clay	Farr	Kildee

Kilmer	Moulton	Schrader	Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Scalise	Ruppersberger	Sewell (AL)	Tonko
Kind	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David	Hunter	Mooleenaar	Schweikert	Rush	Sherman	Torres
Kirkpatrick	Nadler	Serrano	Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin	Ryan (OH)	Sinema	Tsongas
Kuster	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sires	Van Hollen
Langevin	Neal	Sherman	Issa	Mulvaney	Sessions	Sanchez, Loretta	Slaughter	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Nolan	Sinema	Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus	Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Norcross	Sires	Jenkins (WV)	Neugebauer	Shuster	Schakowsky	Speier	Vela
Lawrence	O'Rourke	Slaughter	Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Simpson	Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Lee	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Johnson, Sam	Noem	Smith (MO)	Schrader	Takai	Visclosky
Levin	Pascarell	Speier	Jolly	Nugent	Smith (NE)	Scott (VA)	Takano	Walz
Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)	Jones	Nunes	Smith (NJ)	Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Takai	Jordan	Olson	Smith (TX)	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Loeb sack	Peters	Takano	Joyce	Palazzo	Stefanik		Titus	Yarmuth
Lofgren	Peterson	Thompson (CA)	Katko	Palmer	Stewart			
Lowenthal	Pingree	Thompson (MS)	Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Stivers			
Lowe y	Pocan		King (IA)	Pearce	Stutzman			
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Price (NC)	Titus	King (NY)	Perry	Thompson (PA)	Kirkpatrick	McKinley	Waters, Maxine
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Quigley	Tonko	Kinzinger (IL)	Pittenger	Thornberry	Lewis	Payne	Welch
	Rangel	Torres	Kline	Pitts	Tiberi	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Wasserman	
	Rice (NY)	Tsongas	Knight	Poe (TX)	Tipton		Schultz	
Lynch	Richmond	Van Hollen	Labrador	Poliquin	Trott			
Maloney, Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Vargas	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Turner			
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Veasey	Lamborn	Posey	Upton			
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Vela	Lance	Price, Tom	Valadao			
McCollum	Rush	Velázquez	Latta	Ratcliffe	Wagner			
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky	LoBiondo	Reed	Walberg			
McGovern	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walz	Long	Reichert	Walden			
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters, Maxine	Loudermilk	Renacci	Walker			
Meeks	Sarbanes	Watson Coleman	Love	Ribble	Walorski			
Meng	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)	Lucas	Rice (SC)	Walters, Mimi			
Moore	Schiff	Yarmuth	Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Weber (TX)			
			Lummis	Roby	Webster (FL)			
			MacArthur	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup			
			Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Westerman			
			Marino	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland			
			Massie	Rohrabacher	Whitfield			
			McCarthy	Rokita	Williams			
			McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)			
			McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman			
			McHenry	Roskam	Womack			
			McMorris	Ross	Woodall			
			Rodgers	Rothfus	Yoder			
			McSally	Rouzer	Yoho			
			Meadows	Royce	Young (AK)			
			Meehan	Russell	Young (IA)			
			Messer	Ryan (WI)	Young (IN)			
			Mica	Salmon	Zeldin			
			Miller (FL)	Sanford	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—9

Frankel (FL)	Polis	Wasserman
Lewis	Scott (VA)	Schultz
McKinley	Smith (MO)	Welch
Payne		

□ 1455

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. MCGOVERN. 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 242, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

AYES—242

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Coffman	Fox
Allen	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Amash	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Babin	Comstock	Gibbs
Barletta	Conaway	Gibson
Barr	Cook	Gohmert
Barton	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Benishkek	Cramer	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blum	Denham	Griffith
Bost	Dent	Grothman
Boustany	DeSantis	Guinta
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bridenstine	Dold	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Buck	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling
Burgess	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hill
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Holding
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Hudson
Chabot	Flores	Huelskamp
Chaffetz	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)

NOES—181

Adams	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Agullar	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Ashford	Dingell	Lawrence
Bass	Doggett	Lee
Beatty	Doyle, Michael F.	Levin
Becerra	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Bera	Edwards	Lipinski
Beyer	Ellison	Loeb sack
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Lofgren
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Bonamici	Esty	Lowe y
Boyle, Brendan F.	Farr	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Lynch
Brown (FL)	Foster	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Bustos	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Gabbard	Matsui
Capps	Galleo	McCollum
Capuano	Garamendi	McDermott
Cárdenas	Graham	McGovern
Carney	Grayson	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Meeks
Cartwright	Grijalva	Meng
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	Moore
Castro (TX)	Hahn	Moulton
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Murphy (FL)
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Nadler
Clark (MA)	Higgins	Napolitano
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Neal
Clay	Hinojosa	Nolan
Cleaver	Holiva	Norcross
Clyburn	Hoyer	O'Rourke
Cohen	Huffman	Pallone
Connolly	Israel	Pascarell
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Cooper	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Crowley	Kaptur	Pingree
Cuellar	Keating	Pocan
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Quigley
DeFazio	Kilmer	Rangel
DeGette	Kind	Rice (NY)
Delaney	Kuster	Richmond
DeLauro	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DelBene		Ruiz

NOT VOTING—8

Kirkpatrick	McKinley	Waters, Maxine
Lewis	Payne	Welch
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Wasserman	
	Schultz	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1504

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 175, answered “present” 2, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—236

Abraham	Cook	Granger
Allen	Cooper	Grayson
Amodei	Courtney	Griffith
Ashford	Cramer	Grothman
Barletta	Crawford	Guthrie
Barr	Crenshaw	Hahn
Barton	Culberson	Hardy
Beatty	Cummings	Harper
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Harris
Bilirakis	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler
Black	DelBene	Higgins
Blackburn	Dent	Himes
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Hinojosa
Bonamici	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Boustany	Deutch	Huffman
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Brat	Dingell	Hurt (VA)
Bridenstine	Doggett	Issa
Brooks (AL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Buck	Edwards	Kaptur
Bucshon	Ellison	Katko
Burgess	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Byrne	Engel	Kennedy
Calvert	Eshoo	Kildee
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	King (IA)
Carter (TX)	Farr	King (NY)
Chabot	Fattah	Kline
Chaffetz	Fincher	Knight
	Fleischmann	Kuster
	Fortenberry	Labrador
	Foster	LaMalfa
	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
	Garamendi	Latta
	Goodlatte	Lieu, Ted
	Gosar	Lipinski
	Graham	Loeb sack
		Lofgren

Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Pascarell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson

Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—175

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Bass
Benishke
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Esty
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxo
Fudge
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (IA)
Graves (MO)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Pallone

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Sires
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert

Tonko

NOT VOTING—18

Blum
Carson (IN)
Conyers
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Kirkpatrick
Lewis

Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
McKinley
Meng
Payne

Pingree
Pitts
Scott (VA)
Slaughter
Wasserman
Schultz
Welch

□ 1512

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS, THE RO- TUNDA OF THE CAPITOL, AND EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR OFFICIAL CONGRESSIONAL EVENTS SURROUNDING THE VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on House Administration and Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 43, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 43

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS.—The Capitol Grounds may be used for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on Thursday, September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.—The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to enforce the restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds in connection with the events authorized by this section.

(c) EVENT PREPARATIONS.—The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the events authorized by this section.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF ROTUNDA FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

The rotunda of the United States Capitol is authorized to be used for ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Adminis-

tration of the Senate may jointly designate. Physical preparations for the conduct of such ceremonies and activities shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate. Physical preparations for the conduct of such ceremonies and activities shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

SEC. 4. ARRANGEMENTS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.

In carrying out their duties under this concurrent resolution, the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are each authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under such arrangements as each may enter into with the heads of those departments and agencies in connection with the ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2028.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 2028.

Will the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1515

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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 29, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 22, line 7.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 25, lines 13 and 16, after each dollar amount, insert “(reduced to \$0)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, my amendment builds on the committee's work to support scientific research and development within the Department of Energy.

More than 30 years have elapsed since Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and over that time, technology and scientific knowledge have evolved significantly. However, Congress still clings to outdated technology and policy prescriptions to address today's nuclear waste issues.

The fact is that dumping our country's highly radioactive nuclear waste in a hole and hoping for the best is a 20th century solution. Instead, we must encourage the use of 21st century technology to address this issue. My amendment eliminates the money earmarked for the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Geological Repository and increases funding for the Nuclear Energy University Program within DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy so that we can better support our scientists and universities as they work to develop a 21st century solution to this problem.

According to CBO, this amendment decreases budget authority by \$75 million and has no net impact on budget outlays. The Nuclear Energy University Program is authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Pursuant to these authorities, DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy allocates up to 20 percent of its R&D to university-based programs and mission-supporting R&D and related infrastructure improvements each year.

The funds provided by my amendment will be used by the Office of Nuclear Energy to support the Nuclear Energy University Program and the efforts by our universities to research and develop ways to reduce the radiotoxicity of nuclear waste, better recycle and reuse spent nuclear fuel, and ultimately provide a 21st century solution to our nuclear waste problem.

For instance, grants provided through the Nuclear Energy University Program to the University of Nevada-

Las Vegas College of Sciences help support and maintain a world-class radiochemistry program at UNLV that is currently working to reduce the radiotoxicity of nuclear waste. In fact, the technology available to students at UNLV is so advanced that scientists working at the national laboratories often use the facilities at UNLV to conduct experiments in the field of radiochemistry.

Strengthening and supporting the research and innovations already taking place at UNLV and other universities throughout the country to solve our Nation's nuclear waste problem is a much wiser investment of Federal resources than the flawed Yucca Mountain proposal. Instead of continuing the outdated, unworkable, one-State-must-lose-for-49-States-to-win approach to this problem, why don't we invest in the development of research and technology that will allow every State to win?

For Nevada and other States throughout the country, the 21st century solution proposed by this amendment has the potential to create countless new high-paying R&D jobs by utilizing existing regional technological capabilities. It is time we stopped subscribing to 20th century ideas that waste taxpayer resources by trying to sweep our nuclear waste problems under a very expensive rug and instead invest in American innovation and ingenuity to develop solutions that will make our country a leader in the field of nuclear energy once again.

I urge my colleagues to embrace the future of nuclear waste disposal, support my amendment to help create jobs, and restore the United States role as a leader in science and technology development.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and him offering the amendment, and I appreciate his point of view and why he is offering it, but this amendment would eliminate \$150 million in the bill for the Department of Energy to reorganize its adjudicatory response team and get the Yucca Mountain licensing process back on track and running.

Yucca Mountain is the law of the land. You have to remember that. Yucca Mountain is the law of the land, even though the administration has failed to follow that law. It has seen overwhelming support in countless numbers of votes and countless numbers of times in the House and is the only permanent repository option we have on the table.

This amendment would put in jeopardy the more than \$15 billion—let me repeat that, the more than \$15 billion—that has been spent so far on this program.

Once the Yucca Mountain application is finished, all Members of this body

and the Senate will have the opportunity to decide whether to move forward to construct and use the facility, but killing the process at this point, I think, is shortsighted, even though I understand the gentleman's concern.

I, therefore, urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), \$605,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$120,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$45,000,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$45,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It is designed to reduce wasteful spending, which I think we all would like to do around here.

This year Republican appropriators increased taxpayer-funded fossil fuel research and development by \$45 million above the President's request. My amendment would simply reduce the funding for the Office of Fossil Energy by \$45 million, down to the President's requested level, and then dedicate these funds to the spending reduction account, which is something that I think all of us want to do, given how much we talk about wasteful spending and deficit reduction around here.

The five most profitable oil companies—Exxon Mobil, Shell, Chevron, BP, ConocoPhillips—together made more than a trillion in profits last decade. A trillion dollars of profit; I think that is pretty good. Fossil fuels are reaping \$550 billion a year in subsidies, four times the amount of \$120 billion paid out in incentives for renewable energy. So fossil fuels are not getting the short shrift.

Air pollution from fossil fuels costs money. Nationwide the hidden health costs of electricity generated by fossil fuels adds up to as much as \$886 billion annually, or about 6 percent of gross domestic product. I am from Minnesota, and I live in north Minneapolis, and I can tell you, Madam Chair, that children there suffer greater rates of asthma than the rest of the State, partially as a result of emissions from vehicles that run on fossil fuels.

Climate change costs money, too. Climate change will make our electricity costs go up. Greenhouse-gas-driven changes in temperature will likely increase demand for electricity. This will make it necessary for construction of up to 95 gigawatts of new power generation over the next 5 to 25 years.

Residential and commercial ratepayers will pay up to \$12 billion more per year, and people living in coastal communities could pay as much as \$35 billion a year within the next 15 years because of sea level rise and hurricane activity.

Conclusion: let's lower the deficit; let's cut wasteful spending; let's stop wasting taxpayer money on dirty fossil fuel resources that cost all of us a lot more in the long term.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is almost humorous to listen to someone who wants to reduce the deficit and put this money into the deficit reduction account but then complains that we are following sequestration, and it is just too low and too crazy, and we need to do away with sequestration. We need to be able to spend more money.

The reality is, it is not that it is the deficit reduction account; it is that it is out of the fossil fuel program, which is more than what the President recommended. The administration has priorities, and Congress has priorities. This bill reflects the priorities of the subcommittee and the full committee that brought it to the floor. The amendment would reduce funding for the fossil energy account by \$45 million in favor of deficit spending.

Fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses. Fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs for the foreseeable future.

The bill rejects the administration's proposed reductions to the fossil energy program, particularly the drastic cuts to the coal program, which is cut by \$31 million in the budget request, and instead funds these programs at \$605 million, a \$34 million increase over last year. With this additional funding, the Office of Fossil Energy will target

research into how water can be more efficiently used in power plants, how coal can be used to produce electric power through fuel cells, and how to efficiently capture and store carbon from our abundant natural resources.

This amendment would reduce funding for a program that ensures we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. Let me repeat. Fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by our Nation's homes and businesses, and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs in the foreseeable future.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, do I have time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, surely my friend and I can join together on the spending reduction account on this particular measure. It is not that much money in the scope of this big event. The fact is, we should all be trying to reduce the deficit where we can, particularly when we are talking about industries that have combined profits of a trillion dollars. A trillion.

I do not think my constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota need to foot the bill for R&D for Exxon Mobil, Shell, Chevron, BP, and ConocoPhillips. I think they should pay their own R&D if they are banking money like that. I think they are doing just fine, and they don't need more of the average taxpayer's dough.

Let me also say that we are already giving the fossil fuel industry \$550 billion a year in subsidies. Isn't that enough? Can't they live with a little less, given that they are making a trillion dollars in combined profits? We are giving them \$550 billion in subsidies, and they want more, and they just cannot possibly do with \$45 million less than we are giving them already?

I have got to tell you, I have just got a feeling that if they don't get this extra money, they will be fine. I feel ConocoPhillips and Chevron will somehow make it if they don't get our American taxpayers' \$45 million.

□ 1530

I urge a very strong "yes" in favor of this amendment for deficit reduction and to end a little bit of corporate welfare.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. The reality is ExxonMobil, all of the other companies you named, don't get this money. This money goes into research, research that fuels 85 percent of the electrical needs in this country—research.

Now, you could also say: If you are going to do that, why not take away all the money that goes into renewable energy research? Why not take away all the money that goes into wind power or into solar power or into nuclear

power or into any of the other research that we do?

It is just that some people can't fathom the fact that 85 percent—that is getting close to 100—but 85 percent of our energy is produced by fossil fuel. While the gentleman talks about deficit reduction, the reality is I think he just wants to take some money out of the fossil fuel research account.

I will be interested, being so interested in deficit reduction, how the vote comes later on with the Republican budget that will be before the House later on, so I will be watching that very closely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For Department of Energy expenses necessary to carry out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, \$17,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$212,030,000, to remain available until expended.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve storage, operation, and management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$7,600,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, \$117,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$229,193,000, to remain available until expended.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out uranium enrichment

facility decontamination and decommissioning, remedial actions, and other activities of title II of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, \$625,000,000, to be derived from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, to remain available until expended, of which \$32,959,000 shall be available in accordance with title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

SCIENCE

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of not more than 17 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one ambulance and one bus, \$5,100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$181,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,500,000)”.

Page 51, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an important amendment that ensures that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is appropriately funded to meet its core mission. The NRC's work is vital to the energy picture of our Nation, and safety remains and always will be the number one priority.

The NRC is funded in two ways: 10 percent of its budget comes from appropriated funds from the taxpayers; and, secondly, 90 percent of the fees are collected from the nuclear industry.

While I am a strong supporter of nuclear power and safety, the NRC budget has grown dramatically in the last decade from \$669 million per year in 2005 to the current level of over \$1 billion this year. Herein lies the problem.

This chart lays out the picture that we face today with the NRC. Under the NRC's 2005 budget, there were 3,108 employees responsible for oversight on 104 reactors and the review of 1,500 licensing actions. In their fiscal year 2016 budget request of \$1.032 billion, the NRC called for 3,754 employees to oversee 100 reactors and review 900 licensing actions.

In summary, the number of reactors has gone down by 4 percent; the number of licensing actions has gone down by 40 percent; the number of employees has gone up by 21 percent, and the budget has grown by 54 percent.

Madam Chair, only in Washington does the staff and the cost grow while

the workload goes down. The historical increases in both funding and staff resources occurred in anticipation of new reactors being built under a nuclear renaissance for our country.

Unfortunately, due to increasing bureaucratic red tape and other market conditions, the work never materialized; thus, a shrinking nuclear industry has faced an ever-growing regulator over the past 10 years. Only in Washington, as I said before, does the bureaucracy grow while the workload shrinks.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission even admits that it needs to downsize. In its February 2015 report entitled, “Project Aim 2020,” they said the same thing. Additionally, the NRC has 60 rulemakings underway, and they are collecting additional fees from existing reactors to make up for lost licensing revenue. These fees are ultimately paid by hard-working American families in their electricity bills.

My amendment is simple. It reduces funding by \$25 million, or about 2.5 percent, and would right-size the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to meet its core mission and safely regulate our existing nuclear fleet.

The industry share of support, or 90 percent of that, would be reduced by \$22.5 million, and the Federal share of \$2.5 would be redirected to basic research in DOE's Office of Science in order to develop future American energy solutions.

Madam Chair, in the last few minutes, I have had the opportunity to have great discussions with Chairman SIMPSON, and I am confident that he is aware of this issue and has taken steps to do this. He said he would work with me in the future to continue addressing this issue. I am raising this today, but I will be withdrawing my amendment.

I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON for his efforts to address this issue and for agreeing to work with me on the issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to thank the gentleman for being dogged on this issue. We share his concern. We had a great hearing with all the commissioners of the NRC. They also understand this concern. It was the Aim Project 2020 that they put together that realized that they have too many staff and they need to reduce it. They want to do it in a responsible way.

In the full committee, we adopted an amendment to reduce their budget by \$25 million. That is in addition to the fact that they had carryover fund that they could have spent last year that they won't have available this year.

Their budget is going down; whether it is the right amount or not, we don't know yet, but we are going to keep on

this because we want them to reestablish their credibility in the world. They need to do that because they are a regulatory agency that is very important, and they do incredibly important work.

We are going to be holding hearings again on this next year when we do their budget to make sure they are following through on their commitment to reduce their size and scope, particularly the rulemaking authority that they have got out there. Many people believe they are writing far too many rules, and some believe it is because they have too many employees.

I appreciate the gentleman offering this amendment and the discussion and offering to withdraw the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just say to the offerer of the amendment from Texas that I come from a part of the country where the Nuclear Regulatory Commission did not do its job for a long time.

I appreciate what you are attempting to do, and all I would say is, coming from a region where we have serious infractions that put human life at risk more than once, as you look at that budget and try to improve it, do not assume whatever levels of regulation existed in fact were appropriate because, in many cases, they were shortchanged and inadequate.

As you move forward in this important arena, I would urge you to look at the places in the country where mistakes happened and figure out why and then direct resources to where they are most important in this very important technology.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROKITA) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 5, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$239,749,000)”.

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$239,749,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to address an imbalance in our efforts to promote the long-term economic security interests of the United States.

This appropriations bill would underfund the Office of Science by almost \$240 million below the President's request for the next fiscal year. My amendment would correct this by bringing the Office of Science account up to the President's request level.

Investments in the DOE Office of Science and its laboratories have supported American innovation and discovery science at the forefront of the physical sciences and engineering.

It is impossible and unwise to ignore the value of our national labs. They have helped answer fundamental questions on how the universe works, supported breakthroughs in fields as diverse as medicine and astronomy and developments in industry that drive our economy.

Investments in our labs have led to the construction of accelerators and detectors that enable our scientists to discover new particles, including quarks and the Higgs boson, to help explain the nature of the universe in matter, energy, space, and time. Physicists have used their fundamental research to develop new technologies, including the PET scan, which is used every day to treat patients diagnosed with cancerous tumors.

The Office of Science has also supported the training of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers for more than 60 years. We need to maintain a competitive advantage now more than ever.

While the U.S. is reducing investments in Federal R&D, Europe and Asia have been increasing investments. In 1968, we spent 9.1 percent of the budget on research and development. Today, we are spending only 3.6 percent. If this trend continues, it won't be long before China's investments in R&D will far outpace our own.

The Office of Science is not only an important investment in our future, it is a valuable investment in our economy. Our national labs and the major user facilities housed at those labs are some of the greatest tools we have to offer researchers and industry. They are also important contractors to the local economy. The economic impacts of Argonne and Fermilab in Illinois are estimated to be more than \$1.3 billion annually.

Those who seek to underfund and eliminate Federal programs often say that the private sector can do it better,

but, when it comes to fundamental scientific research, that simply is not an option. The Office of Science is responsible for building and maintaining research facilities, which many private companies rely on but are far too big for any single business or university to develop.

These user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory, are a critical research tool to academics and industry alike. For example, Eli Lilly conducts nearly half of the research in their drug discovery portfolio at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, but the funding levels in this bill will threaten the Advanced Photon Source and other critical projects.

At a time of ongoing economic stress, we must continue to develop the next generation of the American technical workforce. As other world powers are growing and challenging our position as the global leader in science and innovation, we cannot let the number of American scientists and researchers or the quality of their research facilities diminish. Bringing the Office of Science budget up to the President's request is crucial to maintaining that quality.

I would also like to briefly discuss the offset, which is the NNSA weapons activities account. It is important for us to recognize that we need to strike the right balance between defending our country today and investing in scientific research for the future.

□ 1545

I would argue that maintaining an advantage as the global leader in science and technology makes us much more secure than amassing and maintaining excessive numbers of nuclear weapons.

Madam Chairman, I rise today because we must continue to invest in American innovation and fully fund the research and development conducted through the DOE Office of Science.

I understand that the majority party has the power to block that funding and that there will be a point of order pending against this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425), including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be made available to affected units of local government, as defined in section 2(31) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C.

10101(31)), to support the Yucca Mountain geologic repository, as authorized by such Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$150,000,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$150,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I come to the floor today on behalf of the people of Nevada to ask my colleagues to reject the failed policies of the past and concentrate our efforts on real solutions to the Nation's energy challenges.

The bill before us appropriates \$150 million for the failed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste project. Taxpayer-funded junkets and photo ops cannot change the fact that this project has never been based on sound science but, instead, stems from targeted politics.

After decades squandered and \$15 billion wasted, we are no closer to a solution than when President Reagan signed the “Screw Nevada” bill in 1988. Yet, today, the House is set to consider legislation that will waste millions more on this failed project.

Now, I have heard my colleagues say this is the law of the land. Well, the ACA is the law of the land, and that hasn't stopped them from trying to overturn it 57 times. Furthermore, it appears that although this is the so-called law of the land, the interpretation of that law is pretty flexible.

I want to bring my colleagues' attention to a particular line in this bill that appropriates \$5 million for units of local government to support Yucca Mountain. This simply creates a slush fund to pay off local governments in return for their support of this failed project.

I don't anticipate that many of my colleagues are as familiar with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as we are in Nevada, but the law clearly states that any benefits that the Federal Government may appropriate can only be provided through mutual agreement between the Federal Government and the State. Last time I checked, Republican Governor Brian Sandoval, not the House Appropriations Committee, is the chief executive of the State of Nevada, and he strongly opposes Yucca Mountain.

Madam Chairman, I will submit for the RECORD an op-ed written by Governor Sandoval and former Governor Richard Bryan, titled “Yucca Mountain: Unsafe site won't ever be safe for nuclear waste.”

[Special to the Review-Journal, Apr. 12, 2015]

**YUCCA MOUNTAIN: UNSAFE SITE WON'T EVER
BE SAFE FOR NUCLEAR WASTE**

(By Brian Sandoval and Richard Bryan)

Nevada Rep. Crescent Hardy, who joined a pro-Yucca Mountain congressional site visit this past week, recently asked the question, "Is there a scenario in which Nevadans would actually welcome nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain?" ("Time for Nevada to talk Yucca Mountain," March 22 Review-Journal).

The answer to that question is an emphatic "no" for one simple yet unavoidable reason: Because Yucca Mountain is an unsafe place for storing or disposing deadly nuclear waste and was selected for purely political reasons having nothing to do with science or suitability. There is nothing for state officials to negotiate. In fact, our leaders would be remiss in their duty to protect the public and the environment to entertain the notion that any amount of dollars could possibly compensate for likely grievous and lethal harm from siting a facility in such an unsafe location as Yucca Mountain.

From day one, science with respect to Yucca Mountain has taken a back seat to Washington, D.C., power politics.

In 1987, Congress ignored science completely and named Yucca Mountain as the only site to be studied as a potential repository in spite of its known serious flaws. Yucca was picked not because it was the best site or even a safe one. It was chosen solely because Nevada was the most politically vulnerable state at the time. Sites in Texas, Louisiana, Washington, and other states were dismissed out of hand because their states were protected by powerful Washington, D.C., politicians.

As site characterization at Yucca progressed, every time the science showed the site to be seriously flawed, the Energy Department merely invented another engineering fix—like the metal waste packages that will have to remain intact for 10,000 years or more, even though they've never been built or tested; more than 11,000 titanium drip shields that must be placed over the "corrosion-resistant" waste packages (DOE does not plan to install them for 100 years or more) in order to meet the radiation exposure criteria; and manipulating the site's boundaries so the aquifer below Yucca can be used to "dilute" the radiation that will inevitably escape from the repository.

And when even these "fixes" were not enough, the Energy Department simply abandoned its own siting criteria containing specific qualifying and disqualifying conditions (that Yucca couldn't meet) and created a black box-like assessment tool (called Total System Performance Assessment, or TSPA) that allows the site's many flaws to be camouflaged and rendered insignificant.

The way to fix the nuclear waste disposal problem is not to keep beating the dead horse that is Yucca Mountain, as Rep. John Shimkus, R-Ill., appeared to be doing with the promotional tour of the shut-down Yucca Mountain site last week. A more constructive and fruitful approach would be to move forward with new initiatives that rely on real science to identify safe and suitable storage and disposal sites and require states and local governments to give their consent to any future nuclear waste siting efforts.

Brian Sandoval, a Republican, is governor of Nevada. Richard Bryan, a Democrat, is a former Nevada governor and U.S. senator, and chairman of the Nevada Commission on Nuclear Projects.

Ms. TITUS. Also, the committee's report language sites that this hush money is provided for local govern-

ments that give "formal consent." This raises yet another question about the intent of this section. The law does not outline any process for giving formal consent, so how would the newly bribed localities be able to provide that consent?

If you are looking for consent, I urge you to support H.R. 1364, the Nuclear Waste Informed Consent Act, which I introduced, along with my colleague Congressman HECK and Senators REID and HELLER. This bipartisan legislation sets out a formal consent process so that Nevada or Texas or New Mexico or any other State and affected local community or tribe that chooses to host a nuclear waste depository will have a process by which it can give consent for siting by the Federal Government. No community should have to face what we in Nevada have faced for the last few decades of having this pushed down our throat.

Madam Chairman, I will also submit for the RECORD two articles outlining nuclear waste storage proposals that are supported in the State of Texas and the State of New Mexico.

[West Texas Radio, Feb. 13, 2015]

**COMPANY WANTS TO EXPAND NUCLEAR WASTE
SITE IN TEXAS**

(By Travis Bubenik)

A Dallas-based company is looking to expand its nuclear waste site in rural West Texas into a longer-term storage site for high-level radioactive waste.

Waste Control Specialists (WCS) is asking the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission to approve a new license to expand its above-ground storage facility in Andrews County to allow more radioactive types of waste.

The company already stores "low level" waste—contaminated rags, tools and other equipment that have come mostly from the national nuclear research lab in Los Alamos, New Mexico.

The site also served as a home for waste that was supposed to wind up at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico, until that site was shuttered after a leak contaminated workers there about a year ago.

WCS now wants to store used fuel rods from nuclear power plants across the country—a more radioactive form of waste.

In theory, the waste would stay in West Texas temporarily—until the federal government comes up with a long-term disposal plan—but it could be decades before that happens.

"Even though it is called an interim storage facility, that storage period is a long time," says WCS President Rod Baltzer. "We think that's somewhere between 60 to 100 years."

Baltzer was in Washington, D.C. Monday talking to reporters about the company's push to expand the facility.

"This wasn't initially something we intended to do when we got out there, but we've been out there a long time, and times have changed," he says.

Those changes have riled some environmentalists in Texas.

The Sierra Club has criticized the company for its track record of slowly expanding its intentions for the West Texas site. The environmental group says the company's misled lawmakers and the public as it's sought to store more radioactive types of waste through the years.

Cyrus Reed, Conservation Director for the Sierra Club's Lone Star Chapter, says he's

watched with concern while the company's plan for the site grew from storing low level waste to larger quantities of the same waste.

"Now it turns out we are to become the nation's dumping ground for all manner of dangerous highly toxic radioactive waste," he says.

WCS maintains it can store the waste safely, and that the community in Andrews County has welcomed the idea.

Baltzer says the company is fulfilling the Obama Administration's call in 2013 for a "consent-based" approach to transporting, storing and disposing of the nation's nuclear waste.

That strategy instructs the government to seek out communities willing to house nuclear waste "in expectation of the economy activity that would result from the siting, construction and operation of such a facility in their communities."

For now, Andrews County appears to be that kind of place. County Commissioners recently passed a resolution enthusiastically backing the plan.

If the Nuclear Regulatory Commission gives WCS the green light, the company says construction on the expanded facility could be complete by the end of 2020.

[From the Associated Press, Apr. 30, 2015]

**NEW MEXICO JOINS RACE TO BUILD STORAGE
FOR NUCLEAR WASTE**

(By Susan Montoya Bryan)

Two rural New Mexico counties announced Wednesday they're partnering with an international firm in the race to build an interim storage facility to house spent nuclear fuel that has been piling up at reactors around the nation.

Officials from Lea and Eddy counties and Holtec International gathered at the National Museum of Nuclear Science and History in Albuquerque to outline their plans.

John Heaton, a former state lawmaker and chairman of the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, a consortium of city and county governments, said there's no better place in the U.S. than southeastern New Mexico to build such a facility since the region is already home to a multibillion-dollar uranium enrichment plant and the federal government's only underground nuclear waste repository.

Heaton acknowledged that in vetting the project, safety was the top priority.

The region is still rebounding from the indefinite closure of the government's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, where a chemical reaction inside a drum of waste resulted in a radiation release in February 2014. The U.S. Department of Energy has said it will take years and more than a half-billion dollars before the repository resumes full operations.

The proposed storage facility would be designed to handle spent nuclear fuel from power plants, not the kind of defense-related waste that was shipped to WIPP.

Holtec CEO and President Kris Singh said his company has spent more than a decade developing technology to ensure the safe storage of spent fuel inside triple-lined stainless steel casks that are capable of enduring the force of a freight train collision or an earthquake.

"We became convinced that this is an extraordinary, safe process that needs to occur in this country," Heaton said.

Federal officials acknowledged that the future of nuclear energy in the U.S. depends on the ability to manage and dispose of used nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

In March, the DOE announced it would begin siting interim storage sites as part of its plan to spur the use of nuclear power and develop the transportation and storage infrastructure needed to manage the waste.

Some members of Congress have shown renewed interest in the mothballed Yucca Mountain project in Nevada.

In West Texas, Waste Control Specialists announced plans earlier this year to build a temporary storage facility that would eventually be capable of holding up to 40,000 metric tons.

Yucca Mountain was designed with a cap of 70,000 metric tons. The proposed facility in southeastern New Mexico would hold even more.

The agreement between Holtec and the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance addresses the design, licensing, construction and operation of an underground storage site on 32 acres between the communities of Carlsbad and Hobbs.

Holtec officials say the company expects to apply for a permit from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission within a year. State permits would also be required. Licensing could take three years.

"It's a tough road to get any nuclear project off the ground, otherwise we would have repositories and interim storage facilities all over the country," Heaton said. "We have great partners and the will to get it done."

Gov. Susana Martinez weighed in earlier this month. She sent a letter to Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz as a preliminary endorsement of the proposal.

Watchdogs have raised concerns, pointing to transportation issues and the possibility that New Mexico could become a permanent repository for such waste. Supporters said Wednesday they would have to work with communities along the transportation routes, just as they did when setting up the network for shipping waste to WIPP.

Holtec officials were reluctant to put a price tag on the venture, but Heaton said it could involve anywhere from \$200 million to \$400 million in capital costs.

The revenue the storage facility could bring in for the counties and the state would ultimately depend on how big of a share of the market Holtec could attract, Singh said.

Ms. TITUS. So I would say, Madam Chairman, instead of wasting tens of millions of dollars more on an unworkable solution, let's, instead, meet our fiduciary obligations to future generations. At the same time, let us commit to moving forward on a new policy to address the Nation's nuclear waste, one that relies on a consent-based system that doesn't force waste on communities like mine, which is the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and send a message that Congress will not continue to move backwards but will take serious action to address our Nation's nuclear waste policy.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I understand the lady's passion for this, but some of the rhetoric, quite frankly, isn't accurate.

When she calls it a failed policy, it is only a failed policy politically because this administration came into office on a promise of not doing Yucca Mountain because they needed electoral votes

from the State of Nevada. That is the reality.

The fact is we have spent over \$15 billion on this project, and the fact is it is the law of the land. Until you change that law of the land, it remains the law of the land.

Whether it is safe or not, I don't know. I am not a scientist. But what I do know is there has been 52—I think it is 52—National Academy of Sciences studies on all sorts of aspects. This is the most studied piece of earth on the Earth. In fact, I have suggested during a hearing with the Department that if we ultimately decide not to do Yucca Mountain, they shouldn't close that down because they are going to need a space that big to put all the papers from the studies that we have done on Yucca Mountain. That is the reality.

I think we all understand my colleague's opposition to Yucca Mountain. I don't blame her. I know she is from Nevada. But I can't support this amendment. This amendment would eliminate \$150 million in the bill for the Department of Energy to reorganize its adjudicatory response team and get the Yucca Mountain licensing process back up and running. Otherwise, more than \$15 billion which has been spent on this program will truly be wasted.

Once that application is finished, all Members of this body, all Members of this body and the Senate will have the opportunity to decide whether to move forward, to construct and use the facility. But killing the process at this point, I think, would be very shortsighted. I therefore urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague, but he does not address the points I make about how this amendment looks at provisions of the bill that are contrary to the new proposal.

I urge a "no" vote. There is no point in throwing good money after bad. American taxpayers deserve a wiser expenditure of their dollars. Nevadans deserve to be heard on this issue, and those areas that want to have a site in their State or their community deserve a chance to be considered.

I thank you, and I urge, strongly, a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairman

for acting to impose greater discipline on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

We know that the future of nuclear power in the United States depends on having a credible nuclear safety regulator and depends on the industry continuing to perform at a high level of safety. We feel strongly that the agency must continue its core mission of protecting the public health and safety, but the NRC must do so in a manner that does not add to the economic headwinds that the industry faces.

Thanks to the scientific breakthroughs and renewed interest in nuclear energy, our Nation has an incredible opportunity to develop new sources of power that can provide affordable and reliable energy. I hope that the NRC can work with industry to seize these opportunities, while fulfilling its mission to ensure public safety.

I support the committee's direction to require the NRC's rulemaking process to be commission-driven in order to provide greater discipline, transparency, efficiency, and accountability.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—
ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out the activities authorized by section 5012 of the America COMPETES Act (Public Law 110-69), \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$28,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF
CALIFORNIA

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of Mr. SCHIFF of California and Mr. POLIS of Colorado, which would increase funding for the Advanced Research Project Agency-Energy, also known as ARPA-E. Mr. SCHIFF offered this same exact amendment last year, and it passed the House with bipartisan support. I hope the House will vote in support of it again.

Like the House's mark last year, the underlying bill this year provides \$280

million for ARPA-E, which is \$45 million below the President's request. This amendment would increase funding for ARPA-E by \$20 million, with the offset taken from the Department administration.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for providing at least level funding for ARPA-E this year, which is a substantial improvement from last year, which cut the program by as much as 80 percent over previous years.

However, I think that rather than providing flat funding, we should be stepping up our commitment to a potentially game-changing research program, and that is exactly what this amendment does.

This is a very modest investment for an agency whose work is helping to reshape our economy. While the amendment would leave us still short of where the funding should be and where it is in the President's budget, passing it would send a strong signal that there is bipartisan support for this kind of research.

Started in 2009, ARPA-E is a revolutionary program that advances high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that are too early for private sector investment. ARPA-E projects have the potential to radically improve U.S. economic security, national security, and environmental well-being as well.

ARPA-E empowers America's energy researchers with funding, technical assistance, and market readiness. ARPA-E is modeled after the highly successful Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, which has produced groundbreaking inventions for the Department of Defense and the Nation, perhaps most notably the Internet itself. A key element of both Agencies is that managers are limited to fixed terms, so new blood continuously revitalizes this research portfolio.

As we cut spending to return the budget to balance, we must not weaken those programs that are vital to our economic future and national security, and ARPA-E is such an agency. Even if we can't make the investment that the President has called for in his budget, let's be sure that we don't hinder an agency that is pointing the way to a more energy-secure future.

Energy is a national security issue; it is an economic imperative; it is a health concern; and it is an environmental necessity. Investing wisely in this type of research going on at ARPA-E is exactly the direction we should be going as a nation.

We want to lead the energy revolution. We don't want to see this advantage go to China or anywhere else in the world. If we are serious about staying at the forefront of the energy revolution, we must continue to fully invest in the kind of cutting-edge work that ARPA-E performs. By providing the funding I am recommending today, we will send a clear signal of the seri-

ousness of our intent to remain world leaders in energy.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time reluctantly. I happen to be one who thinks the ARPA-E does some good work. My biggest problem is that, as I said last night on either the first or second amendment that was offered to this bill, they took money out of departmental administration to fund something, and then another one to take money out of departmental administration. So far we have taken out about \$50 million out of a \$245 million budget for the departmental administration.

It is easy to vote that way because who wants to pay for the administrative costs? Yet we are going to have to deal with that when we get into conference to make sure that they have adequate funding in the Department for the administrative work.

□ 1600

So at some point in time, I have to say I can't support continuing to take money out of the departmental administration in order to fund a variety of programs, even though some of them may be very worthwhile.

And while I, myself, am not opposed to ARPA-E and think they do some good work, the reality is, you have to balance this bill.

We have got ARPA-E down \$266 million from what it was last year and substantially below what the President requested, but we had other priorities that we had to fund. And the other thing I had to consider is that the Science and Technology Committee—that is, the authorizing committee that does much of this work—has marked up a bill in their committee that substantially reduces the overall funding authorization for ARPA-E. So that causes me some concern.

While I may or may not agree with their markup—I don't know; we will see when that hits the floor—that is the reason that I am going to oppose this amendment.

Other than that, I understand what the gentleman is trying to do and the concern that many people have for the decrease in funding in ARPA-E.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE 17 INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Such sums as are derived from amounts received from borrowers pursuant to section 1702(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 under this heading in prior Acts, shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That, for necessary administrative expenses to carry out this Loan Guarantee program, \$42,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided further*, That \$25,000,000 of the fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account to cover administrative expenses and shall remain available until expended, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$17,000,000: *Provided further*, That fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the amount appropriated for administrative expenses shall not be available until appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department of Energy shall not subordinate any loan obligation to other financing in violation of section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 or subordinate any Guaranteed Obligation to any loan or other debt obligations in violation of section 609.10 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

For Department of Energy administrative expenses necessary in carrying out the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, \$6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), \$247,420,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$30,000, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$117,171,000 in fiscal year 2016 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$130,249,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$31,297,000 is for Energy Policy and Systems Analysis.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, let me begin by thanking Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for the work that they have done, a very challenging and popular appropriations when it comes to energy and water and also the issues of the environment.

I have a very simple amendment that reinforces our commitment to communities from rural America to urban America, from hamlets and villages to large urban centers. And it simply emphasizes a quality of life: for all Americans to have a good, clean environment; to reduce asthma in children; to help senior citizens; and to have a good quality of life in their sunset years, in their older homes, in older communities, of which I represent, is an important funding necessity for this Nation.

I want to emphasize the work that has been done and remind my colleagues—for those of us who had the privilege of being here—that President Clinton issued an executive order directing Federal agencies to address the disproportionately high and adverse human health environmental impacts on minority and low-income populations, which covered rural America, which oftentimes experienced the impact of the environment.

We have worked over the years to improve their quality of life, and today I ask that we continue to do so.

In particular, I want to refer to a project in Houston, Texas, called the CAS site. That site was attempted to be cleaned up. It is in an older neighborhood, Madam Chair. Senior citizens own their homes. They have been there for a long time.

There have been a lot of machinations about this entity that is espousing chemicals, leaking chemicals because it is old and closed down and abandoned. And we had to call upon the environmental justice sector in the Federal Government to provide the leverage to help these senior citizens, people who did not want to move from their homes.

I walked those streets, went into the backyards of senior citizens and saw the seepage coming out of the ground and, as well, coming in from the property on the back side.

Environmental justice is a good thing, and it is through those efforts that we are working with the EPA to give hope to these citizens that they can stay in their homes.

I live in the energy capital of the world. It is a job-creator. But on occasions, in the midst of our wetlands and our areas of pristine, if you will, environmental assets, we have some ups and downs.

Just recently, I flew over the Houston port at the time of a spillage that

was impacting some of our most environmentally important areas, including wetlands and areas that are protected or are important to the environment and to the quality of life.

So I am asking that the Jackson Lee amendment be accepted for the importance of providing for the continued support of environmental justice and equality for areas that are both urban and rural.

Let me finish by making this statement, Madam Chair.

This is an important cause because, as we look at the funds that are dealing with environmental justice, they increase youth involvement through science, technology, engineering, and math. They also help to promote clean energy, weatherization, cleanup, asset revitalization, and they help my constituents and the constituents of so many in this body whose older neighborhoods are sometimes impacted by older entities that are left behind in the neighborhood where seniors continue to live. I want to be able to walk those neighborhoods and make sure that my seniors can stay in their homes—small frame homes—and make sure that as they stay in their frame homes, that they will have the quality of life that all of us would like.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member. This is a tough job to do. And I would like to emphasize the importance of the funding for environmental justice and helping to continue, if you will, to put focus and emphasis on quality of life for homeowners, seniors, and people living in rural America and urban America.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment increases funding for DOE departmental administration by \$1,000,000 which should be used to enhance the Department's Environmental Justice Program activities.

Madam Chair, the Environmental Justice Program is an essential tool in the effort to improve the lives of low-income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

A healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Maintaining funds for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Minority-Serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges, and other organizations is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment.

The funding of these programs is vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environ-

ment and the continued preservation of their homes.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

IMPORTANCE OF DOE'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Funds that would be awarded to this important cause would increase youth involvement in STEM fields and also promote clean energy, weatherization, clean-up, and asset revitalization. These improvements would provide protection to our most vulnerable groups.

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities. Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture have distributed over 5,000 computers to low-income populations.

The Community Leaders Institute is another vital component of the Environmental Justice Program. It ensures that those in leadership positions understand what is happening in their communities and can therefore make informed decisions in regards to their communities.

In addition to promoting environmental sustainability, CLI also brings important factors including public health and economic development into the discussion for community leaders.

The CLI program has been expanded to better serve Native Americans and Alaska Natives, which is a prime example of how various other minority groups can be assisted as well.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefited by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. The DOE also works to increase low-income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

Since 2002, the Tribal Energy Program has also funded 175 energy projects amounting to over \$41.8 million in order to help tribes invest in renewable sources of energy.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

In fiscal year 2013, the environmental justice program was not funded.

For fiscal year 2016, we ask that money be appropriated for the continuation of this vital initiative.

We must help our low-income and minority communities and ensure equality for those who are most vulnerable in our country.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment for the Environmental Justice Program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978,

\$46,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$8,713,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$92,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON.
RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL
YEAR 2016

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 29, 2015, at page H2516.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking everyone involved in getting us to this moment, where we have an agreement between the House and the Senate Budget conferees on a joint balanced budget proposal before the Congress.

All members of our committee and the conference committee and their

staffs should be commended for their hard work. And I want to commend specifically the staff directors on both sides of the aisle. Rick May on the Republican side and Tom Kahn on the Democratic side worked yeoman's service in making certain that their respective Members were prepared for the activity that we have gone through over the past 4 months.

We are set, Mr. Speaker, to adopt the first balanced budget of this kind in over a decade. That is important not only from an historical perspective but also for what it says about this Congress' commitment to doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, to get it done, to move forward with positive solutions for a healthier economy and a stronger, more secure nation.

□ 1615

What we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, is a budget that balances within 10 years without raising taxes and reduces spending over \$5 trillion over that period of time, which will not only get Washington's fiscal house in order, but pave the way for stronger economic growth, more jobs, and more opportunity.

It invests in our Nation's priorities, ensures a strong national defense, and saves, strengthens, and protects important programs like Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I know our friends on the other side of the aisle, we will hear from them, and they may have a difference of opinion. If past is prologue, we are bound to hear from them a few items that they will talk about. They will say that our budget will, in their words, "hurt the middle class." That statement bears no resemblance to reality, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, what is hurting the middle class right now are the policies of our Democrat friends and President Obama that they have put in place, policies that have led to the worst economic recovery in the modern era, stagnant wages and underwhelming growth in our economy. We just heard today, Mr. Speaker, that the economy grew in the first quarter by 0.2 percent. There is a reason for that.

What we need to do is to get the economy rolling. The best thing we can do for the middle class—for hard-working American families—is to get our economy turned around so more jobs are being created and more dreams are being realized.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. Our budget does just that through responsible reforms that make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable by lifting the oppressive regulatory regime here in Washington off the backs of job creators and entrepreneurs and by fundamentally reforming our Tax Code so it is simpler, fairer, and American companies can better compete more effectively in the global economy.

By doing all of that, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office tells us

that we will rein in deficits and lower government spending which will have a positive, long-term impact on the economy as well as the budget, benefits like increases in the pool of national savings and investment which would allow for more growth, job creation, and more economic security.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of attacking our efforts to save, strengthen, and protect programs like Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Why some folks here in Washington would be willing to let these programs go bankrupt is beyond me. Medicare and Social Security are going broke. That is not according to me. That is according to the trustees of the programs.

Medicaid is not working for patients or the doctors who would like to be able to serve them. The status quo is unsustainable, and doing nothing is indefensible. We can save these programs and improve them. We have to do so for the sake of their beneficiaries and for future generations, and our budget does just that.

Further, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before, our budget prioritizes the safety and security of the American people, channeling important resources to our men and women in uniform. We do so in a responsible way, in a manner consistent with current law, and without allowing further across-the-board cuts in defense spending.

There are those who criticize how we do that, and I respect that there are differences of opinion on this, but, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can all agree that, when we are faced with hugely complex national security threats and growing unrest around the world, what we need to do is to find a way to move forward to ensure that those protecting our lives and our freedom have the support and the training that they need.

I look forward to an open and honest debate about the vision we have put forward to get our Nation's fiscal house in order, to strengthen our Nation's defenses, to protect our most vulnerable citizens, and to ensure a healthier economy for all Americans because that is exactly what this budget agreement does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong opposition to this budget conference report.

I do agree with the gentleman on one issue, which is that the staff of the Budget Committee on both sides, Republican and Democrat, have worked very hard; but, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the product that is brought before us today is the wrong direction for America.

We began with a House budget that was wrong for America, and we went to conference with a Senate budget that was wrong for America. It is not surprising, but it is still disappointing,

that we come to the floor today with a budget that is wrong for America.

Why do I say that? We are all entitled to our opinions, but we don't get to make up our own facts. The reality is, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the folks who are referees in this House, in this Congress, where people have competing opinions, they have said that this Republican budget will slow down the economy over the next couple of years.

It is right here on page 3 of their report. Real GNP, real economic growth per person, would be lowered by as much as 0.6 percent under the specified paths than under the baseline 2016 to 2018 CBO budget estimates.

Let's translate that. What that means is that, compared to what would happen in the economy without the Republican budget—if we didn't have this—this will make things worse. This will slow down economic growth. This means less economic growth per person in the United States of America. That is not me saying it, that is the nonpartisan budget experts saying it. So it is going to slow down economic growth, although we have good news, some good news in the economy, right. I mean, we have seen month after month now of positive economic growth. We would like to see the economy grow faster, and we would like to see it grow stronger, but we have seen over 61 consecutive months of positive economic growth. Why in the world would we want a budget that over the next couple of years slows down that economic growth, according to the Congressional Budget Office?

But it gets worse than that because one of the chronic problems we have seen in our economy, Mr. Speaker, over the last many years—not just 2 or 3 or 4, but over decades—is this phenomenon where Americans are working harder than ever and they are more productive than ever, but their paychecks are flat. Their take-home pay is flat.

You have rising worker productivity on the one hand; people are working harder than ever, but it is not translating into higher wages and benefits.

Back about 30 or 40 years ago—we had a chart with rising worker productivity—guess what else was rising with it? It was worker wages. But, over the last 30 years, we have seen people working harder than ever, and productivity has gone up, but wages for most Americans have been pretty flat in real terms.

The gain of that increased worker productivity has flowed dramatically and overwhelmingly to folks at the very top end of the economic ladder, and God bless them. But why would we want to bring a budget to the floor of the House that squeezes even tighter and harder the people who are working hard every day and not seeing their paychecks go up?

How does their budget make life harder for most Americans? First of all, Mr. Speaker, it increases taxes on

working families. They get rid of the bump up in the Child Tax Credit. They get rid of the strengthening of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

They eliminate entirely the college deduction that helps families afford college in this era of high tuition rates; they get rid of that. They eliminate the Affordable Care Act tax credits, meaning millions of Americans will no longer be able to access affordable care.

Students, they actually start charging students higher interest rates on their loans. Right now, a student in college doesn't have to pay interest on their loan while they are in college. Our Republican colleagues apparently think that \$1 trillion of student debt is not enough. They want to charge them more. It is a fact under this budget.

Seniors, they want to reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole. It is not a secret. They have said they will do this. As a result, seniors with high prescription drug costs on Medicare will be paying lots more, and they will be paying higher copays for preventative health care under this Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, working families, students, and seniors are all squeezed even tighter.

I will tell you who is not squeezed at all under this budget, the folks at the very top. This budget green-lights the Romney-Ryan tax plan. What does that plan propose? Let's cut the top tax rate for millionaires by one-third—by one-third. Let's take it down from 39 percent to the 28, 25 percent range. That is who gets a big break in their tax rates.

While they are cutting tax rates for folks at the very top, what else are they cutting? They are cutting our investment in our kids' education. They are cutting our investment in science and research at places like NIH. They are cutting our investment in modernizing our infrastructure which has helped power our economy.

Why? It is because they are cutting the portion of the budget we use to make those investments by 40 percent below the lowest level as a share of the economy since we have been keeping records in the 1950s. That is a disinvestment in America, so they are cutting those investments.

I will tell you what they don't cut, Mr. Speaker. They don't cut one special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit, not one penny. Apparently, that corporate jet tax deduction? Oh, they really need it. Apparently, that special tax rate for hedge fund managers? They really need it because they don't want to eliminate any of those in order to reduce the deficit. They do apparently want to increase taxes on working families and cut our investment in education.

Here is the sad part about it, Mr. Speaker. After all that, it still doesn't balance, not by a long shot. Here is the chart. I'm sorry we have to go through this math so many times, but I will tell you that the current chairman of the

Senate Budget Committee, Senator ENZI, before he became chairman, talked about this budget accounting scam that is at the heart of the Republican budget and at the heart of the claim that they have a balanced budget because, you see, they claim that, at the end of the 10-year window, they are \$33 billion in balance, but they also say they are eliminating the Affordable Care Act.

Guess what, the budget relies on the same level of revenue as the Affordable Care Act. If you get rid of the Affordable Care Act in those revenues, you are not close to balance.

I will tell you what else it doesn't take into account, the tax provisions. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that we had on this floor, just about 10 days ago, a Republican proposal to eliminate the estate tax for estates over \$10 million.

That was the overwhelming economic priority of our Republican colleagues, to get rid of the estate tax for estates over \$10 million, about 5,500 people in this country per year. You can put more people on a big cruise ship. That added about \$260 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

Guess what, it wasn't accounted for in the Republican budget. If you did account for that in the other tax cut measures for special interests that are being brought to the floor, it is even further out of balance, so this is just Alice in Wonderland accounting.

Mr. Speaker, we really should be going back to the drawing board. We haven't even talked about the whole sort of shell game being played with the OCO account, which is already having an impact on appropriations bills here in the House because our Republican colleagues are doing this year the exact opposite of what they said we should do just last year. Read the Republican's own budget conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with respect to veterans because the reality is that the first bill coming to the floor based on this budget conference report for veterans and military construction, the Veterans of Foreign Wars says it is bad for veterans.

It has a lower amount for our veterans than in the President's proposal. We believe we should be true to the values and priorities of this country, and we don't think that means giving folks at the very top, millionaires, another cut in their tax rate while disinvesting in the rest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I must strongly oppose this Republican conference committee report because it really does take America down the wrong path, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the distinguished vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

□ 1630

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman PRICE for his

extraordinary leadership throughout this entire process. And I want to thank my fellow conferees for their hard work, many hours over many days, to get us to where we are today and, of course, my fellow Budget Committee members, both Republican and Democrat, for the robust discussion, debate, spirit, as it was sometimes. The process worked. We did go late into the night a few times. But we came out of those late nights, those long hours, with the product here today.

The product here today, unfortunately, is a more rare product than it should be. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 2001, 14 years, we have a balanced joint budget resolution, bicameral.

As a relatively new person to this Chamber, in my fifth year, and you think about why that is the case, you, unfortunately, in my opinion, have to conclude it is because most of the time we are talking about the demagoguery, like some of which we just heard, half the story, so to speak, about what is really going on here. If we had full discussions about where this country really needs to go, where this Federal Government needs to go in terms of improving its debt and deficit picture, the whole budget picture, you would really see that the economy in this country could be better off with those honest, full discussions.

This budget, for example, does balance in less than 10 years without raising taxes—without raising taxes. The gentleman very much knows that the Budget Committee doesn't write tax prescriptions; it is the Ways and Means Committee. We say in our budget document that the Ways and Means Committee should get on with the business of tax reform.

What the Congressional Budget Office that the gentleman mentioned says is that over the 10-year window of this budget agreement, the economy will grow \$400 billion. That is hardly a contraction. \$400 billion, at least to some of us, is a lot of money, and that is great for economic growth. This budget agreement does that.

Do you see what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by "the whole story"?

It also ensures a strong national defense, making sure that our troops have the money they need, but remain accountable to the money that is given. It gives us a chance to repeal in full, taxes and all, ObamaCare, and allows us a chance to start over with patient-centered health reform. It hasn't been done. We haven't had that chance in a long time. ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, is an expensive proposition, and we are seeing more and more proof of that every day.

It strengthens Medicare in the future without affecting those in or near retirement now. This is important. Some of us, for my friends on the conservative side, have looked at the press reports and found, hey, we have given up on Medicare. Absolutely not; nor for Social Security.

These are the drivers of our debt, Mr. Speaker, and our budget language remains intact. The fact of the matter is this conference committee report is numerically driven, not policy driven.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROKITA. And for everyone, this is what is driving our debt. These pieces of the pie. They are all attached together, whether it is Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid, or the interest we owe ourselves and others for the amount of money we are borrowing.

Our ideas for correcting this debt, the drivers of our debt, are still in place. I call upon the authorizing committees, whether it be Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, or any other committee, to start working on reforming this debt.

This budget agreement, Mr. Speaker, gives us the opportunity, finally, after 14 years, to start down that road. This is not a conclusion; this is a beginning, and I ask my Democratic friends to join us down that road.

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

I would actually encourage all those authorizing committees to get to work trying to implement this budget so the American people can see just how bad it is. I would be curious as to whether they are actually going to do it in the next couple of months.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

I rise in strong opposition to this budget.

There is football and then there is fantasy football. Mr. Ranking Member, you were being very charitable when you used the word "scam." This is a real lemon by any stretch—and you don't have to use your imagination.

This is a formula for another 2007–2008. This will be a duplication. And the pain caused by that decade, that 8 years of the 21st century, the budgets from 2001–2008 when we cut taxes in 2001 and we cut taxes in 2003, and then 2007 and 2008 the world fell apart. Why? An enormous loss of jobs every month. Look at the numbers. You want to hold up charts, hold them up.

This agreement uses gimmicks to balance the budget and does so on the backs of the poor and the middle class and senior citizens. It imposes its cuts on programs that assist low- and middle-income Americans even though they constitute—those programs—less than one-fourth of the Federal spending.

The Republican plan would cause tens of millions of people to become uninsured or underinsured. I know how you are careful to even talk about that. In other words, if we are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, make

sure you put in a sentence about what we need to do about those people who have preconditions.

Phony, phony, phony. You said it; we didn't.

Slashing funding for education, for research, for infrastructure. Wait until the bridges fall down and more people fall into the water. Cuts to nutrition, cuts to health will only increase poverty. Your claims that this budget balances is a total farce—not a semi-farce, a total farce.

Congressman VAN HOLLEN produced a very strong, fair budget. It was a strong budget. It was dismissed. But I like it. I like it. Through the Chair to my ranking member, I like it when we are seen as irrelevant. We do our best work.

So that is what you have got in front of you. This budget, while calling for a complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act, continues to assume the law's \$2 trillion revenue. That is not a farce. That is fantasy football. How could you do that? The bill stinks, but we will use the money in the bill. Explain that one.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCARELL. To me, when we get the taxes, this budget assumes that revenues remained unchanged from our current law. Someone needs to have a conversation with the chairman of Ways and Means, because he seems to be unaware. In fact, he stated explicitly that he doesn't think we should be using the current law baseline. He said it; I didn't.

Two weeks ago, this same majority—and I end on this point, Mr. Speaker—we passed \$294.8 billion in unpaid-for tax breaks for Paris Hilton and Ivanka Trump and the rest of that crowd and their fortune enough to be left a nice inheritance. Much of that money has never been taxed in the first place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to other Members in the second person.

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

As I said when we talked about this the first time around, folks across this land, if they turn on the television and they take a look, you have got one parent yelling at the other: Hide the dog and the cat and the kids, sweetheart, they are talking about the budget.

The distortion and the misrepresentation that is coming from the other side, Mr. Speaker, it really is absolutely phenomenal.

I am pleased to hear that the gentleman likes their budget, and I commend him for liking their budget; but let me just state for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that neither their budget nor the President's budget ever, ever, ever gets to balance. If the American people can't live on borrowed money, their

Federal Government ought not do so either.

Our budget gets to balance within a 10-year period of time. It does so without raising taxes. That is why the American people are going to appreciate the work that is being done right here.

I am very, very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), an incredibly productive member of our committee, and a member of the conference committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a year makes. Since I came to Congress in 2011, my House Republican colleagues and I worked every year to pass a responsible, timely budget that confronts our runaway spending in Washington; but meanwhile, the Senate Democrats refused to pass a budget during 4 of the last 5 years. That ends now.

This year, our new American Congress worked to pass a balanced budget in both the House and the Senate and to then unify our budgets through regular order. I had the distinct privilege of serving on the budget conference committee, and I am pleased with the final product that we were able to deliver. This will mark the first balanced budget, joint budget resolution, since 2002, and we did it without raising taxes.

But we didn't stop there. This budget would also erase the President's disastrous healthcare law, allowing us to start over on reforms that put patients and their doctors in charge, not Washington bureaucrats. And we used the critical reconciliation tool to help ensure an ObamaCare repeal bill that reaches the President's desk so that we can put him on record, forcing him to make a decision and defend that to the American people.

What is more, this plan supports the growth of 1.2 million jobs over the next decade, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said many times before, budgets aren't just a series of numbers; they are a statement of our values. I believe the priorities found in this budget are shared by my constituents and reflect the values that we can all be proud of.

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

We keep hearing this mathematical fantasy that somehow the Republican budget balances.

I just want to turn to an authority. He is the now-chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. Here is what he said last year:

One of the problems I have had with budgets that I have looked at is that they use a lot of gimmicks. Now, when there was an anticipation that ObamaCare would go away, and that all of that money would still be there, that's not realistic. I'd like to see us get to a real accounting with the budget.

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker; the Affordable Care Act is still here, the

revenue is still here, and the Republican budget assumes that revenue for the purpose of achieving balance at the same time they are getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. That leaves people's heads spinning and it means the budget is not in balance.

I am now happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. VAN HOLLEN yielding.

We are talking a lot about gimmicks. Even the conservative Financial Times said the Republicans had to resort to smoke and mirrors to make this budget balance. But I want to talk about one of the other tricks that is used.

What the Republicans' budget uses is they do something called dynamic scoring, which basically allows you to project all sorts of, probably, at least, speculative growth based on policies that they would anticipate doing.

Now, here is a real-world example of that. This weekend is the Kentucky Derby. It would be as if somebody went out and said: I am going to buy a 2-year-old for \$2 million. And then that 2-year-old I am sure is going to win the Kentucky Derby, so I am going to use that \$3 million purse that that horse is certainly going to win next year, and I am going to plug that into my budget so my budget comes out ahead.

Yes, it could happen, but there is no evidence to believe it will happen. That is one of the ways that this budget reaches so-called balance.

There are other macroeconomic effects which we ought to consider, however. As we have mentioned several times, this budget would direct the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

The Deloitte professional services firm just did an audit of Kentucky's experience over the last 14 months, 15 months, with the Affordable Care Act. Here is what it said would happen in Kentucky over the next 6 years.

□ 1645

\$30 billion in increased economic activity, 44,000 new jobs, and a positive impact on the Kentucky State budget of \$850 million—that is what would be eliminated from Kentucky. That is another effect of the Republican budget. Think about what it might do in other States—California, New York, Florida. For it to have that much impact in a State like Kentucky, the national effect would be very consequential.

Aside from all of the truly damaging ways in which this budget affects our economy and our citizens, we have to take note of the fact that there are impacts beyond just the Federal budget, and this budget would be a disaster for the American economy and the American people. I urge its defeat.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a productive and delightful member of our Budget Committee and a freshman member of our conference.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. I thank the chairman for his kind words and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to say that, for the first time in many years, the House and Senate will adopt a unified resolution for a balanced budget. The 2016 Federal budget resolution will set the guardrails for Federal spending, and it is a step in the right direction for our country.

Families in my home State of Michigan and across the country tighten their belts when there is a change in household income or expenses, and Washington needs to do the same. The 2016 budget resolution does not raise taxes on hard-working Americans. It keeps the promises that have been made to seniors while slowing the soaring national debt. Leaving less debt to our children is vital, and if we fail to act, debt payments will crowd out spending for the priorities of the American people, including national security and protecting the Great Lakes.

This budget provides for flexibility, and it gives States the opportunity to innovate on Medicaid policy, allowing them to design a safety net that works best for those in need. This will move Medicaid further away from Washington bureaucrats and closer to the people it was meant to serve.

This budget also calls for tax reform, which has the potential to add 1 million new private sector jobs. The Tax Code is over 74,000 pages long and was last overhauled 29 years ago. It is time for a pro-growth Tax Code that is simpler and fairer.

This budget addresses our country's fiscal problems in a responsible way, and it puts our Nation on a brighter path for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and colleague and the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Written by House and Senate Republicans alone, it reaffirms their commitment to a severe and unworkable policy agenda that would harm the economy and that stands little chance of being implemented.

This budget conference report draws heavily on the House Republicans' budget framework by eliminating the Medicare guarantee, turning Medicaid into a capped block grant, limiting Pell grants for college students, and cutting nutrition assistance while hiding \$1 trillion in additional cuts behind a magic asterisk to be filled in at some time in the future.

These proposals, if implemented, would be disastrous for our country, and I suspect even most Republicans wouldn't vote to make them law, and I predict they will not vote to make them law. Still, many of its proposals must be taken very seriously.

The Republican budget conference report includes reconciliation instructions to fast-track yet another vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, jeopardizing affordable coverage for millions of Americans with no alternative in sight.

It continues the Republican policy of sequester for nondefense priorities this year—a disinvestment suggestion, an undermining of America's economy and its quality of life—and further limits our ability to invest in priorities like education, research, and infrastructure by \$496 billion below sequester levels over the ensuing decade. This is the same sequester policy that the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee called “unrealistic and ill-conceived.” Let me repeat that. He is the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, and he said that the policies being pursued in this budget are “unrealistic and ill-conceived.” He is right.

Shamelessly, they propose to do all of this while exempting defense spending from the sequester caps. Defense spending needs to be raised. It ought to be raised honestly and not pretend that some slush fund will pay for, not contingencies, which it is intended to do, but for regular defense investments, which we need to do.

This budget conference report is, essentially, a work of fiction, promulgated as a message to the Republican base. I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Instead, let us work together in a bipartisan way to replace the unrealistic and ill-conceived—not my words but HAL ROGERS' words—and, I would add, completely unworkable sequester caps with an alternative that enables Congress to invest in America's future growth and prosperity.

That is what our constituents want. That is what we owe them—honesty and responsibility. I hope this resolution is defeated.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my friend that we look forward to enacting and bringing forward the policies that are incorporated within this budget. In fact, just last night, the Armed Services Committee passed out on a 60-2 vote policies that are consistent with the spending on the defense area in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), who is a wonderfully productive and energetic member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in watching this debate back and forth, I am reminded of the saying: “If you like sausage, don't watch it being made.” The same is true, certainly, with the budget process, in fairness to my colleague from Maryland, and the same is true for the

overall legislative process. It is a decidedly human and imperfect process.

What we have here is a result of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, and it is something that we haven't seen for a long, long while. We certainly didn't see it while HARRY REID was running the Senate. As a consequence of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, we will see debate go to 11:30 or midnight tonight on appropriations bills, and they will do that week, after week, after week going forward. I, myself, will come down with an amendment on Energy and Water. I suspect other Members in this very Chamber will come down with similar amendments, saying, “I think we need to add something here,” or “we need to subtract something here.”

That process of scrubbing the budget is something that has been absent for years. That process is called regular order, but regular folks back home would call it, simply, common sense because it is what they do every day. Vital to any well-run organization is that ability to go in and say, “This isn't working so well over here. I think we need to take from here this low performer and add to this high performer.” It is done in churches; it is done in families; it is done in businesses; and it needs to be done in the Federal Government.

I think, as a matter of process, what we have is awfully, awfully important. For too long, our Federal Government has been running on automatic pilot. Entitlements run on automatic pilot, but, in essence, domestic discretionary has been running on automatic pilot as we run on CRs and omnibus bills. I mean, you would go bankrupt in no time if your mode of operation were to simply say, “I will take what I spent last year, and I am going to spend it again this year.” Yet that is the way the Federal Government has been running, and it is this budget that actually moves us away from that process.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, this is important from the standpoint of democracy. When you have an omnibus bill or a CR, somebody is still deciding what goes into that stuff. It is oftentimes leadership and staff as opposed to rank and file Members going down to the floor and saying, “I think we need to subtract here or to add here.” So there are two different levels that, I think, are awfully important.

Are there still deficiencies? Obviously so. I mean, I think that when you look at the budget cap issue and when you look at the issue of off budget those are both pathways to financial oblivion, and they have got to be addressed. The bigger framework that has been set in place is by moving to regular order and by the House and Senate coming together on a budget—thanks to your leadership, Mr. Chairman—which, I think, is vital. As a consequence, I will be supporting this measure.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Republican budget because of the way that it treats our Nation's veterans.

As I have said during the Budget Committee debates, the Republican proposal does not provide our past and present servicemembers with the resources they need upon their return. Protecting our veterans is not an option—it is our duty. We owe it to our veterans to provide them with quality health care, education, job training, and the long-term treatment they have earned through their service to our Nation.

It is more than just a moral obligation. It is also a wise investment in America's future. The Greatest Generation was not called “the Greatest Generation” in 1946. That term didn't come about until the 1990s. It had as much to do with what our veterans of World War II did after the war, when they came home, as with what they did in it. To ensure success for today's veterans, we need to do much better than the Republican proposal.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MOULTON. As a veteran, I see firsthand that insufficient funding for VA programs creates an environment in which our veterans fall through the cracks. I do not support simply throwing money at the current bureaucracy, but insufficient funding for the VA and its programs will only exacerbate this problem.

We ought to be able to agree that caring for our veterans should be a national priority. The budget before us today fails to prioritize our servicemen and -women, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a very diligent and dedicated senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I first need to commend and thank Chairman PRICE for all of his hard work in putting this budget resolution together. This is a rare occasion on this floor. It has been a long time since we have had a budget agreement, and it is not an easy thing to do. As one of the House budget conferees, I can tell you that a lot of work has to be done and that a lot of difficult choices have to be made.

Mr. Chairman, you have done a spectacular job in getting this here to the floor.

One of the most important things, Mr. Speaker, that the budget resolution has to do is to, frankly, set the stage so that we can move forward on the appropriations process. We need a budget that puts Congress and our committees on a path to move forward, and this budget resolution does it. It balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes.

It is no secret, I believe—and I think many of us believe—that the first responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect the American people, and it is no secret that the world around us—I think greatly due to the failed foreign policy of this administration—is almost in flames. We see a growing instability, and we see a growing pressure to our allies, and we see the thugs and the enemies of freedom who believe they have a green light.

We must provide for a strong national defense through the robust funding of our troops, of their training, of their equipment, of their readiness. This budget does so. It accomplishes these goals while staying under the budget control caps—in other words, adhering to the law of the land.

□ 1700

It funds the military over the President's request, without breaking the law and without raising taxes. Again, something that is easier said than done, but Chairman PRICE has been able to do that.

At a time when we see China's rapidly growing defense capabilities, North Korea's nuclear weapons program, Iran pursuing theirs, and growing threats from terrorist groups, let's not forget what our number one priority has to be.

This budget resolution reflects our commitment to our national security, to the men and women in uniform, to the safety of the American people. It does so, balancing the budget within 10 years. It does so without raising taxes.

I know it is very easy to be critical; it is very easy to lecture why this is not perfect. It has been a long time coming. I am grateful for the leadership of Mr. PRICE, of his counterpart in the Senate, Chairman ENZI. I ask the Members of this distinguished body to approve this well-thought-out, hard-negotiated budget that funds our priorities, doesn't raise taxes, and even balances within 10 years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has been focused on trying to make sure we have an economy that works for all Americans.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding. More importantly, I want to thank him for his tireless work as our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget. It is truly a pleasure to serve with him.

A budget is a moral document, a document that really reflects our values as a nation. Unfortunately, this budget just does the opposite. Mr. Speaker,

once again, this Congress is poised to take a huge step in the wrong direction.

The budget agreement before us is truly a work hard, get less budget that uses accounting gimmicks to balance the budget, once again on the backs of the most vulnerable. It calls for cuts to nondefense discretionary programs totaling \$496 billion below the already dismally low sequestered level.

This means further draconian cuts to our education, our infrastructure, veterans, and health programs that have already been eviscerated by slash-and-burn Republican austerity plans.

Today, more than 45 million of our fellow Americans are living in poverty. This agreement will push more people over the brink. With \$300 billion in cuts to SNAP—that is our food assistance—\$431 billion in cuts to Medicare, and a half trillion in cuts to Medicaid, struggling families will continue to fall further and further behind.

We can't forget how these cuts disproportionately affect our communities of color, who are more likely to be living in poverty. What is more, this is the latest in the misguided Republican fixation on repealing the Affordable Care Act, which the House has already voted to repeal over 50 times.

The number of uninsured Americans has gone down by 16 million since it was enacted. Why in the world do you want to take health care away from 16 million people? That is mean.

This agreement continues to use the overseas contingency operation, OCO, account as a slush fund for overbudget Pentagon spending by including—I think it is—\$38 billion over the President's request.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. I introduced an amendment in committee to eliminate the OCO account increase of \$36 billion that was included in the House Republican budget. Members on both sides of the aisle have criticized OCO as an affront to transparency and Congress' constitutionally mandated oversight responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, last month, we introduced our Democratic, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus alternative budgets. Those budgets reflect real solutions to lift Americans out of poverty and to support the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided and very cynical agreement that would put us on a path to a greater unequal America that provides less liberty and less justice for all. It doesn't reflect who we are as a nation.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a senior, thoughtful member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, with this vote, our Nation is about to take its first step away

from financial ruin and back to prosperity and solvency. Our Nation's debt has literally doubled in 8 years, now exceeding the size of our entire economy. That debt requires us to make interest payments of \$230 billion this year. That is nearly \$2,000 from an average family's taxes just to rent the money that we have already spent.

On our current path, that burden will triple within a decade, eclipsing our entire defense budget. Medicare and Social Security will collapse just a few years after that. Time is not our ally, and the future is not a pleasant place if we continue just a few more years down the road that we have been on.

That is why this budget is so important. It changes the fiscal course of our Nation, slowly pointing us back toward solvency and prosperity. It restores congressional oversight of an abusive Federal bureaucracy.

It rescues our healthcare system from the nightmare of ObamaCare. It rescues Medicare from collapse. It adopts the time-tested progrowth policies that produced the Reagan economic recovery and the unprecedented prosperity of the 1980s.

If we can implement this budget, in 10 years, deficits will turn to surpluses, and we can begin paying down this ruinous debt at a pace that ensures that students now in college will retire into a prosperous, secure, and debt-free America.

It is not perfect, and it is not complete. Ahead of us are many months of legislating to build the governmental streamlining and reforms that it calls for, but if we can set this course and if we can stay this course, one day in the very near future, a new generation of Americans can know just how wonderful it is to awaken and realize that it is morning again in America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), another one of our terrific new members of the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today is deeply flawed. It forces hard-working families to work more and take home less and puts our country on the wrong path.

It concerns me that the budget put forth by my Republican colleagues does not address the deep, arbitrary, and damaging budget caps we are facing right now. These caps, which are so bad that they were never meant to become law, are now a reality, a reality that we are gutting our military and harming working men and women and their families in multiple ways.

The gimmicks in the conference report do nothing to address the long-term structural problems that budget cuts have created at the Pentagon, and they do nothing on the nondefense side to help hard-working families buy a home, send their children to college, or enjoy a safe, secure retirement with adequate health care.

Democrats have a better way, a better budget, one that creates greater opportunity for a secure future. We need a secure budget, and we shouldn't stand for anything less.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to take a moment and thank the chairman. He has done a tremendous job. Again, he has brought another budget to the floor that balances, but he has done something no one has done in 6 years. He has brought a bicameral budget.

That is something that we shouldn't just take for granted, something that the House and Senate couldn't do for quite sometime. Your leadership has been tremendous.

To my friend on the other side, you make a lot of debates, and I look forward to hearing them. I am thankful this time you have more Democrats on the floor helping you than you did a couple weeks ago, and that is helpful. That is helpful for a debate. This is the place we should have it.

Two weeks ago, I was on this floor to talk about a budget. I said that a budget is a vision for the future; it sets out your priorities, but it also shows your values. Well, for the first time in 6 years, the House and Senate have gotten together, worked out our differences, and drafted a bicameral budget. This budget shows America exactly where we stand.

With this budget, we have a choice before us. Do we keep going down our current path? Or do we change course? Our current path adds to the debt; it is stuck in the past. In fact, the budget the Democrats offered would never balance.

I say to my friend, the ranking member: we have a family close in age; we have children about the same age. My question to the other side is simply this: How will our kids invest in the future when they are busy paying for our past?

The budget is a different course. It says that we will balance the budget and then actually start paying down the debt. It says that it is a more dangerous world, so we will increase spending for defense. It says we will repeal ObamaCare, and it says no new taxes. It says that it is time to grow America's economy, not Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the future is not about Washington; it is not about government trying and failing to solve our problems while adding more and more debt that our children and grandchildren have to pay. America's future, our 21st century, will be built by American people. That is what this budget would do. It is the foundation for a strong American future and a future even brighter than our past.

I look forward to taking the first steps to that future. I look forward to not leaving our children our debt, but

leaving them a brighter future where they have greater opportunities.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the Republican leader, who mentioned the children of America, that if the children of America learn Republican math, we are going to be in real trouble because they won't be able to count.

As the Republican chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget has said, this kind of budget approach that claims balance because they take the level of revenue from the Affordable Care Act, when at the same time say they are repealing the Affordable Care Act, I think most kids can figure out that that is a shell game, and we are going to be in real trouble if that is the basis of teaching math in our schools, not to mention the fact that we have got a budget here that is squeezing people who are really working hard while providing a green light to tax cuts for people at the very top. That is also not a set of priorities I think that we want to pass on to our children.

We want an economy that works for everybody, an economy where everyone who works hard can get ahead. I don't see how we are going to get our kids ahead by providing tax cuts to folks at the top while cutting our kids' education and making them pay more for their college loans. That is a recipe for decline.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and also for his leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I really want to thank the entire Committee on the Budget and the conferees for doing the hard work and the responsible work of finally focusing on bringing responsibility and fiscal discipline back to Washington.

If you look at what has been happening all across the country, people are struggling. These are tough times. It is a tough economy. People's wages are stagnant. They are paying more for food. They are paying more for electricity. They are surely paying more for health care.

They are looking to Washington and saying: Why doesn't Washington start focusing on these problems? Why doesn't Washington do what families are doing? Hard-working taxpayers live within their means. Why can't Washington do the same?

This budget does that. It focuses on creating a healthy economy, actually getting jobs, and getting people back to work in this country, forcing Washington to finally balance the Federal budget.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, when we pass this budget, it will represent the first time since

2001 that Congress has come together to pass a budget that balances in the 10-year window. That shouldn't be something that happens every 14 years; that should be something we do every year.

The other side surely didn't do it when they were in the majority. In fact, none of the budgets they brought to the floor ever get to balance—not 10 years, not 20 years, not 50 years. They rack up more debt. They increase taxes. There are over \$2 trillion of new taxes in the President's budget that he proposed, and he never gets to balance.

This budget not only calls for good tax reform to make our country competitive again, lower rates so that families can keep more of their money and invest in themselves and not grow the size of government, but it actually focuses on getting more jobs in this country and stop shipping jobs out of the country.

It repeals the President's healthcare law that is causing so many problems, millions of people losing the good healthcare plans they have and paying more for it.

We have got to finally bring this discipline back and finally force Washington to do what families have been doing and be responsible.

It is a good budget. I am glad that we are going to be bringing it to the floor and passing it. Let's get to doing the other work we need to do to get our economy back on track, and it starts here.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining.

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

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

This budget does not reflect the priorities of the American people. If you ask most Americans what kind of economy they want, they would say they want an economy that is growing rapidly, with more shared prosperity.

You don't get that kind of economy with trickle-down economics with the kind of theory that is embedded in the Republican budget. That theory is that if you provide tax rate cuts to people at the very top—to millionaires—somehow the benefits are going to trickle down and lift everybody up. We tried that in the 2000s under George Bush. It didn't work.

What happened—not surprisingly—is folks at the top who got tax cuts ended up with even more take-home income. Everybody else was either treading water or falling behind. Why we would want a budget based on a failed economic strategy is going to leave the American public scratching their heads.

The approach we recommended was one where we provide more tax relief to hard-working Americans. We wanted to expand the provision for child and dependent tax credits so that people can make sure their kids are in a safe environment while they are at work and not have to break the family bank in order to do it.

We want to invest in our kids' education; we want to invest in scientific research, and we want to pay for it by closing some of those tax breaks that encourage American corporations to ship American jobs and money overseas and getting rid of the special tax rates that hedge fund managers have that hard-working Americans don't.

We proposed fixing a tax system that is rigged in favor of the special interests and the very powerful and changing in a way that provides additional help to people who are being squeezed and are in the middle or working their way into the middle. That is an economic plan that works for everybody in the country, not one that just works for people at the very top.

What we saw just last week was the number one economic priority of our Republican colleagues was to eliminate the estate tax on estates above \$10 million, help 5,500 Americans run up the deficit by \$270 billion, and then come back and say, Hey, the deficit just went up by \$270 billion because we provided an estate tax cut to estates \$10 million and up. Now, let's cut our kids' education. Let's increase the amount we charge seniors for their prescription drugs. Let's raise the cost of student loans. Let's cut our investment in kids' education.

That is what this Republican budget does. It is not that our colleagues don't believe in this failed theory, but you would think, at some point, reality would intrude, and people would say we need an economy that works for every American, not just a few.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget. Let's start again in a way that really reflects the greatness of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. Con. Res. 11.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is appropriate that we begin the process of this debate that is called "and now for the rest of the story."

For folks who are watching and for our colleagues who have been observing this debate and want more information, I would urge you to go to the Web site and take a peek at the resolution,

budget.house.gov. You can get all sorts of information about the positive solutions that we are putting forward.

It is not just our opinion. We have got a lot of folks who are out there supporting the resolution that we put forward.

The 60 Plus Association says:

On behalf of more than 7 million senior citizen activists, the 60 Plus Association applauds the leadership of you and Senate Budget Committee Chairman ENZI in putting forth a responsible balanced budget plan. Not only will this legislation protect today's seniors, but it will also protect our children and grandchildren.

The National Federation of Independent Business says:

On behalf of the NFIB, the Nation's leading small business advocacy organization, thank you for your efforts . . . NFIB and small-business owners strongly support your efforts.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce: the world's largest business federation representing interests of more than 3 million businesses—those are jobs, Mr. Speaker—of all sizes, sectors, and regions strongly supports your resolution.

The Association of Mature American Citizens:

On behalf of 1.3 million members of AMAC . . . I am writing to applaud the House and Senate for working to pass a budget this year and to convey our strong support for the policies set forth therein.

There is significant support literally from across the country, Mr. Speaker.

I want to address some very specific issues that have come forward because, as I say, now, it is time for the rest of the story.

Our friends talk about the lack of growth within our budget. In fact, that is not the case. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office stipulates that over \$400 million in growth will occur in the first 10-year period of time. We believe it will be much more than that because we believe in a dynamic market.

We believe that, when you allow the economy to thrive, when you allow folks to have more jobs and more opportunity and more dreams realized, that in fact you get the economy rolling to a greater degree and actually more increase in growth will occur within the economy.

We have heard from our friends on the other side about all these tax increases that are in this budget. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you very clearly: there are no tax increases in this budget. We balance the budget within a 10-year period of time with no tax increases. What they describe is their extrapolation on what they think policy is going to be.

As you know and our colleagues in this Chamber know, it is not the Budget Committee that brings forward tax resolutions. It is the Ways and Means Committee. We charge the Ways and Means Committee with coming forward with progrowth tax policy to get this economy rolling again and to actually get rates down—yes, for large and

small businesses, so that we can create more jobs, but, yes, Mr. Speaker, for the American people as well.

That is our vision. That is our goal. That is what we think ought to occur again so that more dreams can be realized and more Americans can have the kind of opportunity that they so desire.

We have heard a lot of talk about student loans. Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution does not decrease student loans, does not decrease the Pell grants. It is important that the American people know that. If you don't believe it, just go to the Web site. Read the resolution at budget.house.gov.

We have heard over and over and over again about the talk on health care. In fact, one individual on the other side of the aisle said we were "taking away health care from 16 million."

Nonsense, Mr. Speaker, nonsense—it just simply is not so. What we believe is that we ought to have a healthcare system that actually works for patients and families and doctors and allows them to make medical decisions and healthcare decisions, not Washington, D.C., not the Federal Government. That is not what the American people want.

We are mired in a system right now that the President forced down the throats of the American people and our friends on the other side of the aisle forced down the throats of those of us in this Congress a few short years ago. We are mired in a system that actually is providing less quality of care and less affordability and less access to care.

That is not what we believe ought to happen. What we do is charge the committees with coming forward with that patient-centered solution, a solution that will again put patients and families and doctors in charge.

Then we hear about continuing the sequester. You are right. We do follow the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, because the budget resolution can't change the sequester.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and I invite them to work together as we move forward over the next number of months to get together and solve the challenge of sequester in a responsible way by decreasing spending on the mandatory side so that we can find the resources that are so vitally necessary on the discretionary side. I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that gets our Nation's fiscal house in order. It is a budget that would get folks back to work. It is a budget that would save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid, put us on a path to saving Social Security. It is a budget that protects our national defense. It is a budget that deserves support in this Chamber.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the House Budget Committee and the Office of the Sixth District of Georgia. We are on the cusp of agreeing to

this budget resolution, due in large part, to the hard work and dedication of my staff. For the past four months, they have worked many long hours and out of the spotlight to help build a budget that balances within 10 years. It has been an honor to work with each of these staff members as they have helped craft a budget this Congress can be proud of, and the staff should be proud of what they have helped accomplish.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE STAFF

Alex Campau, Alex Stoddard, Amanda Street, Andy Morton, Ben Garndenhour, Brad Watson, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, Emily Goff, Ersin Aydin, Jane Lee, Jenna Spealman, Jim Bates, Jim Herz, Jon Romito, Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Kara McKee, Kelle Long, Kyle Cormney, Mary Popadiuk, Pat Knudsen, Paul Restuccia, Rich Kisielowski, Rick May, Ryan Murphy, Tim Flynn, William Allison.

PERSONAL AND DISTRICT OFFICE STAFF

Brent Robertson, Carla DiBlasio, Charlene Puchalla, Cheyenne Foster, Daniel Grey, Devin Kreci, Gary Beck, Jennifer Poole, Kris Skrzycki, Kyle McGowan, Kyle Zebley, Megan Wells, Meghan Dugan, Meghan Graf, Ryan Brooks, Tina McIntosh, Warren Negri.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

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 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1740

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 197, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—197

Adams	Bonamici	Carney
Aguiar	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Amash	F.	Cartwright
Ashford	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Becerra	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cleaver

Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Connolly	Jolly	Peters
Conyers	Jones	Peterson
Cooper	Kaptur	Pingree
Costa	Katko	Pocan
Courtney	Keating	Polis
Crawford	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kennedy	Quigley
Cuellar	Kildee	Rangel
Cummings	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kuster	Ruiz
DeGette	Labrador	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Langevin	Rush
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	T.
Deutch	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Levin	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schiff
F.	LoBiondo	Schrader
Duckworth	Loeback	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Ellison	Lowe	Serrano
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	(NM)	Sherman
Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sinema
Farr	(NM)	Sires
Fattah	Lynch	Slaughter
Foster	Maloney,	Speier
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Takai
Gabbard	Massie	Takano
Gallego	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Garamendi	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Gibson	McDermott	Titus
Graham	McGovern	Tonko
Grayson	McNerney	Torres
Green, Al	McSally	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Meeks	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Meng	Vargas
Gutiérrez	Moore	Veasey
Hahn	Moulton	Vela
Hastings	Mulvaney	Velázquez
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Higgins	Nadler	Walz
Himes	Napolitano	Walters, Maxine
Honda	Neal	Watson Coleman
Hoyer	Nolan	Welch
Huffman	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Israel	O'Rourke	Yarmuth
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Zinke
Jeffries	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—9

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Garrett	Payne	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)	
Hinojosa	Wagner	

□ 1815

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, COLE, STEWART, FINCHER, and REICHERT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 183 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 2029.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) kindly take the chair.

□ 1817

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. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 29, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 67, line 10.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

An amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

An amendment by Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin.

An amendment by Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 229, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

AYES—191

Adams	Becerra	Bonamici
Amash	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Bass	Bishop (GA)	F.
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)	Grijalva	Pallone
Burgess	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Butterfield	Hahn	Pelosi
Capps	Hastings	Perlmutter
Capuano	Heck (WA)	Perry
Cárdenas	Higgins	Peterson
Carney	Himes	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Honda	Pocan
Cartwright	Hoyer	Polis
Castor (FL)	Huelskamp	Posey
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Chu, Judy	Israel	Quigley
Ciulline	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher
Cleaver	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Jordan	Rush
Cohen	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Collins (GA)	Keating	Salmon
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cooper	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kildee	Sanford
Costa	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Crowley	Kind	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cummings	Kuster	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Labrador	Schweikert
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
DeGette	Lawrence	Sensenbrenner
Delaney	Lee	Serrano
DeLauro	Levin	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Loebback	Sigmund
DesJarlais	Lofgren	Sires
Deutch	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Dingell	Lowe	Speier
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.	(NM)	Takano
Duncan (TN)	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Lummis	Tipton
Engel	Lynch	Titus
Eshoo	Maloney,	Tonko
Esty	Carolyn	Torres
Farr	Massie	Tsongas
Fattah	Matsui	Van Hollen
Foster	McClintock	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Veasey
Fudge	McDermott	Vela
Gabbard	McGovern	Velázquez
Gallego	McNerney	Visclosky
Garamendi	Meeks	Walz
Garrett	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Gohmert	Moore	Watson Coleman
Gosar	Mulvaney	Welch
Grayson	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Napolitano	Woodall
Green, Gene	Neal	Yarmuth
Griffith	Nolan	Yoho
	O'Rourke	

NOES—229

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Aderholt	Coffman	Gibbs
Aguilar	Cole	Gibson
Allen	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Amodei	Comstock	Gowdy
Ashford	Conaway	Graham
Babin	Cook	Granger
Barletta	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Barr	Courtney	Graves (LA)
Barton	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Benishek	Crawford	Grothman
Bera	Crenshaw	Guinta
Bilirakis	Culberson	Guthrie
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Hanna
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Hardy
Black	Denham	Harper
Blackburn	Dent	Harris
Blum	DeSantis	Hartzler
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Boustany	Dold	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Duckworth	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Duffy	Hill
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Farenthold	Hultgren
Buchanan	Fincher	Hunter
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)
Bustos	Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)
Byrne	Fleming	Jenkins (KS)
Calvert	Flores	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (GA)	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Fox	Jolly
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Joyce

Katko	Newhouse	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Noem	Shimkus
King (IA)	Norcross	Shuster
King (NY)	Nugent	Simpson
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Sinema
Kline	Olson	Smith (MO)
Knight	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
LaMalfa	Palmer	Smith (NJ)
Lamborn	Paulsen	Stefanik
Lance	Pearce	Stewart
Langevin	Peters	Stivers
Latta	Pittenger	Stutzman
Lipinski	Pitts	Takai
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Long	Poliquin	Thornberry
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Tiberi
Love	Price, Tom	Trott
Lucas	Ratcliffe	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Upton
MacArthur	Reichert	Valadao
Maloney, Sean	Renacci	Walberg
Marchant	Ribble	Walden
Marino	Rice (SC)	Walker
McCarthy	Rigell	Walorski
McCaul	Roby	Walters, Mimi
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup
Rodgers	Rokita	Westerman
McSally	Rooney (FL)	Westmoreland
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Messer	Roskam	Williams
Mica	Ross	Wilson (SC)
Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Wittman
Miller (MI)	Rouzer	Womack
Moolenaar	Royce	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Ruiz	Young (AK)
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Young (IA)
Mullin	Russell	Young (IN)
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Zeldin
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Zinke
Neugebauer	Scott, Austin	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Meadows	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Smith (TX)	Schultz
Lewis	Smith (WA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1822

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 229, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—192

Adams	Becerra	Blumenauer
Amash	Beyer	Bonamici
Beatty	Bishop (GA)	

Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Gene Griffith	O'Rourke	Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (FL)	Scalise	Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Gene Griffith	Nolan
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Pallone	Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	Brady (PA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Brooks (AL)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Sessions	Brooks (AL)	Grothman	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Pelosi	Johnson, Sam	Newhouse	Shimkus	Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Burgess	Hastings	Perlmutter	Jolly	Noem	Shuster	Burgess	Hahn	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Perry	Joyce	Norcross	Simpson	Butterfield	Hastings	Perry
Capps	Higgins	Peterson	Katko	Nugent	Sinema	Capps	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Capuano	Himes	Pingree	Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Capuano	Higgins	Pingree
Cárdenas	Honda	Pocan	King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NE)	Cárdenas	Himes	Pocan
Carney	Hoyer	Polis	King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Carney	Honda	Polis
Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Price (NC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Huffman	Quigley	Kline	Paulsen	Stefanik	Cartwright	Huelskamp	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Israel	Rangel	Knight	Pearce	Stewart	Castor (FL)	Huffman	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)	Lamborn	Peters	Stivers	Castro (TX)	Israel	Rice (NY)
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Richmond	Lance	Pittenger	Stutzman	Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Ciциlline	Johnson (GA)	Rohrabacher	Langevin	Pitts	Takai	Ciциlline	Jeffries	Rohrabacher
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard	Latta	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Rush	Lipinski	Pompeo	Thornberry	Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clay	Jordan	Ryan (OH)	LoBiondo	Posey	Tiberi	Clay	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Salmon	Long	Price, Tom	Trott	Cleaver	Jordan	Salmon
Clyburn	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.	Love	Ratcliffe	Turner	Clyburn	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Lucas	Reed	Upton	Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Sanford	Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Valadao	Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Sanford
Connolly	Kildee	Sarbanes	MacArthur	Renacci	Walberg	Connolly	Kildee	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kilmer	Schakowsky	Maloney, Sean	Ribble	Walden	Conyers	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kind	Schiff	Marchant	Rice (SC)	Walorski	Cooper	Kind	Schakowsky
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Schrader	Marino	Rigell	Walters, Mimi	Costa	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Crowley	Kuster	Schweikert	McCarthy	Roby	Weber (TX)	Crowley	Kuster	Schweikert
Cuellar	Labrador	Scott (VA)	McCaul	Roe (TN)	Webster (FL)	Cummings	Labrador	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David	McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Westerman	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sensenbrenner	McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland	Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Serrano	McMorris	Rokita	Whitfield	DeFazio	Lawrence	Serrano
DeFazio	Lee	Sewell (AL)	Rodgers	Rooney (FL)	Williams	DeGette	Lee	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Levin	Lieu, Ted	McSally	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)	Delaney	Levin	Sherman
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Loeb sack	Meadows	Roskam	Wittman	DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Lofgren	Meehan	Ross	Womack	DeBene	Loeb sack	Slaughter
DeBene	Lofgren	Speier	Messer	Rothfus	Yoder	DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Speier
DeSaulnier	Loudermilk	Swalwell (CA)	Mica	Rouzer	Young (AK)	DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Swalwell (CA)
DesJarlais	Lowenthal	Takano	Miller (MI)	Royce	Young (IA)	Deutch	Lowenthal	Takano
Deutch	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)	Moolenaar	Ruiz	Young (IN)	Dingell	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)	Mooney (WV)	Ruppersberger	Zeldin	Doggett	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Tipton	Moulton	Russell	Zinke	Doyle, Michael F.	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Tipton
Doyle, Michael F.	Lummis	Titus	Mullin	Ryan (WI)		Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Titus
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Tonko				Edwards	Lynch	Tonko
Edwards	Maloney,	Torres				Ellison	Maloney,	Torres
Ellison	Carolyn	Tsongas				Engel	Carolyn	Tsongas
Engel	Massie	Van Hollen				Eshoo	Massie	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Matsui	Vargas				Esty	Matsui	Vargas
Esty	McClintock	Veasey				Farr	McClintock	Veasey
Farr	McColum	Velázquez				Fattah	McColum	Velázquez
Fattah	McDermott	Visclosky				Foster	McDermott	Visclosky
Foster	McGovern	Walker				Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Walker
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Walz				Fudge	McNerney	Walz
Fudge	Meeks	Waters, Maxine				Gabbard	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Gabbard	Meng	Watson Coleman				Gallego	Meng	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Moore	Welch				Garamendi	Moore	Welch
Garamendi	Mulvaney	Wilson (FL)				Garrett	Mulvaney	Wilson (FL)
Garrett	Nadler	Woodall				Gohmert	Nadler	Woodall
Gohmert	Napolitano	Yarmuth				Gosar	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Gosar	Neal	Yoho				Grayson	Neal	Yoho
Grayson	Nolan					Green, Al		
Green, Al								

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—9

Buck	Miller (FL)	Wasserman
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Schultz
Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	
Lewis	Wagner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1827

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 231, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

AYES—190

Adams	Becerra	Blumenauer
Amash	Beyer	Bonamici
Beatty	Bishop (GA)	

NOES—231

Abraham	Chabot	Flores
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Forbes
Aguilar	Clawson (FL)	Portenberry
Allen	Coffman	Fox
Amodei	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Comstock	Gibbs
Barletta	Conaway	Gibson
Barr	Cook	Goodlatte
Barton	Costello (PA)	Gowdy
Bass	Courtney	Graham
Benishek	Cramer	Granger
Bera	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Billirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Guinta
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Blum	Denham	Hardy
Bost	Dent	Harper
Boustany	DeSantis	Harris
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Brat	Dold	Heck (NV)
Bridenstine	Duckworth	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Buchanan	Ellmers (NC)	Holding
Bucshon	Emmer (MN)	Hudson
Bustos	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Byrne	Fincher	Hultgren
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hurd (TX)
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Hurt (VA)

NOES—229

Abraham	Chabot	Forbes
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Portenberry
Aguilar	Clawson (FL)	Fox
Allen	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Babin	Comstock	Gibson
Barletta	Conaway	Goodlatte
Barr	Cook	Gowdy
Barton	Costello (PA)	Graham
Bass	Courtney	Granger
Benishek	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Bera	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Billirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Guinta
Black	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Blackburn	Denham	Hanna
Blum	Dent	Hardy
Bost	DeSantis	Harper
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Brady (TX)	Dold	Hartzler
Brat	Duckworth	Heck (NV)
Bridenstine	Duffy	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers (NC)	Hill
Buchanan	Emmer (MN)	Holding
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hudson
Bustos	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Calvert	Fleischmann	Hunter
Carter (GA)	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Carter (TX)	Flores	Hurt (VA)

Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (FL)	Scott, Austin	Bonamici	Garamendi	Nadler	Lance	Pearce	Shuster
Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Boyle, Brendan F.	Gibson	Napolitano	Latta	Perry	Simpson
Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Sessions	Brady (PA)	Grayson	Neal	Lipinski	Peterson	Sinema
Johnson, Sam	Newhouse	Shimkus	Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Nolan	LoBiondo	Pittenger	Smith (MO)
Jolly	Noem	Shuster	Bustos	Grijalva	Norcross	Long	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Joyce	Norcross	Simpson	Butterfield	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke	Loudermilk	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Katko	Nugent	Sinema	Capps	Hahn	Pallone	Love	Poliquin	Smith (TX)
Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Capuano	Hastings	Pascarell	Lucas	Pompeo	Stefanik
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NE)	Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Pelosi	Luetkemeyer	Posey	Stewart
King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Carney	Higgins	Perlmutter	Lummi	Price, Tom	Stivers
Kinzing (IL)	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Carson (IN)	Himes	Peters	MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Stutzman
Kline	Paulsen	Stefanik	Cartwright	Honda	Pingree	Maloney, Sean	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Knight	Pearce	Stewart	Castro (FL)	Hoyer	Pocan	Marchant	Reichert	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Peters	Stivers	Castro (TX)	Huffman	Polis	Marino	Renacci	Tiberi
Lamborn	Pittenger	Stutzman	Chu, Judy	Israel	Quigley	Massie	Ribble	Tipton
Lance	Pitts	Takai	Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Rangel	McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Trott
Langevin	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)	Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)	McCauley	Rigell	Turner
Latta	Poliquin	Thornberry	Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond	McClintock	Roby	Upton
Lipinski	Pompeo	Tiberi	Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard	McHenry	Roe (TN)	Valadao
LoBiondo	Posey	Trott	Cleaver	Kaptur	Rush	McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Vela
Long	Price, Tom	Turner	Clyburn	Keating	Ryan (OH)	McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Love	Ratcliffe	Upton	Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walden
Lucas	Reed	Valadao	Connolly	Kennedy	Sanford	McSally	Rokita	Walker
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Walberg	Conyers	Kildee	Sarbanes	Meadows	Rooney (FL)	Walorski
MacArthur	Renacci	Walden	Cooper	Kilmer	Schakowsky	Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi
Maloney, Sean	Ribble	Walorski	Courtney	Kind	Schiff	Messer	Roskam	Weber (TX)
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Walters, Mimi	Crowley	Kuster	Schrader	Mica	Ross	Webster (FL)
Marino	Rigell	Weber (TX)	Cummings	Langevin	Scott (VA)	Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Wenstrup
McCarthy	Roby	Webster (FL)	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David	Miller (MI)	Rouzer	Westerman
McCauley	Roe (TN)	Westerman	Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Serrano	Moolenaar	Royce	Westmoreland
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield	DeFazio	Lawrence	Sherman	Mooney (WV)	Ruiz	Whitfield
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Williams	DeGette	Lee	Sires	Mullin	Ruppersberger	Williams
McMorris	Rokita	Westmoreland	DeLay	Levin	Speier	Mulvaney	Russell	Wilson (SC)
Rodgers	Rooney (FL)	Whitfield	Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Woodall	Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
McSally	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams	DeLauro	Loeb	Woolf	Neugebauer	Salmon	Womack
Meadows	Roskam	Wilson (SC)	DeBene	Loftgren	Takai	Newhouse	Sanchez, Loretta	Woodall
Meehan	Ross	Wittman	DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Takano	Noem	Scalise	Yoder
Messer	Rothfus	Womack	Deutch	Lowe	Thompson (CA)	Nugent	Schweikert	Yoho
Mica	Rouzer	Yoder	Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)	Nunes	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Miller (FL)	Royce	Young (AK)	Doggett	(NM)	Titus	Olson	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)
Miller (MI)	Ruiz	Young (IA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko	Palazzo	Sessions	Young (IN)
Moolenaar	Ruppersberger	Young (IN)	Duncan (TN)	(NM)	Torres	Palmer	Sewell (AL)	Zeldin
Mooney (WV)	Russell	Zeldin	Edwards	Lynch	Tsongas	Paulsen	Shimkus	Zinke
Moulton	Ryan (WI)	Zinke	Ellison	Maloney, Carolyn	Van Hollen			
Mullin	Scalise		Engel	Matsui	Vargas			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—9

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Schultz
Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	
Kaptur	Wagner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 167, noes 254, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

AYES—167

Adams	Beatty	Beyer
Amash	Becerra	Bishop (GA)
Bass	Bera	Blumenauer

NOES—254

Abraham	Costa
Aderholt	Costello (PA)
Aguilar	Cramer
Allen	Crawford
Amodei	Crenshaw
Ashford	Cuellar
Babin	Culberson
Barletta	Curbelo (FL)
Barr	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Denham
Benishek	Dent
Billirakis	DeSantis
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart
Black	Dold
Blackburn	Duckworth
Blum	Duffy
Bost	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Ellmers (NC)
Brady (TX)	Emmer (MN)
Brat	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Fincher
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann
Brownley (CA)	Fleming
Buchanan	Flores
Bucshon	Forbes
Burgess	Fortenberry
Byrne	Fox
Calvert	Franks (AZ)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Carter (TX)	Garrett
Chabot	Gibbs
Chaffetz	Gohmert
Clawson (FL)	Goodlatte
Coffman	Gosar
Cole	Gowdy
Collins (GA)	Graham
Collins (NY)	Granger
Comstock	Graves (GA)
Conaway	Graves (LA)
Cook	Graves (MO)

Green, Gene	Green, Al
Griffith	Grijalva
Grothman	Gutiérrez
Guinta	Hahn
Guthrie	Hastings
Hanna	Heck (WA)
Hardy	Higgins
Harper	Himes
Harris	Honda
Hartzler	Hoyer
Heck (NV)	Huffman
Hensarling	Israel
Hice, Jody B.	Jackson Lee
Hill	Jeffries
Holding	Johnson (GA)
Hudson	Johnson, E. B.
Huelskamp	Kaptur
Huizenga (MI)	Keating
Hultgren	Kelly (IL)
Hunter	Kennedy
Hurd (TX)	Kildee
Hurt (VA)	Kilmer
Issa	Kind
Jenkins (KS)	Kuster
Jenkins (WV)	Langevin
Johnson (OH)	Larsen (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Larson (CT)
Jolly	Lawrence
Jones	Lee
Jordan	Levin
Joyce	Lieu, Ted
Katko	Loeb
Kelly (PA)	Loftgren
King (IA)	Lowenthal
King (NY)	Lowe
Kinzing (IL)	Lujan Grisham
Kirkpatrick	(NM)
Kline	Luján, Ben Ray
Knight	(NM)
Labrador	Lynch
LaMalfa	Maloney, Carolyn
Lamborn	Matsui

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Payne	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Slaughter	Schultz
Lewis	Smith (WA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1834

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) 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 210, noes 213, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

AYES—210

Adams	Bera	Brady (PA)
Aguilar	Beyer	Brown (FL)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Ashford	Blum	Bustos
Bass	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Beatty	Bonamici	Capps
Becerra	Boyle, Brendan F.	Capuano
Benishek		Cárdenas

Carney	Higgins	Perlmutter	Keating	Noem	Shimkus	Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Himes	Perry	Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Shuster	Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Pocan
Cartwright	Honda	Peters	Kennedy	Nunes	Simpson	DeFazio	Kildee	Polis
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Pingree	King (IA)	Olson	Smith (MO)	DeGette	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Pocan	King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Delaney	Kind	Quigley
Chaffetz	Hunter	Poliquin	Kline	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Chu, Judy	Israel	Polis	Knight	Paulsen	Smith (TX)	DelBene	Kuster	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)	Labrador	Pearce	Stefanik	DeSaulnier	Langevin	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Quigley	LaMalfa	Peterson	Stewart	Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Rangel	Lamborn	Pittenger	Stutzman	Dingell	Ruiz	Ruiz
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Reed	Lance	Pitts	Thompson (PA)	Doggett	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Jones	Rice (NY)	Latta	Poe (TX)	Thornberry	Doyle, Michael F.	Lee	Rush
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rice (SC)	Levin	Pompeo	Tiberi	Duckworth	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Coffman	Kelly (IL)	Richmond	Lipinski	Posey	Tipton	Edwards	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cohen	Kildee	Rohrabacher	Long	Price, Tom	Trott	Ellison	Lipinski	
Collins (NY)	Kilmer	Rooney (FL)	Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Turner	Engel	LoBiondo	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Kind	Roybal-Allard	Lucas	Reichert	Valadao	Eshoo	Sarbanes	
Conyers	Kinzingler (IL)	Ruiz	Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Walberg	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Schiff
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger	Lummis	Ribble	Walden	Esty	Lowenthal	Schrader
Costa	Kuster	Rush	MacArthur	Rigell	Walker	Farr	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Costello (PA)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)	Marchant	Roby	Walorski	Fattah	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Marino	Roe (TN)	Walters, Mimi	Fitzpatrick	(NM)	Serrano
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta	McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)	Foster	Luján, Ben Ray	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lawrence	Sanford	McCauley	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)	Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sherman
Curbelo (FL)	Lee	Sarbanes	McHenry	Rokita	Wenstrup	Fudge	Lynch	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman	Gabbard	Maloney,	Sines
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Schiff	McMorris	Roskam	Westmoreland	Gallego	Carolyn	Slaughter
Davis, Rodney	Loebach	Schrader	Rodgers	Ross	Whitfield	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Speier
DeFazio	Lofgren	Schweikert	McSally	Rothfus	Williams	Graham	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Love	Scott (VA)	Meadows	Rouzer	Wilson (SC)	Grayson	McCollum	Takai
Delaney	Lowenthal	Scott, David	Meehan	Royce	Wittman	Green, Al	McDermott	Takano
DeLauro	Lowey	Serrano	Messer	Russell	Womack	Green, Gene	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham	Sherman	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Woodall	Grijalva	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Sinema	Miller (FL)	Salmon	Yoder	Gutiérrez	Meeks	Titus
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires	Miller (MI)	Scalise	Yoho	Hahn	Meng	Tonko
Dingell	(NM)	Slaughter	Moolenaar	Scott, Austin	Young (IA)	Hastings	Moore	Torres
Doggett	Lynch	Speier	Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Young (IN)	Heck (WA)	Moulton	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney,	Stivers	Murphy (PA)	Sessions		Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)	Neugebauer	Sewell (AL)		Himes	Nadler	Vargas
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Takai				Honda	Napolitano	Veasey
Ellison	Massie	Takano	Buck	Lewis	Wagner	Hoyer	Neal	Vela
Engel	Matsui	Takano	Herrera Beutler	Payne	Wasserman	Huffman	Nolan	Velázquez
Eshoo	McClintock	Thompson (CA)	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	Schultz	Israel	Norcross	Visclosky
Esty	McCollum	Thompson (MS)				Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Walz
Farr	McDermott	Titus				Jeffries	Pallone	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	McGovern	Tonko				Johnson (GA)	Pascarell	Watson Coleman
Foster	McNerney	Torres				Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Tsongas				Jones	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Meng	Upton				Kaptur	Peters	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Mooney (WV)	Van Hollen				Keating	Peterson	
Gallego	Moore	Vargas						
Gibson	Moulton	Veasey						
Graham	Mulvaney	Vela						
Grayson	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez						
Green, Al	Nadler	Visclosky						
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Walz						
Grijalva	Neal	Waters, Maxine						
Gutiérrez	Newhouse	Watson Coleman						
Hahn	Nolan	Welch						
Hanna	Norcross	Wilson (FL)						
Hastings	O'Rourke	Yarmuth						
Heck (NV)	Pallone	Young (AK)						
Heck (WA)	Pascarell	Zeldin						
	Pelosi	Zinke						

NOES—213

Abraham	Cook	Gosar
Aderholt	Cramer	Gowdy
Allen	Crawford	Granger
Amodei	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Babin	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Barr	Denham	Griffith
Barton	Dent	Grothman
Bilirakis	DeSantis	Guinta
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Hardy
Black	Dold	Harper
Blackburn	Duffy	Harris
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Emmer (MN)	Hill
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Fleming	Hultgren
Burgess	Flores	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Forbes	Hurt (VA)
Calvert	Fortenberry	Issa
Carter (GA)	Fox	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Clawson (FL)	Garamendi	Johnson, Sam
Cole	Garrett	Jolly
Collins (GA)	Gibbs	Jordan
Comstock	Gohmert	Joyce
Conaway	Goodlatte	Katko

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1839

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POCAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

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 de-
vice, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—186

Adams	Brown (FL)	Clark (MA)
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Ashford	Bustos	Clay
Bass	Butterfield	Cleaver
Beatty	Capps	Clyburn
Becerra	Capuano	Cohen
Bera	Cárdenas	Connolly
Beyer	Carney	Conyers
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Blumenauer	Cartwright	Costa
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Boyle, Brendan F.	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
	Cicilline	Cummings

Abraham	Denham	Huelskamp
Aderholt	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Allen	DeSantis	Hultgren
Amash	DesJarlais	Hunter
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Hurd (TX)
Babin	Dold	Hurt (VA)
Barletta	Duffy	Issa
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Benishek	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Emmer (MN)	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Jolly
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Jordan
Black	Fleischmann	Joyce
Blackburn	Fleming	Katko
Blum	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Bost	Forbes	King (IA)
Boustany	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Fox	Kinzingler (IL)
Brat	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Labrador
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Gibson	Lamborn
Bucshon	Gohmert	Lance
Burgess	Goodlatte	Latta
Byrne	Gosar	Long
Calvert	Gowdy	Loudermilk
Carter (GA)	Granger	Love
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Chabot	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Clawson (FL)	Griffith	MacArthur
Coffman	Grothman	Marchant
Cole	Guinta	Marino
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Massie
Collins (NY)	Hanna	McCarthy
Comstock	Hardy	McCauley
Conaway	Harper	McClintock
Cook	Harris	McHenry
Costello (PA)	Hartzler	McKinley
Cramer	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Crawford	Hensarling	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Hice, Jody B.	McSally
Culberson	Hill	Meadows
Curbelo (FL)	Holding	Meehan
Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Messer

Mica	Roby	Thompson (PA)	Gibbs	Massie	Ross	McNerney	Rice (NY)	Stivers
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Thornberry	Gohmert	McCarthy	Rothfus	Meehan	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi	Goodlatte	McCauley	Rouzer	Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Takai
Moolenaar	Rogers (KY)	Tipton	Gosar	McClintock	Royce	Meng	Ros-Lehtinen	Takano
Mooney (WV)	Rohrabacher	Trott	Gowdy	McHenry	Russell	Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Mullin	Rokita	Turner	Granger	McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Moulton	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Mulvaney	Rooney (FL)	Upton	Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Salmon	Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao	Graves (LA)	McSally	Sanford	Murphy (PA)	Rush	Titus
Neugebauer	Roskam	Walberg	Griffith	Meadows	Scalise	Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Newhouse	Ross	Walden	Grothman	Schweikert	Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sánchez, Loretta	Torres
Noem	Rothfus	Walker	Guinta	Sensenbrenner	Neal	Nolan	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Nugent	Royce	Walorski	Hardy	Sessions	Nolan	Norcross	Schakowsky	Turner
Nunes	Russell	Walters, Mimi	Harper	Shimkus	O'Rourke	Pallone	Schiff	Valadao
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)	Harris	Simpson	Pascarell	Pelosi	Schrader	Van Hollen
Palazzo	Salmon	Webster (FL)	Hartzler	Smith (MO)	Scott (VA)	Perlmutter	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Palmer	Sanford	Westerman	Hensarling	Smith (NE)	Peters	Peterson	Serrano	Veasey
Paulsen	Scalise	Westmoreland	Hice, Jody B.	Smith (TX)	Pingree	Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Pearce	Schweikert	Whitfield	Hill	Stewart	Polis	Price (NC)	Sherman	Velázquez
Perry	Scott, Austin	Williams	Holding	Stutzman	Quigley	Rangel	Shuster	Visclosky
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)	Hudson	Thompson (PA)	Reed	Reichart	Sinema	Walz
Pitts	Sessions	Wittman	Huelskamp	Tipton	Reichart	Renacci	Sires	Waters, Maxine
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Womack	Huizenga (MI)	Trott	Renacci		Slaughter	Watson Coleman
Poliquin	Shuster	Woodall	Hultgren	Upton			Smith (NJ)	Welch
Pompeo	Smith (MO)	Yoder	Hunter	Walberg			Speier	Wilson (FL)
Posey	Smith (NE)	Yoho	Hurd (TX)	Walden			Stefanik	Yarmuth
Price, Tom	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)	Hurt (VA)	Walker				Young (AK)
Ratcliffe	Smith (TX)	Young (IA)	Issa	Walorski				Zeldin
Reed	Stefanik	Young (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Walters, Mimi				
Reichert	Stewart	Zinke	Johnson, Sam	Weber (TX)				
Renacci	Stivers		Jones	Webster (FL)				
Ribble	Stutzman		Jordan	Wenstrup				
Rice (SC)			King (IA)	Westerman				
Rigell			Kline	Westmoreland				

NOT VOTING—8

Buck	Lewis	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1842

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) 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 190, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—190

Abraham	Buchanan	DeSantis
Aderholt	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Allen	Burgess	Duffy
Amash	Byrne	Duncan (SC)
Amodel	Calvert	Duncan (TN)
Babin	Carter (GA)	Ellmers (NC)
Barr	Carter (TX)	Emmer (MN)
Billirakis	Chabot	Farenthold
Bishop (MI)	Chaffetz	Fincher
Black	Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Coffman	Fleming
Blum	Collins (GA)	Flores
Boustany	Comstock	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Fortenberry
Brat	Cramer	Foxx
Bridenstine	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Garrett

NOES—232

Adams	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Aguilar	Davis, Danny	Israel
Ashford	Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee
Barletta	DeFazio	Jeffries
Bass	DeGette	Jenkins (WV)
Beatty	Delaney	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	DeLauro	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	DelBene	Johnson, E. B.
Bera	Denham	Jolly
Beyer	Dent	Joyce
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kaptur
Bishop (UT)	Deutch	Katko
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Keating
Bonamici	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Bost	Doggett	Kelly (PA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dold	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Kind
Bustos	Ellison	King (NY)
Butterfield	Engel	Kinzinger (IL)
Capps	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Capuano	Esty	Kuster
Cardenas	Farr	Lance
Carney	Fattah	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Foster	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Lee
Chu, Judy	Gabbard	Levin
Cicilline	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Clarke (NY)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Clay	Graham	Loeback
Cleaver	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Clyburn	Grayson	Lowenthal
Cohen	Green, Al	Lowe
Cole	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Collins (NY)	Grijalva	(NM)
Connolly	Guthrie	Lujan, Ben Ray
Conyers	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cook	Hahn	Lynch
Cooper	Hanna	Maloney
Costa	Hastings	Carolyn
Costello (PA)	Heck (NV)	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Heck (VA)	Marino
Crowley	Higgins	Matsui
Cuellar	Himes	McCollum
Cummings	Honda	McDermott
Curbelo (FL)	Hoyer	McGovern
		McKinley

NOT VOTING—9

Barton	Lewis	Wasserman
Buck	Payne	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)	
Hinojosa	Wagner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1846

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 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 noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 235, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—186

Abraham	Buchanan	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Bucshon	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Byrne	Ellmers (NC)
Amodel	Calvert	Farenthold
Babin	Carter (GA)	Fincher
Barr	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Barton	Chabot	Fleming
Benishek	Chaffetz	Flores
Billirakis	Clawson (FL)	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Coffman	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Foxx
Black	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Comstock	Garrett
Boustany	Conaway	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Gohmert
Brat	Crawford	Goodlatte
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Gowdy
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Granger

Graves (GA) McClintock
 Graves (LA) McHenry
 Griffith McMorris
 Grothman Rodgers
 Guinta McSally
 Guthrie Meadows
 Harper Messer
 Harris Mica
 Hartzler Miller (FL)
 Hensarling Miller (MI)
 Hice, Jody B. Moolenaar
 Hill Mooney (WV)
 Holding Mullin
 Hudson Mulvaney
 Huelskamp Neugebauer
 Huizenga (MI) Newhouse
 Hunter Noem
 Hurd (TX) Nugent
 Hurt (VA) Nunes
 Issa Olson
 Jenkins (KS) Palazzo
 Johnson, Sam Palmer
 Jones Paulsen
 Jordan Pearce
 King (IA) Perry
 Kline Pittenger
 Knight Pitts
 Labrador Poe (TX)
 LaMalfa Poliquin
 Lamborn Pompeo
 Latta Posey
 Long Price, Tom
 Loudermilk Ratcliffe
 Love Ribble
 Lucas Rice (SC)
 Luetkemeyer Rigell
 Lummis Roby
 Marchant Roe (TN)
 Marino Rogers (AL)
 Massie Rogers (KY)
 McCarthy Rohrabacher
 McCaul Rokita

NOES—235

Adams Denham
 Aguilar DeSaulnier
 Ashford Deutch
 Barletta Diaz-Balart
 Bass Dingell
 Beatty Doggett
 Becerra Dold
 Bera Doyle, Michael
 Beyer F.
 Bishop (GA) Duckworth
 Blumenauer Duffy
 Bonamici Edwards
 Bost Ellison
 Boyle, Brendan Emmer (MN)
 F. Engel
 Brady (PA) Eshoo
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA) Farr
 Bustos Fattah
 Butterfield Fitzpatrick
 Capps Foster
 Capuano Frankel (FL)
 Cárdenas Fudge
 Carney Gabbard
 Carson (IN) Gallego
 Cartwright Garamendi
 Castor (FL) Gibson
 Castro (TX) Graham
 Chu, Judy Graves (MO)
 Cicilline Grayson
 Clark (MA) Green, Al
 Clarke (NY) Green, Gene
 Clay Grijalva
 Cleaver Gutiérrez
 Clyburn Hahn
 Cohen Hanna
 Connolly Hardy
 Conyers Hastings
 Cook Heck (NV)
 Cooper Heck (WA)
 Costa Higgins
 Costello (PA) Himes
 Courtney Honda
 Crowley Hoyer
 Cuellar Huffman
 Cummings Hultgren
 Curbelo (FL) Israel
 Davis (CA) Jackson Lee
 Davis, Danny Jeffries
 Davis, Rodney Jenkins (WV)
 DeFazio Johnson (GA)
 DeGette Johnson (OH)
 Delaney Johnson, E. B.
 DeLauro Jolly
 DeBene Joyce

Rooney (FL) Pallone
 Ross Pascarell
 Rothfus Pelosi
 Rouzer Perlmutter
 Royce Peters
 Russell Peterson
 Salmon Pingree
 Sanford Pocan
 Scalise Scott, David
 Schweikert Serrano
 Scott, Austin Sewell (AL)
 Sensenbrenner Sherman
 Sessions Shimkus
 Simpson Shuster
 Smith (NE) Sinema
 Smith (TX) Sires
 Stewart Slaughter
 Stutzman Smith (NJ)
 Thompson (PA) Speier
 Thornberry Stefanik
 Tipton Stivers
 Trott Swallow (CA)
 Walberg Takai
 Walker Rush
 Walorski Ryan (OH)
 Walters, Mimi Ryan (WI)
 Weber (TX) Thompson (MS)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IA)

Sánchez, Linda Tiberi
 T. Titus
 Sanchez, Loretta Tonko
 Sarbanes Torres
 Schakowsky Tsongas
 Schiff Turner
 Schrader Upton
 Scott (VA) Valadao
 Pocan Scott, David Van Hollen
 Serrano Vargas
 Sewell (AL) Veasey
 Sherman Vela
 Shimkus Velázquez
 Shuster Visclosky
 Sinema Walden
 Sires Walz
 Slaughter Waters, Maxine
 Smith (NJ) Watson Coleman
 Speier Welch
 Stefanik Wilson (FL)
 Stivers Yarmuth
 Swallow (CA) Young (AK)
 Takai Young (IN)
 Takano Zeldin
 Thompson (CA) Zinke
 Thompson (MS)

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
 Crenshaw Payne
 Herrera Beutler Smith (MO)
 Hinojosa Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1849

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will
 read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Military
 Construction and Veterans Affairs and Re-
 lated Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016”.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move
 that the Committee do now rise and re-
 port the bill back to the House with
 sundry amendments, with the rec-
 ommendation that the amendments be
 agreed to and that the bill, as amend-
 ed, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
 and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.
 HULTGREN) having assumed the chair,
 Mr. DOLD, Acting Chair of the Com-
 mittee of the Whole House on the state
 of the Union, reported that that Com-
 mittee, having had under consideration
 the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropria-
 tions for military construction, the De-
 partment of Veterans Affairs, and re-
 lated agencies for the fiscal year end-
 ing September 30, 2016, and for other
 purposes, directed him to report the
 bill back to the House with sundry
 amendments adopted in the Committee
 of the Whole, with the recommendation
 that the amendments be agreed to and
 that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
 House Resolution 223, the previous
 question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any
 amendment reported from the Com-
 mittee 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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I
 have a motion to recommit at the
 desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the
 gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 Clerk will report the motion to recom-
 mit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the
 bill H.R. 2029 to the Committee on Appro-
 priations with instructions to report the
 same back to the House forthwith with the
 following amendment:

In the “Medical Services” account, on page
 27, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert
 “(increased by \$15,000,000)”.

In the “General Administration” account,
 on page 30, line 15, after the first dollar
 amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
 tlewoman from Arizona is recognized for
 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker,
 this is the final amendment to the bill,
 which will not kill the bill or send it
 back to committee. If adopted, the bill
 will immediately proceed to final pas-
 sage, as amended.

As we witnessed last year during the
 VA’s patient access crisis, the VA does
 not have the resources it needs to care
 for our Nation’s veterans. Last year, I
 worked tirelessly with my colleagues
 to pass the Veterans Access, Choice,
 and Accountability Act, which estab-
 lished the VA Choice Program, allow-
 ing our veterans to seek care outside
 the VA when they live too far from a
 VA medical facility or cannot receive
 timely care.

While some improvements in the VA
 patient access have been made, I know
 from listening to the veterans in my
 district and from veterans service or-
 ganizations that veterans are still strug-
 gling to access care. This bill, in its
 current form, underfunds the VA by
 over a billion dollars—a billion dollars.
 The Arizona Department of Veterans’
 Services and the Arizona VFW and vet-
 erans groups all over Arizona and this
 country are opposed to these cuts.

This motion to recommit will pro-
 vide an additional \$15 million for vital
 medical services, long-term care, men-
 tal health treatment, assistance to
 homeless veterans, substance abuse
 treatment, and caregiver support. \$15
 million toward these essential services
 for our veterans is tiny in comparison
 to the drastic cuts to the VA’s budget
 in this bill. This \$15 million is paid for
 by a reduction in administrative ex-
 penses, so this money will go directly
 to providing care for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind my
 colleagues that the VA Choice Program
 will end next year. Whether or not vet-
 erans are given a choice where they
 may receive their care, the VA will
 still need adequate funding and re-
 sources to care for our veterans.

I would also like to remind my col-
 leagues that just 2 months ago we
 learned from another whistleblower
 that the Phoenix VA’s mental health

facility is significantly underresourced. Due to significant understaffing and mismanagement, veterans contemplating suicide and veterans seeking treatment for substance abuse will be unable to receive the immediate care they need. This is horrible and unacceptable.

While it is necessary that we continue to hold the VA accountable, address the VA's management issues, and prevent waste, we will not solve the VA's patient access problem without ensuring the VA has the resources it needs to provide timely and quality care. Veterans will continue to wait if the resources are not there.

If we do not address the lack of VA resources now, we will continue to hear heartbreaking stories from veterans who are unable to receive timely treatment. If the VA Choice Program ends without reauthorization and funding, those veterans will return to the VA, and veterans new to the VA will also need treatment. We will then face another patient access crisis, and this time it will be our fault.

Caring for veterans is a cost of war. Cuts to government spending should not be shouldered by the men and women we have chosen to place in harm's way. We have a moral obligation to ensure these brave Americans who have fought and sacrificed for us receive the health care and the benefits they have earned.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we have a serious responsibility to exercise proper oversight. This bill has long enjoyed broad bipartisan support and was brought up through an open process that allowed all voices to be heard and all opinions to be considered.

Now, I was proud to work in a bipartisan manner with Ranking Member BISHOP on this bill. He is a good friend and a good man and a good partner. We considered, together, 715 Member requests while drafting this bill, of which 562 were from Democratic Members, and we did our best to accommodate the Members on both sides of the aisle. I believe we did. We were successful. We then considered 43 additional amendments, proposals yesterday and all last night. This motion to recommit could have been offered at anytime during this debate, but they chose to do it tonight.

By the way, I should let you know, too, the bill that we are going to be considering passed last year with all but one vote. The bill that we are going to be considering spends 6 percent more than the one last year.

I want to say something about the motion to recommit. It reflects the administration's continuing efforts to deflect their management failures at the VA on the Congress. And the gentle-

lady who just spoke said this bill cuts spending. Well, it does not.

□ 1900

It is a 6 percent increase over last year. It is not a cut.

Yes, I know the administration doesn't want us to talk about the \$930 million cost overrun at the Denver VA medical construction project, and there are others. I know they don't want us to discuss the pervasive neglect and mismanagement at the Philadelphia VA regional office, and of course, they don't want us to discuss the atrocious failure to serve countless veterans in Phoenix.

I know the administration doesn't want us to talk about the cost overruns in Denver, Orlando, or wherever else they may occur—New Orleans. They don't want us to talk about the problems in Philadelphia, where the inspector general, just 2 weeks ago, provided a laundry list of horrible failures.

Most of all, they don't want us to talk about or discuss the atrocious failure to serve countless veterans in Phoenix, many of whom, tragically, paid for the VA's mistakes with their own lives.

The Obama administration has controlled this government for 6 years. It is time that they take responsibility for the VA's failures and allow us to move forward with this bill to increase the services and resources available to our veterans and servicemembers.

For the administration to say they would veto this bill because we provided a 6 percent increase for the VA over enacted levels, instead of a 9 percent increase, is the sort of incendiary threat that can only make sense here in Washington.

Only here in Washington can a 6 percent increase be called a cut. Everywhere else in America, that is called an increase, 6 percent above last year. Congress should not be expected to behave like potted plants and simply accede to the President's request that does not adhere to the budget caps that he signed into law himself.

By the way, just for some numbers, the bill provides \$48.6 billion for VA medical services—\$3.4 billion above last year's level—plus we provide advance funding for fiscal year '17 at \$51.7 billion.

Our bill is a good bill in its current form. It targets the needs of homeless veterans, caregivers who sacrifice their time and livelihood to care for their injured servicemembers, and those veterans waiting too long for decisions on their disability claims.

In all these areas, the bill provides every dollar the administration requested, but that good news story apparently doesn't fit the gloom and doom narrative of this administration which, once again, doesn't want to acknowledge the management failures at the VA, and they are saying a 6 percent increase is a cut.

We know better. The American people know better. The veterans know

better. It is time that we reject this motion and support the underlying bill.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 236, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—181

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

NOES—236

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

NOT VOTING—14

Allen	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)
Barton	Lewis	Wagner
Bilirakis	Payne	Wasserman
Buck	Pelosi	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (MO)	Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1908

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

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—ayes 255, noes 163, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—255

Abraham	Goodlatte	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gosar	Noem
Aguilar	Gowdy	Nugent
Allen	Graham	Nunes
Amash	Granger	Olson
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Ashford	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Babin	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Barletta	Griffith	Pearce
Barr	Grothman	Perry
Barton	Guinta	Peters
Benishek	Guthrie	Peterson
Bera	Hanna	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Hardy	Pitts
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Poliquin
Black	Hartzler	Pompeo
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Posey
Blum	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Boustany	Higgins	Reed
Brady (TX)	Hill	Reichert
Brat	Holding	Renacci
Bridenstine	Hudson	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Brownley (CA)	Hultgren	Roby
Buchanan	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Bustos	Issa	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Chabot	Jolly	Ross
Chaffetz	Jordan	Rothfus
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Rouzer
Coffman	Katko	Royce
Cole	King (IA)	Ruiz
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Russell
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Comstock	Kline	Salmon
Conaway	Knight	Sanchez, Loretta
Cook	Kuster	Sanford
Costa	Labrador	Scalise
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Cramer	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	Latta	Sessions
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Shinkus
Culberson	Long	Shuster
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Sinema
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
DeSantis	MacArthur	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Dold	Marino	Stefanik
Duffy	Massie	Stewart
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Stutzman
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Takai
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Farenthold	Fincher	Thornberry
Fleischmann	Fitzpatrick	Tiberi
Fleming	Fleming	Tipton
Flores	Flores	Trott
Forbes	Forbes	Turner
Fortenberry	Fortenberry	Upton
Fox	Fox	Valadao
Franks (AZ)	Franks (AZ)	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	Frelinghuysen	Walder
Gabbard	Gabbard	Walker
Garrett	Garrett	Walorski
Gibbs	Gibbs	Walters, Mimi
Gibson	Gibson	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Gohmert	Webster (FL)
		Wenstrup
		Westerman
		Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—163

Adams	Fudge	Moulton
Bass	Gallego	Mulvaney
Beatty	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Grayson	Nadler
Beyer	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Nolan
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Norcross
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Boyle, Brendan	Hahn	Pallone
F.	Hastings	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Himes	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Honda	Pingree
Capps	Hoyer	Pocan
Capuano	Huffman	Polis
Cárdenas	Israel	Price (NC)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kildee	T.
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kind	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Conyers	Langevin	Schrader
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Crowley	Lawrence	Lee
Cummings	Lee	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeGette	Lipinski	Sires
Delaney	Loeb sack	Speier
DeLauro	Lofgren	Swailwell (CA)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Takano
Denham	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham	Titus
Deutch	(NM)	Tonko
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray	Torres
Doggett	(NM)	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Lummis	Van Hollen
F.	Lynch	Vargas
Duckworth	Maloney,	Veasey
Edwards	Carolyn	Vela
Ellison	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McDermott	Walz
Esty	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Farr	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meeks	Welch
Foster	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Moore	

NOT VOTING—13

Buck	Neal	Wagner
DeFazio	Payne	Wasserman
Herrera Beutler	Slaughter	Schultz
Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Lewis	Thompson (MS)	

□ 1914

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 2028.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1917

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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (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, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 29, line 4.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$167,050,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$167,050,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, over the next decade, the U.S. is set to spend hundreds of billions of dollars operating and upgrading our nuclear arsenal. But in this budget environment, every dollar we spend to keep our outdated and oversized nuclear arsenal functioning is a dollar we aren't spending on other priorities that keep us safe and secure or on reducing our unsustainable debt and deficits. That is why the amendment I am offering with Mr. POLIS will put \$167 million towards deficit reduction by placing funding for the new nuclear-armed cruise missile warhead back on its original 2015 acquisition schedule.

In the FY 2015 budget, production of the warhead was scheduled to begin in 2027, but this year's budget request sped up the development for the warhead by 2 years. This is despite the fact that the existing air-launched cruise missile and warhead isn't being phased out until the 2030s. And there is plenty of uncertainty about whether this program is affordable or even necessary.

Chairman SIMPSON is so concerned about the cost of the warhead that language was included in the E and W report to require a red team assessment on the affordability of the program—and for good reason, given our history of spending large amounts of money on warhead programs that end up getting tabled.

Given the cost concerns over the program, does it really make sense to rush the acquisition process?

Furthermore, as some experts note, there is no longer a need to shoot nuclear cruise missiles from far away

when we have the most advanced bomber ever created in our arsenal, the B-2 stealth bomber, which is capable of penetrating enemy airspace and dropping a nuclear bomb directly above a target. And if we decide we want to shoot nuclear missiles from thousands of miles away, we still have very expensive submarines and very expensive ICBMs capable of doing just that.

So ask yourselves: Should we really be accelerating the development of a warhead that goes on a missile we don't need and could cost hundreds of millions, if not billions, more than anticipated?

I ask my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to maintain funding at the program's FY 2015 acquisition schedule, and save the taxpayers \$167 million in the process.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Ensuring funding for the modernization of our nuclear weapons stockpile is a critical national security priority in this bill. The bill fully funds the \$195 million needed to initiate a life extension program for the W80 warhead, the only nuclear-tipped cruise missile in the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The life extension program will replace non-nuclear and other components to extend the life of the W80, and to ensure it can be deployed on the Air Force's long-range stand off cruise missile, or LRSO, should that program move forward.

The budget request was considered a 2-year acceleration of the LRSO program, compared to last year's stockpile plan, to meet a defense requirement for deployment in 2030. However, it is clear that there is considerable planning that needs to be accomplished by the administration before Congress can have confidence in these long-term stockpile plans.

While 2030 may seem like many years away, these warheads are very complex, and there is considerable amount of work to accomplish between now and then. Performing additional work earlier in the schedule will allow the NNSA to reduce technical risk and limit any cost growth. The gentleman's amendment would slash funding for this effort, and that will add additional risk and uncertainty to the schedule.

We must do the work that is needed to extend the life of this warhead as long as there is a clear defense requirement for maintaining a nuclear cruise missile capability. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I respect Chairman SIMPSON's request that language be included in the E and W re-

port to require a red team assessment of the affordability of this program. All I am adding to that is, if we have questions about the affordability of this program, a program that is not going to take place for some time, do we really want to accelerate the spending program?

In this budget environment, it does not make sense to accelerate the development of a warhead while, at the same time, requiring an assessment on its affordability. Why would we put more money into a program that may end up getting tabled? Shouldn't we at least wait until the release of the red team report before adjusting the acquisition schedule?

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to please not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. SIMPSON. Again, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

As I said, performing additional work earlier in the schedule will allow the NNSA to reduce technical risk and limit any cost growth while we are finding out about what the red team assessment comes up with. So I think this is important that we defeat this amendment so that we can move forward with modernization of this warhead.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$25,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. SIMPSON in a debate about this very same issue, and I don't want to cover the exact same ground, but I want to put this in the context of, I think, a very

serious concern that all of us ought to have.

The rebuilding, or what is known as the life extension program for our nuclear bombs, is but one small part, actually, one very large part, but small in comparison to the total reconditioning, rebuilding of our entire nuclear enterprise.

And when you consider the totality of what we are doing in this appropriations bill and last night, when we took up the defense authorization bill, you can only, and you must, come to the conclusion that the United States is now involved in a very significant, total restructuring and rebuilding of our entire nuclear deterrent system. It is not just the six to seven different nuclear warheads that are going to be rebuilt at a cost of several tens of billions of dollars; it is also all of the delivery systems. We are, in fact, engaged in a new nuclear arms race.

Now, many of us grew up in the sixties and seventies—fifties, sixties, and seventies—and I think all of us have a memory of the arms race and all of the drills, hiding underneath the table, all of that trouble. I think we have a memory of what went on with the Cuban Missile Crisis.

When you step back and look at what we are doing in the appropriations bill before us as well as in the National Defense Authorization Act, you must come to the conclusion that we are on the path to spend \$1 trillion over the next 25 to 30 years rebuilding the entire nuclear enterprise. We have, in this bill, all of the nuclear weapons.

In this one, we went from some \$9 million last year for this W80 to over \$190 million in this bill. Yes, there are safeguards and, yes, we ought to pull all of this money back until we decide how this fits into the new cruise missile, the new long-range cruise missile replacing the old variety.

That goes on the new stealth bomber, the LRSO, a new stealth bomber, at \$550 million a copy, more than half a billion dollars a plane. A cruise missile, a new plane doing the exact same thing, and that is to be added to a new Minuteman missile for the silos in the Midwest, the upper Midwest, new Minuteman III missiles.

That will be added to the new submarines that are going out there with new missiles and new warheads and, on top of that, some new stealth technology that is going on that we really can't even talk about.

But it is happening, \$1 trillion in a nuclear arms race that is being replicated by China and Russia, the United Kingdom and France.

What in the world is this world coming to?

This isn't Iran. Iran is a separate issue, significantly important, but this is different. This is the major nuclear-armed countries in the world, all of them, upgrading their nuclear systems.

We have the new bombs, new precision bombs. We have the new delivery system, stealth. It is extraordinarily

dangerous because the hair trigger of the past and all of the rules of the past are now going to be put aside, and now we have a really, really, fine hair trigger.

□ 1930

You won't know but a few minutes ahead of time when it is incoming because it is a stealth bomber or a cruise missile or even a hypersonic missile. And suddenly, there you are; you have got seconds to make a decision about whether you are going to annihilate the world or not. How do you respond to this?

And you have got Russia over there talking about using a nuclear weapon as a deterrent to reduce some sort of standard military conflict. This is an extraordinarily dangerous situation.

I want to draw the attention of the entire House and use this particular effort to reduce this account by \$25 million. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), I think, had a better proposal, and that is to reduce the whole thing.

But here we are. Pay attention, men and women of this House and of the Senate. Pay attention to what the overarching issue is here. It is the opening quarter of a new nuclear arms race among the great powers of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The bill fully funds the request of \$195 million to initiate a life extension program for the W80 warhead. The life extension program will replace non-nuclear and other components to extend the life of the W80 and to ensure it can be deployed on the Air Force's Long-Range Standoff cruise missile, or the LRSO, should that program move forward.

Certainly, the committee will look to realign the work that needs to be done on the W80 if there are changes to the schedule for the LRSO. But as long as that program stays on track, we need to make sure that the work that needs to be done by the NNSA is properly aligned with those efforts.

The gentleman's amendment would make it more difficult for the NNSA to meet its schedule requirements, and I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$1,918,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided by this Act for Project 99-D-143, Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, and by prior Acts that remain unobligated for such Project, may be made available only for construction and program support activities for such Project. *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, \$10,394,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$13,802,000) (increased by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$3,802,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Nebraska and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, it is my understanding that our chairman, Chairman SIMPSON, as well as Ranking Member KAPTUR actually support this amendment. I want to express my gratitude to the chairman for working with me and thinking critically as to how we make our nuclear nonproliferation architecture more robust.

What this amendment does is it moves \$13.8 million from the mixed oxide portion of our nonproliferation account over to the nuclear smuggling and detection account and the research and development account as well.

Nuclear smuggling and detection is an important part of our nonproliferation regimen, and research and development into better techniques to detect the illicit movement of fissile material or technology has to be one of the more robust policy considerations moving forward, not only in this appropriations bill but as a body here, ensuring that we, again, are focused singularly on the nonproliferation threats that are occurring throughout the world as this technology spreads and as fissile material potentially becomes

more available to those who would use it for potentially great harm.

I also want, in the amendment, to point out why this money is taken from the mixed oxide program.

Currently in the bill, we are spending about \$345 million on this program. But MOX is expensive, and its future is unclear. We have to come to some policy decision here. We keep digging this hole and digging this hole. This policy is adrift, and it is costing taxpayers a great deal of money. It is not fair in terms of public policy. It is not fair to taxpayers. It is not fair to the people of South Carolina and Georgia because of this uncertainty.

So we need a decision here. If it is, No, we are not going to proceed with MOX, then we have to develop an understanding of what we are going to do with this material, whether it is blend it down or store it or whether we need to rethink the entire public policy that led us to this point, which is about 20 years old, and whether perhaps this ought to become some sort of international consortium, for instance, to deal with this particular issue and share in the cost.

If the answer is, Yes, we are going to proceed with MOX, then spending \$345 million a year to sort of keep it open, with a little bit extra, and that cost to keep it open—to keep it in cold storage, as we say—is approximately \$200 million, so we throw in a little more on top. It doesn't get us to final completion. It doesn't even really get us on that road.

So the policy here is adrift, and we have got to come to some deeper consideration as to what we are going to do.

The problem with MOX fundamentally is the initial cost was \$1 billion. Now we are looking at \$7 billion. The lifecycle costs are skyrocketing. So some clear, deliberate decision. And if it is "yes," we need to expedite this, and we need to do so in a cost-conscious manner. If it is "no," let's turn to other alternatives quickly so that we can move more of these funds into the robust portions of our nonproliferation regimen, our architecture to ensure that we bring down the probability of a nuclear weapons explosion as close to zero as possible, ensuring as well that we are keeping this material out of others hands.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for taking up this issue. The MOX facility lifecycle cost is now over \$47 billion and at the end of the day will not solve the problem.

The disposition of the unnecessary plutonium stock can be done in other ways. We ought to set aside that money. You are quite correct to put it into nonproliferation issues, trying to figure out where the loose nukes might be around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I will draw your attention and the attention of the gentle-

men and gentlewomen here today that in yesterday's National Defense Authorization Act, those facilities that sense the movement of nuclear materials across borders, the in-place were withdrawn, taken out. We ought to pay attention to that, put those back in in one more piece.

I commend the gentleman for being right on. And we do need to sort out the MOX facility and come to some conclusion; otherwise, we are in a \$47 billion rathole that won't solve the problem.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for trying to work with me. This is a difficult position. The chairman has a very difficult task here of balancing competing ends. I really appreciate the way in which he has artfully drawn together an important bill here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his efforts in nonproliferation and his strong advocacy for this program and trying to become the expert. And really, he is what I consider maybe one of the foremost experts in the House on nonproliferation issues. I thank both the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from California for their efforts in this area.

It is a challenging issue for us. You know, I was interested to hear the \$47 billion because I have heard \$31 billion. I have heard \$30 billion. There are all sorts of different estimates, and we haven't got the numbers of how they came to these conclusions. And when they look to the alternatives in this report that just came out from the Department, they said, if I remember correctly, the downblend activities had a cost that was much less. But if you look at the downblend alternatives, what they didn't add into it is that you would put that material in WIPP theoretically.

First of all, you would have to get WIPP extended. It is supposed to be closed. So you have got a 15-year extension of what you would have to do. There was no cost in there for the operation of WIPP for those 15 years and what it was going to cost. So we are still having a hard time coming to grips with what the actual cost of the different alternatives are.

This is one of those things that it is frustrating for our committee, I think, over the years for a lot of different things. Where we head down one path, spend billions of dollars, and then all of a sudden, change directions. And it seems like we are throwing money away.

But I am open to looking at what the alternatives are, and I want to look at the numbers behind the report that

came out. But this amendment simply adds and reduces the defense nuclear nonproliferation account by the same amount. Therefore, the language of the amendment doesn't change the amounts directed specifically for the MOX project in the House report, which will continue to be funded at \$345 million.

But I understand both of your concerns. They are concerns I share. And they are concerns we need to address because you are absolutely right. If we are not going to go down this road, we shouldn't be spending \$345 million a year.

Now we are going to spend a bunch of money at the start. Even if you close it down, it is going to cost some money, or if you stop it. So all of that needs to be taken into consideration. But we need to make a determination of what is going to happen with MOX and what we are going to do with this additional plutonium.

Some people have suggested maybe the best thing to do is store it. Of course that violates an agreement that we have with the Russians. So you would have to get their agreement on that. So it is a challenging issue, I will be the first to admit. And we have had a challenge in the committee trying to deal with it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho's concerns and the way he is approaching it is really quite commendable and the right way to go about it. Two studies have been done, the most recent dealing with the \$47 million. That speaks to the current MOX procedure and process. The blending down, you have correctly analyzed the problem there because it doesn't take into account the full cost, and then you have still got to dispose of this stuff someplace.

There is also the vitrification of it, which is blending down, putting it into a glass container, and then storing that. Those have problems.

There is another option that will be analyzed and is coming out later in this year, in September, and that is the use of a fast reactor to actually burn the plutonium and, thereby, make it unusable for weapons. It also would generate a significant amount of energy, which could produce steam and electrical energy along the way. That study is coming out later this year.

In the meantime, we ought to do what you are doing here, and that is, just slow down, take a look at this.

And for those who are concerned about the jobs in the Savannah River area, a lot of this work can be done there in any one of these options. Just don't do something that doesn't work, which is the current process underway. So you could do a fast reactor there. Use that as a method of consuming the plutonium and rendering it useless.

There are many different ways to do it. But we are headed down a rathole. Slow down. Stop.

I commend both the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Idaho for where they are going on this. Carry on.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from California. And I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, again, for his efforts in this area. I know it is a matter of both urgency to the United States and to the world, actually. But I thank the gentleman for his efforts in this arena, and continue on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Again, let me just reiterate my deep thanks to the chairman for his leadership on this. This is a tough one, and he is working aggressively to try to get to the heart of a prudential and good decision.

Let me thank, again, the gentleman from California for his insights and participation as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$125,000,000)”.

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$105,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I want to raise an issue along the lines of my earlier discussion and part of what we just heard in the previous discussion. That is, where are we going with the nuclear enterprise? What is it all about? Where will it take us?

My personal view is that we are in the first quarter of a new nuclear arms race. This amendment deals with a critical part of that effort to rebuild the nuclear weapons systems of the United States.

We currently have maybe 10,000 unused nuclear plutonium pits. This is the heart of a nuclear bomb. It is pure plutonium, and it is the heart of the bomb.

The 10,000 that are not used came out of nuclear weapons that have been dismantled as a result of the various arms control treaties that have been in place over the last 30 years, all to the good. The MOX facility deals with that unused excess plutonium and others. But this amendment deals with the notion of rebuilding and increasing the capacity of the United States to produce new plutonium pits.

□ 1945

We presently have the capacity to produce somewhere between 5 and 10 plutonium pits, again, the heart of a

nuclear weapon, in the existing facilities. We are going to spend a few billion dollars—unknown—but somewhere probably between \$1 billion and \$2 billion or \$3 billion building the facilities to increase the capacity to manufacture these plutonium pits to 50 to 80 a year.

Now, testimony that we have received in the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee indicates that nobody knows what you are going to do with them or whether you even need the pits, but they want to build the facility just in case.

You go: Wait a minute, you have 10,000 out there; what are you going to do? Why are you doing this?

It has never been answered other than: Well, we might need it some day.

Well, God willing, we will never need it some day. Five to 10 a year, more than we need, 50 to 80, the military doesn't know what to do with it; the NNSA doesn't know what to do with it, but they want to build the manufacturing facility even so.

This amendment simply says let's take \$125 million of that and apply it to something useful like cleaning up what is going on out there. Just keep in mind that we are talking about an enormous amount of money here for the production or the manufacturing facilities of these pits.

It is not just the facility for the plutonium, but it is also for the rest of the bombs, so it is probably going to be well over \$10 billion by the time we finish, and then you have the operating costs, if we ever operate at all. Be careful here. We are into a massive expenditure of over \$1 trillion over the next 20 to 25 years.

I have asked the military: Tell us how we are going to spend that.

They say: Well, we really don't know.

They gave me a document that is a bunch of equations with no explanation of what the factors are. I am asking for information. I was shut down in committee yesterday, but we all ought to demand information.

What is going on here? What are we talking about? A new long-range stealth bomber to replace the B-2, new cruise missiles, new submarines, new missiles for land and sea, and new warheads to go on top of it; and, all the while, other countries are trying to match us. It is a nuclear arms race well underway.

Are we causing it? We are clearly part of it. Russia and China are also involved in this and matching technology, spending a vast amount of money. Just think what we could do if we took one-quarter of that and spent it on education. What could we do for the American people? I think I hear the knock-knock of time having run out, and that frightens me because time is running out on this issue, and we need to pay attention here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SIMPSON and his committee for paying attention to all of this.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I just ask for clarification? Which of your amendments are you addressing in your arguments now? It was our understanding the gentleman was addressing the MOX facility. Are you addressing that or your prior amendment?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am addressing the facilities, the nuclear pit facilities, the plutonium pit facilities. It is \$125 million. The MOX was my colleague from Nebraska's amendment. That was his amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment you are speaking to on the pit production is an end of the bill amendment, and we are not yet at the end of the bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So I can come back and do it again?

Mr. SIMPSON. There you go. The amendment that was reported by the Clerk was the MOX facility that took \$125 million out of the MOX facility.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. That was the amendment that was reported by the Clerk.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is what I was speaking to.

Mr. SIMPSON. You have another amendment that deals with pit production?

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I can go back and talk about the MOX facility now. I stand corrected.

The 125 was the MOX facility amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Our arguments and the debate that we just had with the gentleman from Nebraska about the MOX facility and the challenges that we face in the MOX facility is the same as the debate we just had, and while we asked for the Department to look at the two alternatives, the downblend and the continuing MOX, the Armed Services Committee asked for a report on all five of the alternatives that they were looking at and the cost and stuff.

I would oppose this amendment of taking \$125 million out of the MOX facility.

Mr. CLYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if we are, in fact, about to entertain the MOX amendment, I would love to speak in opposition to that amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. This is the amendment that has been reported.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman would yield for 15 seconds, I will explain the error, and then I will be out of the way.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Quite correct, there was an error on my part.

This is the question of the MOX facility, \$125 million to be applied to other cleanup programs across the Nation. That is it. I spoke on a different issue, and the MOX facility came up earlier.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I oppose this amendment. I do so because I really believe that this amendment would endanger our national security by making harmful cuts to the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility that is located in South Carolina.

This facility will be used to dispose of 34 metric tons of weapons grade plutonium according to binding international agreements originally signed back in 2000 and reaffirmed in 2010. Most of the plutonium has already been transferred to the Savannah River site, and it is there awaiting disposition through the MOX facility.

The President has requested the level of funding included in this bill to continue construction. The facility is over 65 percent complete and supports over 1,500 highly skilled jobs. Any further delay will jeopardize our international agreements and will abandon commitments that the country has made to the State of South Carolina when we signed and agreed to house these dangerous materials for our Nation.

I want to close by saying South Carolina has developed what I call a level of tolerance for nuclear. It didn't get there, as we say down in Gullah Geechee country, just by itself. We got there because of the commitment we made to this Nation years ago with the Manhattan Project.

I believe the State of South Carolina and the Savannah River site have made significant commitments to helping secure this Nation. I believe we would be breaking faith with the State to cripple this effort at this time because it is an agreement, the agreements are international, and I think we have a commitment to the State of South Carolina to continue the movement on this project.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be opposed.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee which has jurisdiction over the NRC, our committee has taken a close look at the regulatory priorities and resource needs of the commission.

The Energy and Power Subcommittee oversees nuclear energy, and the Environment and Economy Subcommittee has oversight on nuclear waste. I serve on both subcommittees.

In both committee and subcommittees, we have held hearings in recent years with the commissioners on the NRC, as well as other experts and stakeholders. In these hearings, we have learned important facts such as, while the Nation's fleet of nuclear reactors continues to operate safely, the evidence clearly demonstrates that the NRC's budget exceeds what is reasonably necessary in light of current regulatory and licensing needs. We have further learned that—and the NRC Chairman recently acknowledged—the NRC budget needs to be right-sized to some degree.

We have also focused on the fact that, unlike most other Federal agencies, 90 percent of the NRC's budget is recovered through fees on nuclear licensees, which are eventually paid through electric rates.

This means that an outsized NRC budget is actually paid for by the American people, both through their taxes and their electric rates. We have also seen recent closures of nuclear power plants in the United States and fewer new plants coming online than anticipated a decade ago. In fact, even though the number of nuclear plants is currently decreasing, the NRC budget has increased substantially compared to 10 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairman for acting to provide a level of appropriations for the NRC that is appropriate under the circumstances. This budget gives the NRC all it needs to ensure the safe operation of the Nation's nuclear fleet without asking taxpayers and electricity ratepayers to pay more than is necessary.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his interest in this subject. I can assure you that the subcommittee is very concerned also, and we look forward to working with you and your committees as we try to right-size the NRC and all of the budgets that we will be doing in the future.

As you said, the NRC is well aware of the fact that they need to right-size themselves as they try to attempt to implement their Project Aim 2020, so I appreciate it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, \$1,320,394,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$43,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,426,400).”

Page 30, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,500,000).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would support beginning an assessment of the feasibility of using low-enriched uranium in naval reactor fuel that would meet military requirements.

Using low-enriched uranium in naval reactor fuel could yield significant potential national security benefits related to nuclear nonproliferation, could lower security costs, and supports naval reactor research and development at the cutting edge of nuclear science.

As we continue to face the threat of nuclear terrorism and as countries continue to develop naval fuel for military purposes, the imperative to reduce the use of highly enriched uranium will become increasingly important over the next several decades. This is the time to begin investments in new technologies to address proliferation threats and to reduce reliance on highly enriched uranium.

R&D on LEU for naval reactors would also support continued R&D within Naval Reactors at the cutting edge of nuclear science and engineering, which remains a critical capability. The Naval Reactors director Admiral Richardson testified on March 24, 2015, before the House Armed Services Committee that, with current technology, using low-enriched uranium fuel would only be feasible for aircraft carriers and would require an additional refueling at a cost of \$1 billion. He added, however:

The potential exists that we could develop an advanced fuel system that might increase uranium loading and make low-enriched uranium possible while still meeting very rigorous performance requirements for naval reactors on nuclear-powered warships.

Mr. Chairman, this \$2.5 million in funding would support early testing and manufacturing development required to advance LEU technology for use in naval fuel. Such a program, if

successful, could yield significant benefits for nuclear nonproliferation and yield security cost savings.

Mr. Chairman, it sounds like we have broad-based support for this amendment. I urge acceptance of this amendment in order to start this very important effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2000

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LAN-GEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for Federal Salaries and Expenses in the National Nuclear Security Administration, \$388,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$12,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one fire apparatus pumper truck and one armored vehicle for replacement only, \$5,055,550,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$281,951,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

DEFENSE URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities for Department of Energy contributions for uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning activities, \$471,797,000, to be deposited into the Defense Environmental Cleanup account which shall be transferred to the "Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund".

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$767,570,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$253,729,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are approved for the Shoshone Paiute Trout Hatchery, the Spokane Tribal Hatchery, the Snake River Sockeye Weirs and, in addition, for official

reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$5,000: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and for marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$6,900,000, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, up to \$6,900,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$66,500,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and for marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the Southwestern Power Administration, \$47,361,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), up to \$35,961,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$11,400,000: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$63,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (ex-

cluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, \$307,714,000, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, to remain available until expended, of which \$302,000,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), and section 1 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939 (43 U.S.C. 392a), up to \$214,342,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Western Area Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$93,372,000, of which \$87,658,000 is derived from the Reclamation Fund: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$352,813,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, \$4,490,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 2 of the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$4,262,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services from the Falcon and Amistad Dams shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the hydroelectric facilities of these Dams and associated Western Area Power Administration activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$228,000: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2016, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration may accept up to \$460,000 in funds contributed by United States power customers of the Falcon and Amistad Dams for deposit into the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, and such funds shall be available for

the purpose for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for such purpose: *Provided further*, That any such funds shall be available without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission for the sole purpose of operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, replacing, or upgrading the hydroelectric facilities at these Dams in accordance with agreements reached between the Administrator, Commissioner, and the power customers.

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For expenses necessary for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$3,000, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$319,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$319,800,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and used for expenses necessary in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

**GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT
OF ENERGY**

**(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSIONS OF
FUNDS)**

SEC. 301. (a) No appropriation, funds, or authority made available by this title for the Department of Energy shall be used to initiate or resume any program, project, or activity or to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals or similar arrangements (including Requests for Quotations, Requests for Information, and Funding Opportunity Announcements) for a program, project, or activity if the program, project, or activity has not been funded by Congress.

(b)(1) Unless the Secretary of Energy notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 3 full business days in advance, none of the funds made available in this title may be used to—

(A) make a grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling \$1,000,000 or more;

(B) make a discretionary contract award or Other Transaction Agreement totaling \$1,000,000 or more, including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation;

(C) issue a letter of intent to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(D) announce publicly the intention to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress within 15 days of the conclusion of each quarter a report detailing each grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling less than \$1,000,000 provided during the previous quarter.

(3) The notification required by paragraph (1) and the report required by paragraph (2) shall include the recipient of the award, the amount of the award, the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated, the account and program, project, or activity from which the funds are being

drawn, the title of the award, and a brief description of the activity for which the award is made.

(c) The Department of Energy may not, with respect to any program, project, or activity that uses budget authority made available in this title under the heading “Department of Energy—Energy Programs”, enter into a multiyear contract, award a multiyear grant, or enter into a multiyear cooperative agreement unless—

(1) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award; or

(2) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement includes a clause conditioning the Federal Government's obligation on the availability of future year budget authority and the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 3 days in advance.

(d) Except as provided in subsections (e), (f), and (g), the amounts made available by this title shall be expended as authorized by law for the programs, projects, and activities specified in the “Bill” column in the “Department of Energy” table included under the heading “Title III—Department of Energy” in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act.

(e) The amounts made available by this title may be reprogrammed for any program, project, or activity, and the Department shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 30 days prior to the use of any proposed reprogramming that would cause any program, project, or activity funding level to increase or decrease by more than \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, during the time period covered by this Act.

(f) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

(1) creates, initiates, or eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(2) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds are denied or restricted by this Act; or

(3) reduces funds that are directed to be used for a specific program, project, or activity by this Act.

(g)(1) The Secretary of Energy may waive any requirement or restriction in this section that applies to the use of funds made available for the Department of Energy if compliance with such requirement or restriction would pose a substantial risk to human health, the environment, welfare, or national security.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of any waiver under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after the date of the activity to which a requirement or restriction would otherwise have applied. Such notice shall include an explanation of the substantial risk under paragraph (1) that permitted such waiver.

SEC. 302. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2016 until the enact-

ment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 304. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for the construction of facilities classified as high-hazard nuclear facilities under 10 CFR Part 830 unless independent oversight is conducted by the Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments to ensure the project is in compliance with nuclear safety requirements.

SEC. 305. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 under Department of Energy Order 413.3B, or any successive departmental guidance, for construction projects where the total project cost exceeds \$100,000,000, until a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for the project for that critical decision.

SEC. 306. Notwithstanding section 301(c) of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science” may be used for a multiyear contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement of \$1,000,000 or less unless the contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award.

SEC. 307. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any prior Act under the heading “Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation” may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to, the Russian Federation.

(b) The Secretary of Energy may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such activity is in the national security interests of the United States. This waiver authority may not be delegated.

(c) A waiver under subsection (b) shall not be effective until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, in classified form if necessary, a report on the justification for the waiver.

SEC. 308. (a) NOTIFICATION OF STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE DRAWDOWN.—None of the funds made available by this Act or any prior Act, or funds made available in the SPR Petroleum Account, may be used to conduct a drawdown (including a test drawdown) and sale or exchange of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve unless the Secretary of Energy provides notice, in accordance with subsection (b), of such exchange, or drawdown (including a test drawdown) to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(b)(1) CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION.—The notification required under subsection (a) shall include at a minimum—

(A) the justification for the drawdown or exchange, including—

(i) a specific description of any obligation under international energy agreements; and

(ii) in the case of a test drawdown, the specific aspects of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to be tested;

(B) the provisions of law (including regulations) authorizing the drawdown or exchange;

(C) the number of barrels of petroleum products proposed to be withdrawn or exchanged;

(D) the location of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve site or sites from which the petroleum products are proposed to be withdrawn;

(E) a good faith estimate of the expected proceeds from the sale of the petroleum products;

(F) an estimate of the total inventories of petroleum products in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve after the anticipated drawdown;

(G) a detailed plan for disposition of the proceeds after deposit into the SPR Petroleum Account; and

(H) a plan for refilling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, including whether the acquisition will be of the same or a different petroleum product.

(2) **TIMING OF NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall provide the notification required under subsection (a)—

(A) in the case of an exchange or a drawdown, as soon as practicable after the exchange or drawdown has occurred; and

(B) in the case of a test drawdown, not later than 30 days prior to the test drawdown.

(c) **POST-SALE NOTIFICATION.**—In addition to reporting requirements under other provisions of law, the Secretary shall, upon the execution of all contract awards associated with a competitive sale of petroleum products, notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the actual value of the proceeds from the sale.

(d)(1) **NEW REGIONAL RESERVES.**—The Secretary may not establish any new regional petroleum product reserve unless funding for the proposed regional petroleum product reserve is explicitly requested in advance in an annual budget submission and approved by the Congress in an appropriations Act.

(2) The budget request or notification shall include—

(A) the justification for the new reserve;

(B) a cost estimate for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of the reserve, including funding sources;

(C) a detailed plan for operation of the reserve, including the conditions upon which the products may be released;

(D) the location of the reserve; and

(E) the estimate of the total inventory of the reserve.

SEC. 309. Of the amounts made available by this Act for “National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities”, up to \$50,000,000 may be reprogrammed within such account for Domestic Uranium Enrichment, subject to the notice requirement in section 301(e).

SEC. 310. (a) Unobligated balances available from appropriations for fiscal years 2005 through 2010 are hereby permanently rescinded from the following accounts of the Department of Energy in the specified amounts:

(1) “Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy”, \$16,677,000.

(2) “Energy Programs—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability”, \$900,000.

(3) “Energy Programs—Nuclear Energy”, \$1,665,000.

(4) “Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development”, \$12,064,000.

(5) “Energy Programs—Science”, \$4,717,000.

(6) “Power Marketing Administrations—Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration”, \$4,832,000.

(b) No amounts may be rescinded by this section from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding 40 U.S.C. 14704, and for expenses necessary for the Federal Co-Chairman and the Alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger

motor vehicles, \$95,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100-456, section 1441, \$29,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), 382M, and 382N of said Act, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998: *Provided*, That funds shall be available for construction projects in an amount not to exceed 80 percent of total project cost for distressed communities, as defined by section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (division C, title III, Public Law 105-277), as amended by section 701 of appendix D, title VII, Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1501A-280), and an amount not to exceed 50 percent for non-distressed communities.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Northern Border Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses, notwithstanding section 15751(b) of title 40, United States Code.

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, \$250,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, \$1,003,233,000, including official representation expenses not to exceed \$25,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$25,000,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not more than \$9,500,000 may be made available for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the Office of the Commission, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which, notwithstanding section 201(a)(2)(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5841(a)(2)(c)), the use and expenditure shall only be approved by a majority vote of the Commission: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$862,274,000 in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more

than \$140,959,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be for university research and development in areas relevant to their respective organization's mission, and \$5,000,000 shall be for a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program that will support multiyear projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$12,136,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$10,060,000 in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and be available until September 30, 2017, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$2,076,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$958,000 shall be for Inspector General services for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, which shall not be available from fee revenues.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$3,600,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act, \$1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That any fees, charges, or commissions received pursuant to section 106(h) of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720d(h)) in fiscal year 2016 in excess of \$2,402,000 shall not be available for obligation until appropriated in a subsequent Act of Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

SEC. 401. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall comply with the July 5, 2011, version of Chapter VI of its Internal Commission Procedures when responding to Congressional requests for information.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. (a) None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(b) None of the funds made available for any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may be transferred to accounts funded in title III of this Act, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(c) The head of any relevant department or agency funded in this Act utilizing any transfer authority shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a semiannual report detailing the transfer authorities, except for any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality, used in the previous 6 months and in the year-to-date. This report shall include the amounts transferred and the purposes for which they were transferred, and shall not replace or modify existing notification requirements for each authority.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations).

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct closure of adjudicatory functions, technical review, or support activities associated with the Yucca Mountain geologic repository license application, or for actions that irrevocably remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain may be a repository option in the future.

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547 of July 19, 2010.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 506. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 transform the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, there have been efforts to privatize and consolidate the National Energy Technology Laboratory, also known to us as NETL. This amendment is offered to

eliminate that uncertainty of privatization and to continue the present public-private partnership.

NETL is our Nation's premier energy laboratory for fossil energy, using 600 government scientists, technicians, and employees, but they couple that with nearly 1,200 private sector contractors. Through this partnership, NETL has developed breakthrough research, carbon capture, enhanced natural gas exploration and production, emission control for our power plants, and steam and gas turbine efficiency.

Having NETL government owned and operated also maintains that the research that they produce will not be proprietary and is available to all utility companies. Small utility companies in rural America where I come from would potentially suffer the most from a move towards privatization, and they would no longer be able to perform this research and be forced to buy the new technologies at very high costs.

Mr. Chairman, who would end up paying these high costs? The limited customers of these small companies through higher electric bills.

People looking to privatize and consolidate these laboratories seem to be searching for a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment would prevent the Department from transforming the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close NETL.

NETL does important research in support of a balanced energy portfolio that will increase the efficiency and safe usage of abundant natural resources in this Nation.

I appreciate my colleague's passion for this issue, and I have no objection to this amendment being included in the bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

Mr. BABIN. 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 under the heading "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that require the Islamic Republic of Iran to cease the pursuit, acquisition, and development of nuclear weapons technology.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying that I strongly support programs and operations that are funded by the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation section of the underlying bill.

Keeping loose nuclear materials—especially from places like the former Soviet Union states—out of the hands of America's enemies is one of the most important duties of the Department of Energy and the Federal Government as a whole. That being said, Congress has the obligation to set requirements and criteria for every dollar of taxpayer money that we spend, especially funds that are sent or used overseas. In fact, my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee already exercised this judgment with an additional provision in their bill that is very similar to the amendments that I will be offering today.

Section 307 of the underlying bill specifically prohibits any DOE nonproliferation funds from being used to enter into new contracts or agreements with Russia, sending a strong signal to Mr. Putin and others that there are real consequences for their irresponsible and destabilizing actions of the last few years.

My amendment adds this section to the end of the bill:

"None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading 'Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation' may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that require the Islamic Republic of Iran to cease the pursuit, acquisition, and development of nuclear weapons technology."

If the last line of my amendment sounds familiar, it should. It is the very same language that Congress defined as total disarmament of Iran's weapons of mass destruction program when it passed the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010. That bill passed the Senate by a vote of 99-0 and in the House 408-8, and only two of the Members who voted "no" on that bill still serve here in Congress today.

There is a lot to be worried about in President Obama's deal with Iran, but two serious concerns trump all of the others:

First, how will Iran properly deal with and dispose of 14,000 centrifuges

and 9,700 kilograms of highly enriched uranium that they are supposed to give up?

And if they are serious about not pursuing a bomb, what are they planning to do with the 6,000 centrifuges and 300 kilograms of uranium that they get to keep under this deal?

On the first question, the Web site Vox, hardly a rightwing outlet, says that the disposal of these materials is an open question and that the negotiators punted on how to safely and effectively remove this material from Iran. Given that fact, there is every reason to believe that the DOE nonproliferation account could be used for this purpose.

The second question is even more troubling than the first. Michael Morrell, former Director of the CIA, said back in February that “the potential Iran nuclear agreement would limit Iran to the number of centrifuges needed for a weapon but too few for a nuclear power program,” a statement verified as “true” by PolitiFact.

□ 2015

Iran's leaders have repeatedly said they have no interest in developing a nuclear weapon, and over the years, they have made that promise to the international community to gain relief from crippling economic sanctions. I don't trust Iran, but even if I did, I would still say that we follow President Reagan's charge that led us to victory when facing another nuclear foe: trust but verify.

Let me be clear. If Iran proves that they are serious about giving up all of their nuclear ambitions, I fully support using DOE nonproliferation assets to get their nuclear materials safely out of that country. Why, I would write a check myself to make sure that my grandkids don't grow up in a world where loose Iranian nuclear material makes its way to the black market or into the hands of terrorists.

But Iran can't have one without the other. That is why my amendment will make sure that, if DOE signs a contract with Iran to help remove nuclear material from Iran, it will also stipulate that they are giving up all efforts to build a bomb.

This is a commonsense amendment that reiterates the position of Congress and the promises made by President Obama's negotiating team. I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and I share a great desire to prevent the spread of Iran's nuclear capabilities, but the only thing that, unfortunately, your amendment does is endanger security, including America's security.

We can differ on how we work with Iran on the broader issue of conditions for an agreement on sanctions and

their nuclear program, but that is not the issue we are debating here today. What we are debating here today is the nonproliferation program at the Department of Energy. Stopping the spread of dangerous materials from the Republic of Iran is in our Nation's interest regardless of the outcome of the broader discussion.

While there are currently no plans to work in Iran and no funding that directly supports work in Iran, let me give you a few examples of what your amendment would stop, would preclude:

One, the Department of Energy's nonproliferation program might be asked to engage with Iran to facilitate the removal of excess low-enriched uranium or heavy water from Iran. Such an engagement could necessitate contracts to arrange for the packaging, shipment, and disposition of such materials and would be prevented by the proposed amendment.

Second, the Department of Energy's nonproliferation program might also be asked to engage with Iran to strengthen Iran's nuclear safety, nuclear security, or nuclear safeguard practices. Such engagement could require contracts to provide technical expertise or support logistical arrangements and would be prevented by your amendment.

There may be some who want to use any bill, including our bill, to make political points, but shouldn't we be more concerned about endangering American lives and the lives of other innocents around the world? Wouldn't you prefer that this material be under lock and key in the United States, for example, or with one of our allies than have it stored in Iran? I can only speculate that our security practices are much better.

This amendment has no place in this bill, and I urge its defeat.

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, yes, I would still earnestly urge an “aye” vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee call up amendment No. 4.

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 under the heading “Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation” may be used to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that include authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct anytime, anywhere inspections of civil and military sites within the Islamic Republic of Iran.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. BABIN. My amendment is similar in nature to the one just offered, and I want to ensure that my strong support for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program and the good work of the committee to properly fund it is, once again, reflected in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this second amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to make clear to Iran and to the world that the complete, intrusive inspections of all Iran civil and military sites are nonnegotiable and must be part of any deal with Iran.

My amendment adds this section to the end of the bill: “None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ‘Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation’ may be made available to enter into new contracts with or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that include authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct anytime, anywhere inspections of civil and military sites within the Islamic Republic of Iran.”

I was encouraged to see Energy Secretary Moniz, President Obama's chief technical expert in the Iran negotiations, quoted as saying: “We expect to have anywhere, anytime access” to conduct nuclear inspections of Iran.

I share his view that without these full, intrusive inspections there is simply no way to fully and truly verify that Iran is complying with the terms of any deal they supposedly agree to.

Unfortunately, the Iranians do not share the views of our Secretary. Shortly after the Secretary made these comments to Bloomberg News, Iranian Brigadier General Hossein Salami responded by saying:

“Not only will we not grant foreigners the permission to inspect our military sites, we will not even give them permission to think about such a subject. They will not even be permitted to inspect the most normal military site in their dreams.”

Apologists for Iran say that they just need to say these types of things, as well as maintain a limited nuclear stockpile, in order to save face and preserve their national pride.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't come here to help the Iranians with their PR efforts. Neither did you, and neither did anyone in this body. Our job is to keep the

American people and the free world safe, and any deal with Iran that lifts sanctions but is not coupled with strict inspection requirements isn't just not worth the paper it is written on; it will make us less safe.

History can be our guide on this very subject. In one of his biggest but least discussed foreign policy failures, President Clinton in 1994 made a similar "deal" with North Korea that was supposed to end their nuclear ambitions and bring them into the international community.

Sanctions were lifted, but we were given nothing but mischief and deception by the North Koreans in return. International inspectors were obstructed and blocked on a regular basis. North Korea continued to develop their nuclear program, only now in the shadows and in hardened, underground facilities. In 2006, they successfully detonated a nuclear bomb, and they continue to develop and test long-range missiles and to threaten their neighbors and the West. Instead of weakening the authoritarian regime that controls North Korea, the lifting of the sanctions and the development of nuclear weapons allowed the Kims to tighten their grip on the country and pass it along to the next generation.

Congress cannot allow President Obama's flawed deal on Iran to take us down this same path.

Once again, if we are going to use DOE resources and taxpayer money to help Iran clean up the mess created by their nuclear ambitions, it should come with conditions. The most important condition should be that they permit the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct the anytime, anywhere inspections that are so essential to any nuclear reduction agreement.

History and our own Energy Secretary tell us that this deal won't work without robust and full inspections. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment to make sure that those inspections do happen.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to the meaning of inspections that qualify as "anytime, anywhere."

The proponent has failed to fulfill his burden as to the meaning of that term.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I call up the Hudson amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 11.1208 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts under the headings "National Nuclear Security Administration", "Environmental and Other Defense Activities", or "Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, this evening, I offer an amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill that would cut spending back to the fiscal year 2008 level.

While I appreciate the work of the Appropriations Committee in crafting this important bill, I recognize that we should go further to cut reckless spending. Washington has a spending problem, and we can't afford to kick the can down the road any longer.

My amendment makes an across-the-board cut of more than 11 percent to the bill in order to decrease the amount back to the fiscal year 2008 level, saving nearly \$2 billion for the taxpayers.

We are over \$18 trillion in our national debt. This is merely a drop in the bucket, and we owe it to our constituents to cut even more to restore fiscal sanity in Washington. Defense accounts are exempt from this cut because Congress is expected to take up the National Defense Authorization Act in the near future to address those programs.

Mr. Chairman, when I first ran for Congress, I was repeatedly asked: "If you are elected, what programs would you cut?"

The answer I gave was: "First, I would go back to 2008 spending levels, and then we will start cutting."

My amendment does just this. It allows us to return to the point when we can finally get serious about paying down our national debt and saving future generations from economic disaster. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because it is sort of an untargeted proposal, and

our budget in many places on this bill is very tight. We know the net effect will be to reduce jobs and hurt the middle class in a sector where America needs help, and that is energy independence and the modernization of our infrastructure.

The result of the amendment will be less investment in water resource infrastructure all over this country at a time when global trade is increasing. Energy research and development programs, which lead us to future energy, not past energy resources, which create good jobs and have substantial returns on investment, will be harmed.

At a time when unemployed Americans lose jobless benefits and when many young families struggle just to survive, we should be creating jobs and securing the American Dream through investing in our energy future, including innovation and investments in the ground in every "all of the above" energy sector we have, not tearing it down. Just since 2003, the United States has spent \$2.3 trillion in importing foreign petroleum. Think about that one.

This is a vast shift of wealth, and thousands upon thousands of jobs are connected to energy production from our country. This amendment only exacerbates this shift of wealth from the American middle class to offshore. It is not something I support, and I doubt the gentleman really wants to support that.

This bill funds critical water resource projects; it supports science activities necessary to breakthroughs to lead us to a new energy future; and it contributes, importantly, to our national defense through vital weapons, naval reactor research, and the non-proliferation funding we had been discussing earlier this evening.

□ 2030

We must make certain decisions to lead our country forward. There are a lot more people who live in this country than lived here in 2008 or 2003. Also, one of the reasons that we have a little bit of uptick in some of the accounts is, there are actually more American people now, so we have got to do some things in terms of the ports. Our ports silt up. We have got to get that out of there in order that we can get larger ships into our ports carrying more goods.

We can't live in the past. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. Let's take America to the future and not backwards.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. This bill that we are currently considering meets the budget resolution that was just adopted. We have been cutting discretionary spending for the last 4 years, \$173 billion, as I understand it, over the last 4 years, not in decreases

in the increases, but actual decreases in spending. This goes way too far and makes sweeping changes with broad cuts to the reductions. This is an approach I can't support.

I am particularly concerned about the impact this amendment would have on our critical infrastructure, as mentioned by the gentlewoman from Ohio, and the basic research needs that are prioritized in this bill. While the gentleman has attempted to exclude national security activities, I have got to tell you, in all honesty, national security is not the only thing the Federal Government does. We do do other things. We maintain our waterways and our ports and other activities. This amendment would still have the detrimental impact on the security of nuclear materials at the Idaho National Laboratory. These accounts are very complex, and reductions to each account must be carefully weighed, and that is what this subcommittee has been doing and holding hearings on for the last 4 months.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just wanted to say to the author of the amendment that I said something to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means today. I think he took it rather lightly, but I said, Here we are discussing our appropriation bills on the floor, and I said, We are trying to balance the budget. I said, But you know what? Your committee is sitting back; there are no revenues on the table, and mandatory spending isn't on the table, and you are trying to take it out of the hides of discretionary spending, which is such a small part of the entire Federal budget. You know what he did? He twirled around and kind of laughed me off and walked toward the back of the Chamber. I didn't think that was a very responsible answer.

So I respect the gentleman being down here tonight, offering his amendment. I would encourage you to talk to the head of the Committee on Ways and Means because to try to get us to shrink even more than we have done in many of our accounts—and, by the way, eleven other appropriation bills coming after us that have been asked to do the same—really isn't fair to the American people.

We need all hands on deck, all hands on deck. So I thank the gentleman for attempting to be responsible, but I really think you ought to look to some of the other committees that are sitting back while the burden is on our committee to make these decisions alone. That isn't right.

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

Mr. HUDSON. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I acknowledge the fine point the gentlewoman

made that we can't cut discretionary spending to get ourselves out of debt. She makes two valid points: we need more revenue and we need to address the mandatory spending side. I agree wholeheartedly. We need tax reform to get us more revenue, to get the economy generated, to get people back to work, and we also need to look at saving Social Security and Medicare, shoring them up for future generations and controlling the cost curve. She makes a valid point.

I also want to acknowledge that Chairman SIMPSON and the Committee on Appropriations have actually made real cuts over the last few years. He also makes a valid point that we have actually cut discretionary spending in real dollars. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, we can do more. I just believe that if you look at the path we are on, we are heading, if we don't spend another dime, toward a horrific debt crisis in this country. We just can't afford to sit back and not deal with that.

I believe we do need to work on the mandatory side for sure because that is the real driver of our debt. But in the meantime, let's go back to pre-stimulus time, let's go back to 2008 spending levels because I don't remember the Federal Government starving for money. I don't remember the Federal Government just barely being able to function because it didn't have enough revenue back in 2008. I think it is prudent for us to do that. It is about jobs, it is about the economy, it is about our future generation, our children and grandchildren who are going to have to actually pay the bills that we are running up right now. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to please support the amendment.

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

Mr. HUDSON. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. 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 by the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that required all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31 of this year.

My amendment echoes the President's memorandum by prohibiting funds in this act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles unless that purchase is made in accord with the President's memorandum.

I have submitted identical amendments to 15 different appropriations bills over the past few years, and every time they have been accepted by both the majority and the minority. I hope my amendment will receive similar support today.

Global oil prices are down. We no longer pay \$147 per barrel, but despite increased production here in the United States, the global price of oil is still largely determined by OPEC. Spikes in oil prices have profound repercussions for our economy. The primary reason is that our cars and trucks run only on petroleum. We can change that with alternative technologies that exist today. The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America, over 635,000 vehicles. More than 50,000 of those vehicles are within the jurisdiction of this bill and being used by the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding the use of ethanol. People there can drive to a gas station and choose whether to fill their vehicle with gasoline or with ethanol. They make their choice based on cost or whatever criteria they deem important. I want the same choice for American consumers. That is why I am also proposing a bill this Congress, as I have done many times in the past, which will provide for cars built in America to be able to run on a fuel instead of or in addition to gasoline. They do it in Brazil. We can do it here, and it would cost less than \$100 per car to do so.

In conclusion, expanding the role these alternative technologies play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage that foreign government-controlled oil companies hold over Americans. It will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers. I am delighted that both my Republican and Democratic colleagues have unanimously supported this bill for the past several years. I ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program" is hereby reduced to \$0.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide a loan under section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise because too often here at the Federal level we find ourselves rewarding or occasionally funding corporations that would do what they do irregardless of what we did at the Federal level. It has been a point of contention with Democratic colleagues. Too often we continue to pay for programs that have outlived their original purpose. I think that too often we find ourselves looking the other way at programs that don't work and/or have wasted tens upon tens of millions of dollars.

It is for those different reasons that I rise to offer this amendment, which would indeed defund the Department of Energy's failed Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing program. Quite simply, it would just do two things: one, it would eliminate the \$6 million in funding that would go to this program, and, two, it would prevent any further lending from this program's unused lending capacity.

The reason I think doing those two things are awfully important is, one, this is, indeed, a case of paying corporations to do what they would already do. Again, this has been a point in the budget debate that we had earlier today from both Republican and Democratic colleagues alike, saying we shouldn't be paying corporations to do things they would already do. Two, this is, indeed, a stimulus era program. However well intended in 2009, it has outlived its purpose, and we are not in the economic situation that we found ourselves in 2009. In fact, this program's authority expired back in 2012, and I think it is a recognition by this Congress of the fact that maybe some of the program hasn't been working so well as to why that has indeed occurred.

Finally, this program has seen real losses; 40 percent of its loans have gone bad. According to a GAO report, they actually wrote up some of those losses. What I might do is just share for one moment with my colleagues, as part of

a government reform look at this program, there was a letter to then Secretary Chu February 28, 2012, from one of the applicants. In it he quotes the chairman of a Fortune 10 company—not 100, but Fortune 10 company, and this is in the reference to the letter—told your former deputy, Jonathan Silver, that this program lacked integrity. That is, it did not have a consistent process and rules against which private enterprises could rationally evaluate their chances and intelligently allocate time and resources against that process.

There can be no greater failing of government than to not have integrity when dealing with its taxpaying citizens. For a variety of reasons, I offer this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I want to share a story. I was out at one of our energy labs in California and walked into a research lab, a Cummins engine was up on the boards. I said, What is going on in here? The answer was, We are trying to understand the science of combustion. I said, You mean it is 2014, and we don't understand that yet? They said, No, Congresswoman, we really don't know what happens inside an internal combustion chamber. They were studying what happens when fuel ignites inside that chamber so they could make it more energy efficient. I was surprised to learn that every single automotive company in this country depends on the results of that research, and Cummins is in the lead.

I want to say to the gentleman, I come from automotive America. When the industry fell to its knees in 2008 because we have never had a trade policy that opens closed markets like Japan and Korea and China, I thought to myself, I never thought I would live to see this day. After the wise decision of a majority of this Congress and the Obama administration, we lifted the automotive industry of this country out of the dregs.

I have watched it recover with vehicles like the Cruze and with the Wrangler, which is leading the list. When I look at what Ford is doing in terms of its EcoBoost engine, I see an industry being reborn in our Nation. The economic growth that comes with it, the incredible muscle that it provides inside the spine of this economy—not tangential growth, but real wealth, real wealth being created, again, across this country in this very important industry—I wouldn't do anything at this point in American history with the closed markets we are facing abroad not to support advanced technology in this country.

What we are competing against in other places are countries disguising themselves as companies, and they are able to subsidize their industry, close

their markets, and prevent even our parts going into their original equipment. We can succeed most importantly by advancing automotive technology, advanced vehicle technology.

□ 2045

This particular program allows the component suppliers, as well as the original equipment, to benefit. I can tell you, though, the companies do research themselves; they don't do the kind of basic research that is necessary to provide the incredible breakthroughs that can come through the Department of Energy.

If I said to you 25 years ago, "Would you believe that 10 percent of gasoline blends are ethanol and renewable fuels," you would probably say, "Congresswoman, you have been staying up too late too many nights of the week."

In fact, it has happened. Now, we are going to move to a 15 percent renewable blend. Who would have thought that would be possible? Who would have thought we could get 40-mile-a-gallon vehicles on the road? We are moving toward that now, flexible fuel. That is not by accident. This program supports just what it says, advanced technology vehicles manufacturing.

Given concerns that have been expressed by my colleagues regarding appropriate oversight of these programs, I think the net effect of your amendment is going to be to eliminate oversight of this program, which I don't think we want to do. I think we want to make it work for America's sake.

I oppose your amendment, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I also have to oppose this amendment. While I appreciate the gentleman's position on the ATVM program, the elimination would hurt Federal oversight of the program of more than \$8 billion in loans already given. The committee recommendations include the \$6 million as a reasonable amount to provide oversight and direction to the existing loan portfolio and no more.

I don't think the gentleman wants to actually eliminate the oversight of the loans that are out there that are going to be running for the next 30 years.

I must oppose the gentleman's amendment in order to ensure that there is proper oversight of taxpayer funding.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank both of my colleagues for their counterpoints, and I understand absolutely this notion of competitiveness. I agree with Thomas Friedman, the world is flat; and we are in a global competition for jobs, capital, and way of life.

Look at, again, the fundamentals of this program. I have here a GAO—Government Accountability Office—report

that says the cost of participating in this program outweighs the benefits to companies. That is a GAO report, not a private sector report, not a rightwing report.

I think it is also interesting, in pulling this letter that was, again, written by a supplicant to the agency itself, said that the due diligence process in their attempt—and they ultimately quit—but their attempt to get a loan was more than 1,175 days. His point in this letter was that that was more than tenuous and, frankly, had much to do with their ultimately ceasing and desisting.

I would also make this point: they have only made five loans. If we were depending on these five loans for innovation in new technology in the way that internal combustion engines work or the way that we burn fossil fuel, we are in real trouble, but five loans is what we are talking about.

I would also make this point: I think, at some point, given the scarcity of resources that we do deal with in Washington, D.C., we have to at some level make a divide between big companies. Ford's market cap is \$63 billion. Alcoa's is \$16 billion.

Would not these funds be better used going to small innovators, as opposed to these large, multinational corporations that I think, in many cases, are the beneficiary of corporate largesse, but corporate largesse that I don't think serves the taxpayer well or, according to these industry analysts, the industry as well?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. SANFORD. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. During fiscal year 2016, the limitation relating to total project costs in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) shall not apply with respect to any project that receives funds made available by title I of this Act.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would waive the limit on total costs for Army Corps projects which are set forth in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

The law states that a project cannot be funded by more than 20 percent of the project's total authorized cost. This amendment would waive that limitation for any project that receives funds made available by title I of this act.

Thirty or so years have passed since Congress originally authorized many of the current Federal flood control projects. Unfortunately, the large backlog of projects, incremental funding by Congress, and unforeseen circumstances has resulted in costly delays for projects across this country, pushing many over the now outdated authorized limits. Many of these projects are so close to the finish line, and this language could help them cross it.

Mr. Chairman, this language is vital to the continuation of valued flood control projects in my congressional district. The Dodson Industrial District project in Kansas City, Missouri, has completed its first three phases. However, without an increase in its authorized total cost, the project cannot move forward on the final phase.

Currently, the area has a floodwall unconnected to the rest of the project and investments of \$250 million at risk. If the project could be fully funded at the increased total amount, it could be completed in fiscal year 2017.

Projects that have reached their 902 limit can apply for a project cost modification. However, the application and review process routinely takes several years to get approval from the Army Corps headquarters. These valued projects, in which the Federal Government has already invested millions of dollars, are languishing for 2, 3, or more years during that review process.

Another control project in Kansas City, called Turkey Creek Basin, has over \$200 million in investment protected by this project, including a major interstate highway. It was authorized in 1999 and is ready for the final phase, but did not receive Federal funding last year or in this year's budget request because of a pending cost modification application, which began in 2013.

Mr. Chairman, just in my district, there are three flood control projects that have pending cost modification applications that were started in 2013. I can only surmise that this trend has continued in just about every other congressional district in the country.

Mr. Chairman, these are not exotic projects. These are projects which will help generate the businesses in those areas to a point where they can begin to grow.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their at-

tention to this matter. With some assurances that the committee will try to address this issue as the bill moves into conference process, I would consider withdrawing the amendment at any time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

“An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.”

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law by waiving section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 with respect to certain projects covered by the bill.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that actually maintains current law.

Since its passage in 2007, I have heard from tens of thousands of constituents about how the language in the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act will take away consumer choice when deciding what lightbulb to use in your home. In fact, they are right.

While the government has passed energy efficiency standards in other realms over the years, they have never jumped so far and lowered standards so drastically. It is to a point where technology is still years away from making lightbulbs that are compliant with the

law at a price point that the average American can afford.

Opponents to my amendment will claim that the 2007 language does not ban the incandescent bulb. That is true. It bans the sales of the 100-watt, the 60-watt, and the 45-watt bulbs. The replacement bulbs are far from economically efficient, even if they are energy efficient. A family living paycheck to paycheck can't afford to replace every bulb in their house at even \$5 a bulb.

The economics of the lightbulb mandate are only part of the story. With the extreme expansion of Federal powers undertaken by President Obama and the Democrats in Congress during the first 2 years of the Obama administration, Americans have woken up to just how far the Constitution's Commerce Clause has been manipulated from its original intent. The lightbulb mandate is a perfect example of this.

The Commerce Clause was intended by our Founding Fathers to be a limitation on Federal authority, not a catchall nod to allow for any topic to be regulated by Washington; indeed, it is clear that the Founding Fathers never intended this clause to be used to allow the Federal Government to regulate and pass mandates on consumer products that do not pose a risk to human health or safety.

This Congress must be on the side of consumers and consumer choice. If new, energy-efficient lightbulbs save money and are better for the environment, we should trust the American people to make that choice on their own and move to these bulbs. We should not be forcing these lightbulbs on the American public.

The bottom line is the Federal Government has no business taking away the freedom of Americans to choose what bulb to put in their homes. I will add that, recently, the lightbulb manufacturers in this country have claimed that, because of the stopgap provision in the 2007 law, if we continue to prevent the Department of Energy from promulgating rules pursuant to these provisions, the manufacturers will be forced to stop manufacturing compliant incandescent bulbs.

This is actually an argument to repeal the 2007 language in its entirety, not to allow it to be implemented. We should not allow a stopgap trigger in the law to extort us into passing bad policy and moving forward.

This exact amendment has been accepted for the past 3 years by a voice vote and has been included in the annual appropriations legislation signed into law by the President each year since its first inclusion. It allows consumers to continue to have a choice and to have a say about what they will put in their homes. It is common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I should add that I have had conversations with my good friend, Mr. JORDAN from Ohio, on this amendment. I understand that there have been discussions about changes to the language in order to balance both

the philosophical belief that this is the wrong policy for our country and the pragmatic belief that we should do no harm to the livelihoods of our constituents.

I continue to offer, as I did last July, to sit down with Mr. JORDAN or anyone else to see if compromise language can be achieved prior to the end of the fiscal year, but in the meantime, I offer this amendment to the body.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BARTON. I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. I think it is absolutely the right thing to do. It is pure common sense.

As you know, these newer bulbs, while they may be more energy efficient, they are much more expensive. I have yet to see one that costs less than \$3 or \$4. The incandescent bulbs—when you can find them—you can get four for \$2.50 or something like that.

This is a commonsense approach to let the consumer choose. Certainly, for lower-income Americans that don't have the ability to buy the more expensive bulbs, it makes a lot of economic sense.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2100

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I strongly oppose this damaging rider by my good friend, Congressman BURGESS of Texas, because it would block the Department of Energy from implementing or enforcing commonsense energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs. This rider was a bad idea when it was first offered 4 years ago, and it is even more unsupportable now.

Every claim made by proponents of this rider has been proven wrong. Dr. BURGESS told us that the energy efficiency standards would ban incandescent lightbulbs, but that simply is false. You can go to the store today and see shelves of modern, energy-efficient incandescent lightbulbs that meet the standard. They are the same as the old bulbs, except that they last longer, use less electricity, and save consumers money.

We have heard for years that the energy efficiency standards restrict consumer choice. But if you have shopped for lightbulbs lately, which I have, you know that isn't true either. Modern incandescent bulbs, compact fluorescent lightbulbs, and LEDs of every shape, size, and color are now available. Consumers never had more choice.

The efficiency standards spurred innovation that dramatically expanded

options for consumers. Critics of the efficiency standards claimed that they would cost consumers money. In fact, the opposite is true. When the standards are in full effect, the average American family will save about \$100 every year. That is \$13 billion in savings nationwide every year. But this rider threatens those savings, and that is why consumer groups have consistently opposed this rider.

Here is the reality. The 2007 consensus energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs were enacted with bipartisan support and continue to enjoy overwhelming industry support. U.S. manufacturers are already meeting the efficiency standards.

The effect of the rider is to allow foreign manufacturers to sell old, inefficient lightbulbs in the United States that violate the efficiency standards. This is unfair to domestic producers who have invested millions of dollars in U.S. plants to make efficient bulbs that meet the standards.

Why on Earth would we want to pass a rider that favors foreign manufacturers who ignore our laws and penalize U.S. manufacturers who are following our laws?

But it even gets worse. The rider now poses an additional threat to U.S. manufacturing. The bipartisan 2007 energy bill required the Department of Energy to establish updated lightbulb efficiency standards by January 1, 2017. It also provided that if final updated standards are not issued by then, a more stringent standard of 45 lumens per watt automatically takes effect. Incandescent lightbulbs currently cannot meet this backstop standard.

This rider blocks the Department of Energy from issuing the required efficiency standards and ensures that the backstop will kick in. Ironically, it is this rider that could effectively ban the incandescent lightbulb.

The Burgess rider directly threatens existing lightbulb manufacturing jobs in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, to name but three. It would stifle innovation and punish companies that have invested in domestic manufacturing. This rider aims to reverse years of technological progress, only to kill jobs, increase electricity bills for our constituents, and worsen pollution.

It is time to choose common sense over rigid ideology. It is time to listen to the manufacturing companies, consumer groups, and efficiency advocates who all agree this rider is harmful. I urge all Members to vote "no" on the Burgess lightbulb rider.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I would just observe, at the end of calendar year 2007, the commentator George Will observed the United States Congress had two jobs: deliver the mail and defend the border. It had done neither. But what it had done was ban the incandescent bulb, perhaps the greatest invention ever invented by an American inventor.

This is a commonsense amendment. It deserves passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits" and identified by regulation identification number 1904-AC87.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to stop overbearing Department of Energy regulations from driving up the cost of ceiling fans and increasing energy consumption as a result. I offer this amendment, along with my colleagues Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee and Mr. ROKITA of Indiana, both of whom have been very engaged on this issue.

The Department of Energy is currently considering a proposed rule, entitled, "Standard Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits," which would impose increased efficiency requirements for ceiling fans sold in the United States. This regulation, if implemented, would have the effect of increasing the cost of ceiling fans, in some cases by nearly double, thereby reducing the purchase and use of ceiling fans by American consumers. The end result, ironically, would be heavier reliance on central air-conditioning and, thus, increased energy consumption.

Ceiling fans, by their nature, are already an extremely energy-efficient method of cooling a home or a business, using between 20 and 100 watts during operation, compared with a central A/C unit which typically uses between 3,500 and 5,000 watts. That is an order of magnitude less energy, which can save a household up to 14 percent on cooling costs.

The Department of Energy's proposed standard is regulatory solution in search of a problem.

Now, the ceiling fan industry has already demonstrated a strong commitment to energy efficiency, as evidenced by the dramatic increase in ENERGY

STAR certified ceiling fans on the market over the past decade. The industry continues to develop energy-saving innovations, such as a redesigned motor, which uses up to 70 percent less electricity than the traditional ceiling fan motor. This has all taken place absent the heavy hand of government regulation.

At a time when homeowners across the United States are trying to reduce energy usage and cost, we should not increase the price of ceiling fans by setting unrealistic and unnecessary efficiency requirements on an already efficient product. Ceiling fans can help reduce dependence on foreign energy sources and ease the strain on our national power grid during the time of year when it is most heavily taxed.

Madam Chairman, I would simply state that ceiling fans are an inexpensive, easy way to reduce cooling costs, and the Federal Government should avoid taking actions that will stifle innovation and, ultimately, drive consumers to less efficient methods of cooling their home and business.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to stop this burdensome government regulation, and encourage reduced energy consumption through increased efficiency.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Mr. DENT and Mr. ROKITA for their work on this issue.

The Department of Energy is so determined to redesign the ceiling fan that they have released a 101-page rule-making framework document which evaluates the potential energy savings of their new regulations.

Well, what we have found is that, just like stretching their tentacles into lightbulbs and so many other areas of our home, what they are doing is pricing people out of the ceiling fan market. These new regulations would significantly impair the ability of ceiling fan manufacturers like Hunter Fans in Memphis, Tennessee, to produce reasonably priced, highly decorative fans.

The regulations will not only place a higher price tag on the less-pleasing designs, but could increase homeowners' reliance on cooling systems that are less energy efficient.

What we are seeing is, with ceiling fans, that many of our constituents save as much as 14 percent on their energy use to cool their home, and they can save homeowners as much as 40 percent of their air-conditioning bills by creating a breeze that makes the room feel a little bit cooler. New regulations will curb increased consumer trends in the marketplace, which currently include placing ceiling fans in laundry rooms, closets, and master bathrooms.

I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her continued work on this matter.

Frankly, as I look around the room tonight, I think it is kind of ridiculous that we are sitting here talking, standing here talking about ceiling fans. This is what it has come to.

The bureaucracy in this town is now telling the American people that they know what belongs on their ceiling more than those people do. It is government run amuck. It is an example of the complete disregard bureaucrats have for the practical implications of the regulations they issue.

The Department of Energy, as is stated, contends that a certain amount of energy would be saved by requiring greater efficiency from ceiling fans, completely disregarding the fact that if you price people out of this market, as the gentlewoman from Tennessee said, they are going to have to buy cooling systems that are even more expensive, buy fans that are even more expensive.

Let's get out of this business. We have more important things to do than worrying about bureaucrats and what they decide people need on their ceilings. Let's remember, this amendment was adopted in 2014 on the floor, and it was in the base text of the 2015 bill.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I oppose the gentleman's amendment, given it is a solution in search of a problem.

Since their implementation, standards for ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits have saved American consumers—are you ready?—\$4.5 billion—in energy costs, and cut greenhouse gas emissions by 22 metric tons.

Nearly a decade ago—why do we have this system? Because three States—California, Maryland, and New York—created their own unique standards for ceiling fan test procedures and performance, and these varying requirements created difficulties for manufacturers marketing products across all 50 States.

In response, the fan manufacturing industry asked the Federal Government for a national standard that would reduce unnecessary complexity. Since that time, the DOE, Department of Energy, has not even proposed a new rule on ceiling fans, so it is premature to react to what might be in a new rule. Even if a new rule is proposed, implementation is years away.

The Department's analysis so far has shown that options exist for increasing

ceiling fan efficiency that are cost-effective for manufacturers and the consumers. Any upgrades will enable consumers to save money by saving energy, also moving our country closer to its low-carbon future.

Given the proposed rule has yet to be released, industry cannot anticipate how much their manufacturing costs might increase, whether their business model would be turned upside down, or whether the rule would result in energy growth. Industry has not substantiated any of their claims.

The Department of Energy has conducted extensive consultation with industry stakeholders, including the companies themselves, and any potential indirect effects on air-conditioning units.

The amendment ensures that consumers will be stuck with less efficient fans and higher energy costs. I can't see why we would want to do that.

Let's help this industry. As I have stated, I object to the amendment as proposed and urge a "no" vote by my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 2101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238b) or section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the DeFazio-Poe-Napolitano amendment.

I sincerely thank Ranking Member DEFazio and, of course, the ranking member of the committee for offering this critical amendment which implements the harbor maintenance allocation formulas that were carefully negotiated and included in the WRRDA 2014 and passed the House by a vote of 412-4. I repeat, 412-4.

WRRDA '14 said that any funds appropriated for the harbor maintenance account above \$898 million—of course this was the baseline amount appropriated in fiscal year '12—should be—it doesn't say "would be," "could be"—it should be allocated based on the following parameters:

Ten percent at least goes to the Great Lakes. At least 10 percent goes to expanded uses at donor ports, which

would be New York/New Jersey, Miami, Seattle, Tacoma, Los Angeles, and Long Beach. Expanded uses are berth dredging, removal of contaminated sediment, environmental remediation, and/or subsidies to shippers to continue to use their ports. At least 5 percent goes to underserved harbors. Ten percent goes for emerging harbors.

The 2016 Corps budget does not—I repeat, does not—include the WRRDA 2014 harbor maintenance trust allocations. It does not include them.

This amendment is needed to require the Corps to implement these funds allocations, as directed by Congress.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is especially important to provide fairness to my State of California and to other ports.

All ports in California only receive 15 percent—this is all ports—back of what their shippers paid into that harbor maintenance trust fund.

Last year, the users of the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach alone paid \$263 million in harbor maintenance taxes and received zero—I repeat, zero—back in harbor maintenance funds. This is terribly unfair, and it is, as far as we are concerned, illegal.

This amendment will ensure that it brings back a little bit of that fairness to the donor harbors by providing them with a small portion of what they paid into the system.

I do want to add that this amendment is supported by the American Association of Port Authorities and the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

I ask for support of the DeFazio amendment. I request a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Cape Wind Energy Project on the Outer Continental Shelf off Massachusetts, Nantucket Sound.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Chair, the amendment I am offering tonight is simple. It prohibits funding for the Cape Wind project off Nantucket Sound. This amendment was offered last year and was accepted unanimously, and I hope it will be again.

The problem with this project isn't that it is renewable energy. We all support renewable energy. This is a renewable energy that is not supporting American jobs. In fact, they have

outsourced their turbines to Denmark and their turbine platforms to Germany.

The other issue is, this project has been quite controversial, and I think that we don't want another Solyndra.

This amendment was adopted last year by a voice vote. I would urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOX) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEWHOUSE, 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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DISAPPROVAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress disapproves of the action of the District of Columbia Council described as follows: The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Act 20-593), signed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia on January 25, 2015, and transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act on March 6, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for the purpose of controlling the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unfortunately, our thoughts this evening have to be with the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, who could not be here due to ongoing events in his Baltimore district, but his statement strongly opposing H.J. Res. 43 will be entered into the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, resentment does not begin to relate our response to this unprecedented disapproval resolution. Republicans this evening continue their war on women, but this time, they have added men in the District of Columbia for good measure.

This resolution is wildly undemocratic. It is a naked violation of the Nation's founding principle of local control of local affairs, and it is profoundly offensive to D.C. residents.

This resolution uniquely targets my district, but every Member will get to vote on it except for me, the District's elected Representative.

Notwithstanding its late-night consideration, Democrats will make sure Americans understand this inflammatory resolution. For the first time ever, the House is voting to license employers to discriminate against employees for their private, constitutionally protected reproductive health decisions.

For the first time in a quarter of a century, the House is voting to overturn the law of a local jurisdiction. The D.C. bill stops employers from job discrimination based on the reproductive health decision of employees, their spouses, or their dependents.

To name just a few of the horrors permitted by this resolution: employers may fire a woman for having an abortion due to rape or a man for using condoms. Or to use actual examples in the United States today, Emily Herx of Indiana was fired for using in vitro fertilization to become pregnant. Jennifer Maudlin of Ohio was fired for having nonmarital sex and becoming pregnant. Christina Dias of Ohio was fired for using artificial insemination to become pregnant. Shaela Evenson of Montana was fired for using artificial insemination to become pregnant. Michelle McCusker of New York was fired for having nonmarital sex and becoming pregnant.

The D.C. bill is constitutional and legal.

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. bill applies to all employers, does not target religion, and promotes workplace equality.

Under the Federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 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. bill is the least restrictive means to do so.

The D.C. bill certainly protects religious liberty. The bill is subject to constitutional and statutory exceptions to discrimination laws.

The narrow constitutional ministerial exception allows religious organizations to make employment decisions for ministers and ministerial employees for any reason whatsoever.

The exception in title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which I enforced as chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, permits religious organizations to make employment decisions based on religion.

□ 2130

D.C. law permits religious and political organizations to make employment decisions based on religion and political views; thus, employers in D.C. may continue to make employment decisions based on their religious and other beliefs, and their employees must be willing to carry out the employer's mission and directives with no exceptions.

The D.C. bill does not require employers to provide health insurance; instead, it requires equal treatment of employees. Both the text and the legislative history of the D.C. bill make that clear.

Nevertheless, when Members of Congress express concerns, the D.C. government, in order to eliminate any doubt, passed a new version of the bill that says, "This act shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to reproductive health decisions."

This provision is in effect now, but, under the Home Rule Act, a D.C. bill is not final until the end of the congressional review period. How absurd is that?

This disapproval resolution is a deliberate abuse of congressional authority over the district. In 1973, Congress passed the Home Rule Act to give the district the authority to legislate on local matters with a few enumerated exceptions and "to relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters." D.C. employment and reproductive health laws are not among those exceptions.

This evening, Madam Speaker, I ask my Republican colleagues to live up to their own recently passed fiscal year 2016 budget which calls for the Federal Government to let States and cities govern their own affairs.

"America is a diverse nation. Our cities, States, and local communities are best equipped and naturally inclined to develop solutions that will serve their populations. But far too often, local leaders are limited by numerous Federal dictates," so said the Republicans in their own budget this very year.

I ask the majority to live up to its professed principles of local control and of local affairs, Federalism and limited government. I urge Members to vote "no" on the disapproval resolution to protect employees' reproductive health decisions, to protect workplace equality, and to protect the District's right to self-government as tax-paying American citizens.

I insert in the RECORD the President's veto threat on this resolution.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 43—DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

(REP. BLACK (R-TN) AND 46 CO-SPONSORS)

The Administration strongly opposes H.J. Res. 43, which would overturn the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (the Act). The Act added reproductive health decisions to the list of employment non-discrimination protections included under the basis of sex, which had previously included pregnancy, childbirth, related medical conditions, and breastfeeding. By taking away this newly-added protection, H.J. Res. 43 would undermine the reproductive freedom and private health care decisions of the citizens of the District of Columbia. This legislation would give employers cover to fire employees for the personal decisions they make about birth control and their reproductive health. These personal decisions should not jeopardize anyone's job or terms of employment.

The Act preserves the current exception in the District's Human Rights Law for religious entities and does not impose additional requirements on employers, contrary to their personal beliefs, to provide insurance coverage related to reproductive health decisions.

H.J. Res 43 would also have the unacceptable effect of undermining the will of District of Columbia citizens. While the Home Rule Act of 1973 created a procedure for the Congress to overturn laws passed by the District of Columbia, the Congress has not exercised this authority in over two decades and should refrain from doing so in this circumstance, as well. The Administration urges the Congress to adopt the President's FY 2016 Budget proposal allowing the District to enact local laws and spend local funds in the same way as other cities and States.

If the President were presented with H.J. Res. 43, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this resolution.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we are here today for two reasons: one, our constitutional duty assigned to us by the Constitution; and, two, to maintain the protections that same document ensures for all Americans.

First, the Constitution mandates Congress oversee the District of Columbia. Article I, section 8, clause 17 makes clear Congress exercises “exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District” of Columbia.

In that vein, Congress passed the Home Rule Act, which gives the District some autonomy, but Home Rule also retains the constitutional duty imposed on Congress to be the ultimate signoff for all of the District’s legislation. That responsibility could not be more important than today.

The D.C. Council recently passed legislation that affects the hiring practices of organizations that work to advance certain beliefs. As passed, the bill fails to acknowledge certain longstanding constitutional protections of the First Amendment for political and religious organizations. Because of this, we cannot let this legislation stand.

Former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray requested the council postpone its vote on the bill because of its legal problems. In a December 2014 letter, Mayor Gray explained D.C.’s attorney general found that the bill “raised serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993.”

He went on to say, “Religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and Religious Freedom Restoration Act grounds for challenging the law’s application to them.”

To remedy these problems, the Mayor requested the council include an exemption to “protect the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act are designed to secure.”

Madam Speaker, I will insert Mayor Gray’s December 2, 2014, letter to the D.C. Council into the RECORD.

While the council postponed the vote, they took none of the Mayor’s advice. Once again, Mayor Gray wrote the council, again, in mid-December voicing his disapproval for the bill.

In that letter, he suggested, “If the council wishes to adopt this bill, it should clarify the D.C. Human Rights Act’s existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that that exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act are designed to secure.”

Mayor Gray concluded that, “Without this language, I cannot support the legislation and believe that the council would expose the District government to costly legal challenges by moving forward.”

Again, Madam Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD Mayor Gray’s December 17, 2014, letter to the D.C. Council.

Despite these warnings, the council and Mayor Bowser ignored the former Mayor’s requests, passed the bill, and

sent it to Congress. If they had taken Mayor Gray’s advice, we would not be here today.

Madam Speaker, this law is contrary to the Federal statute, and the D.C. Council knows it. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed in 1993 prevents the government from creating any law, rule, or regulation that prevents an individual from freely exercising their religion.

Based on this mandate, the Supreme Court recently held that certain corporations are not required to provide health insurance coverage for contraceptive methods that violate their religious beliefs.

From the way it was drafted, it is unclear if the D.C. bill violates this mandate, making it unconstitutional. Both Mayor Bowser and the D.C. Council know that this is a problem.

In fact, in February, Mayor Bowser admitted that the bill was ambiguous and requested the council pass temporary emergency legislation clarifying that the bill doesn’t require employers to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions.

Madam Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD Mayor Bowser’s February 2, 2015, letter to the D.C. Council.

Madam Speaker, that fix was only temporary and does not address the constitutional concerns I share with Mayor Gray. Given this ambiguity and no permanent fix, the bill is unconstitutional and cannot stand, given the recent Supreme Court decision in *Hobby Lobby*.

Protecting the freedoms guaranteed by our First Amendment should not be a partisan issue. Mayor Gray knew this and pointed this out to the council that it has gone too far.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to speak directly to the claims that this resolution is somehow an attack on women’s health care or their rights to use contraceptives. These attacks are offensive and are patently false.

As a registered nurse, I have spent my adult life bringing health care to women, children, and families. This resolution would in no way threaten anyone’s access to care or freedom from discrimination based on the use of contraceptives; rather, it simply maintains the status quo in Washington, D.C., before this misguided law was passed.

Women are already protected from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy status and a number of other fronts through both D.C. and Federal law, as they should be.

Specific to concerns regarding how this would impact women using contraceptives, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission makes clear “an employer could not discharge a female employee from her job because she uses contraceptives.” Those protections would in no way be impacted if any resolution were to be signed into law.

Madam Speaker, the RHND law is fundamentally dishonest. It purports to be a nondiscrimination act, but it

directly targets the fundamental First Amendment freedoms of employers in our Nation’s Capital, the very city charged with protecting those same freedoms.

We must act to protect religious freedom and to offer relief from this oppressive RHND law.

THE “DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOTS 36, 41 AND 802 IN SQUARE 3942 AND PARCELS 01430107 AND 01430110 EMINENT DOMAIN EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014”

I urge the Council to approve the potential use of eminent domain to acquire Lots 36, 41 and 802 in Square 3942 and Parcels 01430107 and 01430110 (W Street Site). DC Water currently operates a site south of N Place, S.E., north of the Anacostia River and between 1st and Canal Streets, S.E. (DC Water Site). The District plans to revitalize and develop a portion of the DC Water Site and leverage other District investments, such as the South Capitol Street Bridge project and the Nationals Park, and serve to accelerate and promote economic vitality in the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood.

The District of Columbia and DC Water have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding for DC Water to relocate a portion of the uses from the DC Water Site to a site in Prince Georges County. In order to ensure adequate response times to water and sewer emergencies, DC Water must also maintain a site west of the Anacostia River.

The W Street Site is currently occupied by a trash transfer station, and has been considered by many as blight to nearby communities.

READING AND VOTE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION
BILL 20-790, THE “REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014”

I urge the Council to postpone voting on this measure until significant legal concerns expressed by the Office of Attorney General are resolved. My staff shared with the Committee on the Judiciary a detailed review of the bill by OAG that deemed the legislation legally insufficient. The District of Columbia Human Rights Act (Human Rights Act) protects many facets of an individual’s identity (such as race, nationality, religion, and sexual orientation) from discrimination. Bill 20-790, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, would expand these restrictions by prohibiting employers (and others) from discriminating against an individual based on that individual’s reproductive health decisions.

According to OAG, the bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). 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. Moreover, to the extent that some of the bill’s language protects only one sex’s reproductive health decisions, that language may run afoul of the Fifth Amendment’s equal protection guarantee. If the Council wishes to adopt this Bill or similar legislation, it should clarify the Human Rights Act’s existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that the exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and RFRA are designed to secure.

While I applaud the goals of this legislation, as currently drafted, this legislation is legally problematic. I am committed to working with the Council on language necessary to make the changes needed.

BILL 20-48, THE "CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014"

I support passage of this legislation in Final Reading. Bill 20-48 creates a free-standing title for civil forfeitures, which includes sections on seizures, notice, contesting seizure, interim release of seized property, filing a complaint, forfeiture proceedings, return of property, disposal of forfeited property, adoptive seizures, reporting requirements, remission or mitigation, and the rule of lenity.

While I continue to have reservations about the limitations this bill places on the Executive Branch and the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), I recognize that the forfeiture of civil assets—and procedures for their timely return to the owner—is a significant one in the community that is in need of reform. OAG and the U.S. Attorney's Office worked with the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety on this legislation and was successful in making significant improvements to the requirements included in the legislation. I appreciate the work that the Committee has undertaken to include affected parties, and believe that while this compromise is a good one, future Executives may have to amend the law if the District experiences challenges with the procedures the law puts in place.

BILL 20-468, THE "LIMITATION ON THE USE OF RESTRAINTS ACT OF 2014"

With the amendments circulated on Monday, December 1, I support passage of this measure. Bill 20-468 limits the use of restraints on a woman or youth who is known to be pregnant or in post-partum recovery, including in limited circumstances while in transport to a medical facility or while receiving treatment at a medical facility.

The District of Columbia is considered a national leader in its treatment of pregnant inmates, and I support codifying existing procedures to continue to be a model to other state penal institutions. However, I do not want to overly burden the administration of our detention facilities with procedures that are unsafe both to inmates and corrections officers. The amendment being offered today strikes that balance.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. GRAY.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOTS 36, 41 AND 802 IN SQUARE 3942 AND PARCELS 01430107 AND 01430110 EMINENT DOMAIN AUTHORIZATION EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014" AND ACCOMPANYING DECLARATION AND TEMPORARY VERSION

I urge the Council to approve this legislation giving the Mayor authorization to utilize eminent domain to secure District ownership of property in Ward 5 that has long been a source of community complaint. This authorization is supported by the surrounding neighborhood community. Further, it does not mandate the use of eminent domain. Councilmember McDuffie and I agree that having this tool available to the incoming Administration will be helpful in finalizing the future of the site.

READING AND VOTE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION
BILL 20-790, THE "REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014"

I appreciate that the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety has worked with the Office of the Attorney General to make the bill legally sufficient. However, it is my understanding that additional language which would correct significant legal concerns will not be offered today.

While I support the intent of the bill, without the amendment, the Bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). 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. Moreover, to the extent that some of the Bill's language protects only one sex's reproductive health decisions, that language may run afoul of the Fifth Amendment's equal protection guarantee.

If the Council wishes to adopt this Bill or similar legislation, it should clarify the Human Rights Act's existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that the exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and RFRA are designed to secure. Without this language, I cannot support the legislation and believe that the Council would expose the District government to costly legal challenges by moving forward.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. GRAY.

"H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY DECLARATION RESOLUTION OF 2015;" "H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;" AND "H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015"

I urge the Council to support this legislation. The "Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Act of 2014" and subsequent emergency legislation amended the Bladensburg Road, N.E., Retail Priority Area and included it into the H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area. The "H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Incentive Emergency Amendment Act of 2014" amended the criteria for eligible retail development projects eligible to receive grants, but ambiguity remains on the clarity and accuracy of the legislation amending the criteria for eligible retail development projects eligible to receive grants. This emergency legislation addresses those immediate concerns before the next grant cycle, which concludes at the end of February 2015.

"REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY DECLARATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;" "REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;" AND "REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015"

Finally, I would like to draw the Council's attention to legislation circulated by the Chairman on my behalf to address legal concerns in Bill 20-790, the "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014." The attached emergency legislation, which was circulated on Friday, January 30, will repeal and replace language from the underlying bill to make clear that it does not impose any new insurance requirements on employers related to reproductive health decisions. This emergency legislation ensures that the District will remain in compliance with Federal and Constitutional law. I urge the Council to agendize the emergency at its next legislative meeting.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER.

Chairman Phil Mendelson at the Request of the Mayor

A BILL IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To amend, on an emergency basis, the Human Rights Act of 1977 to provide a clarification that the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision.

Be it enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia, That this act may be cited as the "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Clarification Emergency Amendment Act of 2015".

Sec. 2. Reproductive health choices clarification.

(a) Section 105(a) of the Human Rights Act of 1977, effective July 17, 1985 (D.C. Law 6-8; D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.05(a)), is amended as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of interpreting this act, discrimination on the basis of sex shall include, but not be limited to, discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, related medical conditions, breastfeeding, or reproductive health decisions; provided that this act shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision."

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I point out that, far from not discriminating, I have named five women in five different States who have been discriminated against because of language precisely of the kind the District of Columbia bill needs to avoid.

It is true that the former Mayor and the former attorney general had some issues with the bill. They are no longer in office. Nevertheless, the current Mayor and the current city council have reviewed those issues.

May I say that the Mayor never offered any examples of the kind of interference with religious or other rights. He was referring to the council, and the Mayor, nevertheless, reviewed his objections, and unanimously, the D.C. City Council and Mayor Bowser have, in fact, endorsed this bill.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

This is a new low in the war on women. Women have been fired for using in vitro fertilization and fired for being pregnant before they are married. This isn't some hypothetical or a cautious story from the 1950s. This is happening in America in the 21st century.

The D.C. Council voted unanimously to protect workers from this type of discrimination because it understands what House Republicans must not, that employees should be judged by their performance, not their reproductive healthcare choices.

Madam Speaker, hard-working women already have enough on their plate, from making 78 cents on the dollar compared to men, to acting as caregivers without paid family and medical leave. The majority doesn't even have

the courage to bring up this bill in the light of day.

Congress should be focused on growing the economy and providing opportunity for all Americans, not making women fear that they might be fired if their employer does not approve of contraception or the manner in which they conceive children.

□ 2145

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the cosponsor of this bill, the chair of the Republican Study Committee, and someone who has worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to formally disapprove of the recent measure passed by the District of Columbia that clearly violates religious liberty.

I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Tennessee, for her work on this important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to join her in reaffirming Congress' commitment to protecting our First Amendment rights.

Despite its name, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does, in fact, discriminate against those who exercise their right to live according to their religious beliefs. The D.C. measure tells values-based organizations that they may no longer live and work according to the very principles that they advocate. A Christian school would be required to pay for health insurance policies that include provisions that violate the beliefs that they teach their students. In addition, a pro-life organization would be forced to hire individuals regardless of their commitment to pro-life values.

Simply put, the D.C. Council measure compels Americans to act in clear violation of their conscience. In doing so, they ignore the opinion of most Americans, Supreme Court precedent, and the First Amendment to our Constitution.

More than 80 percent of Americans agree that individuals should be free to run their businesses and their organizations according to their beliefs, without the government telling them what to do. In 2013, the Supreme Court upheld that opinion, ruling in *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby* that employers have the right to operate their businesses according to their religious beliefs and principles.

Most importantly, however, the freedom of belief is enshrined in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. Freedom of belief is the cornerstone of America's founding principles. It was the promise of religious freedom that spurred the first generation of immigrants to come here, and it is the practice of religious freedom that has brought people from all over the world, from all races and creeds, to our shores ever since.

Religious freedom may be one of our oldest tenets and oldest principles, but it is one we must constantly strive and work to defend. This is not about one city or even one piece of legislation. Other cities or States may be considering similar measures, and doing nothing will only embolden those who would violate religious liberty.

We need to make clear, Madam Speaker, where the House stands on this important issue. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join the gentlewoman from Tennessee and me in supporting today's resolution.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to correct the gentleman that the church would have to buy insurance to cover abortion, the church is completely—every church is completely—exempt from this law. Or, as he indicated, that a pro-choice group would have to hire a candidate who believes in abortion, on the contrary, a pro-choice group can ask a candidate if that candidate is willing to carry out the mission of the organization against abortion, and if that candidate has any compunction, that candidate can, indeed, be refused employment; and if such a person is on staff, that person can be fired. You cannot be on somebody's staff and then take a position against the mission of that business or organization.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my good friend.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this resolution is an insult to women everywhere. What business is it of an employer—or anyone else, for that matter—to know whether or not workers or their daughters are taking birth control? It is absolutely none of their business.

And it also makes a mockery of the majority party's oft repeated claims that it wishes to scale back the overreach of the Federal Government, yet here they are reaching into personal lives.

And the resolution is being proposed by the so-called party of states' rights. They are not proposing a Federal law. They are trying to override the decisions of elected officials in the District of Columbia.

Why should the Congress have the right to override the democratic decisions of people in our Nation's Capital? A city with more people than the State of Wyoming and larger than Vermont gets no voting Senators or Congressman in this body.

This offensive effort to intrude into the most intimate of decisions of a woman's life sends a loud and clear message from the majority that they think a woman's employer does get a say in a woman's reproductive healthcare choices, even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and

women all across this country think that they do not.

This resolution would give an employer coercive power to intrude on a woman's private decisions about birth control, in vitro fertilization, and abortion. They are activities that obviously happen off the job and decisions that have no bearing whatsoever on a person's ability to do her job.

The District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does not diminish the right of religious freedom. This new D.C. law is modest in its scope. It simply protects an employee's right to self-determination. It handles a perceived conflict between two differing claims to rights in a simple and straightforward way.

I urge a "no" vote to this new low and public policy.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is an insult to women everywhere.

What business is it of an employer—or anyone else for that matter—to know whether or not workers or their daughters are taking birth control? It is none of your business.

And it also makes a mockery of the majority party's oft repeated claims that it wishes to scale back what it calls the overreach of the Federal government this offensive effort to intrude into the most intimate of decisions of a woman's life—sends a loud and clear message from the Majority that they think a woman's employer does get a say in a woman's reproductive health care choices.

Even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution and women all across the country think you don't.

This resolution would give an employer coercive power to intrude on a woman's private decisions about birth control, in vitro fertilization, and abortion.

They are activities that obviously happen off the job and decisions that have no bearing whatsoever on a woman's ability to do her job.

The District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does not diminish the right of religious freedom.

This new DC law is modest in its scope—it simply protects an employee's right to self-determination.

It handles a perceived conflict between two differing claims to rights in a simple and straightforward way.

An employer has the right to hold whatever belief his conscience dictates—but he does not have the right to discriminate against employees based on their private choice to use birth control, in vitro fertilization, or abortion.

The DC law received a unanimous vote on the DC Council and was even revised to make it clear that it would not force an employer to provide insurance coverage for contraceptive or abortion coverage.

And while this resolution might just affect women and their families here in our nation's capital, women across the U.S. should be very much alarmed: Because if this resolution stands—Can there be any doubt—they're coming for you next.

I urge my colleagues to consider the ways this resolution would threaten the jobs and economic security of hardworking DC residents, and to oppose this absurd, discriminatory resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who has been a big protector of life and has been a good colleague of mine since our election in 2010.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, and I commend the gentlewoman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas for sponsoring this important piece of legislation. This resolution would prevent the District of Columbia from violating America's basic First Amendment freedom of religion.

We must protect pro-life organizations in D.C. and allow them to operate according to their sincerely held beliefs. The D.C. City Council's actions would have serious negative consequences for religious organizations operating in D.C., and religious or pro-life groups could be forced to make personnel decisions that are inconsistent with their moral convictions. Additionally, these actions will force employers to defend against lawsuits of questionable merit brought with a political motivation.

Our Nation's Capital should not be a place where people's freedoms are taken away; it should be a place where the right to live according to your beliefs is most fervently protected. We must respect and protect the religious freedoms established by the Constitution and the Federal law. We must reject the overreach by the D.C. City Council.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I must reject the gentlewoman's desire to protect organizations or residents in D.C. No resident in D.C. has asked any Member of this body to protect them except the Member standing before you, and that Member can't even protect them with a vote on this floor.

This bill was passed unanimously by the D.C. City Council. If there is any objection to this bill, D.C. residents will repair to the courts, who are the only authorities who can tell us what is constitutional and what is not constitutional.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the distinguished Delegate from the District of Columbia. I thank her for her courageous, relentless, persistent, effective leadership and representation of the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor, Madam Speaker, to ask several questions. I think they have to be addressed to you.

How many times have our Republican colleagues come to this floor to express their belief in reducing the role of government, of the Federal Government? How many times have they come to the floor to preach their deference to states' rights and local government? And how many times have these House Republicans thrown all of that out the window when it comes to meddling, government meddling in the reproductive choices of America's families?

Here we are with Republicans who disapprove a duly passed D.C. law in order to enable businesses to fire their employees for the reproductive health decisions that they make. And not only that, not only the decision that the employee makes, but the decision that a spouse makes or a dependent, a child, makes.

Allowing employers to fire employees for using birth control or in vitro fertilization, which answers the prayers of so many families, or any other reproductive health service is an outrageous intrusion into workers' personal lives.

This is Hobby Lobby on steroids. This is about a business firing someone—man or woman—for private health decisions with no bearing on the workplace. In fact, if Republicans have their way, employers would not need to cite religion at all to discriminate against employees for their reproductive decisions.

House Republicans—and I say House Republicans, Madam Speaker, because this isn't what Republicans think throughout the country. House Republicans need to recognize that personal healthcare choices are not your boss' business. A business has no right to threaten its employees for their reproductive choices or for the reproductive choices made by members of their families.

I keep saying it over and over. House Republicans have no business using this House of Representatives to enable such appalling discrimination. I urge my colleagues to stand against this radical assault on the rights of workers and families here in D.C.

Again, how many times have we seen our House Republican colleagues come to the floor to speak of their belief in reducing the role of the Federal Government? Not so fast, families of the District of Columbia. This doesn't mean you.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus. He is a cosponsor of this bill, and he is a defender of life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, let me just say at the outset to my friend, the former Speaker for whom I have the highest regard, it is always appropriate to defend to the best extent possible the fragile lives of unborn children from the violence of abortion, and it is always appropriate

to defend to the greatest degree possible conscience rights when they are under assault. That is why I, along with many of my colleagues, rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to disapprove of D.C. legislation that infringes on the First Amendment freedoms of religious charities and pro-life advocacy groups in the District of Columbia.

I especially want to thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for her consistent and highly effective leadership over many years for fundamental conscience rights and for attempting to respect human life to the greatest extent possible.

□ 2200

I agree with six distinguished law professors—and I will include their letters fully in the Record—who wrote the D.C. Council last November and who said:

"RHNDAs attempt to prevent employers from making decisions based on their 'personal beliefs' implies that the State has the power to judge what are and are not legitimate 'personal beliefs' and to conclude that religiously motivated opposition to State policies is unacceptable. The Supreme Court has unanimously affirmed that employers, not the State, may determine which religious practices they use as the basis for their organization's policies."

The Secretary of Education for the Archdiocese of Washington wrote every Member of Congress, and he said:

"RHNDAs would force religious institutions, including the 20 Catholic schools in the District of Columbia that I oversee, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of the mission of their employer. It would subjugate the church's moral teaching to the moral views of the government."

The National Right to Life Committee, which has its national headquarters right here in the District, said:

"It would be intolerable for an advocacy organization such as ours to be required to hire or prohibit from firing a person who makes a 'decision' to engage in advocacy or any other activity that is directly antithetical to our core mission to lawfully advocate for the civil rights of the unborn."

Christian and Muslim leaders also wrote a letter in which they pointed out:

"We come together to oppose RHNDAs. We believe it would infringe on religious employers' freedom to make employment decisions when necessary to preserve their religious mission and identity."

Catholic University president John Garvey, a very, very distinguished president of Catholic U. and whom I literally had up in hearings to speak out against anti-Semitism, said:

"This bill would require all employers, including religious schools such as ours, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of our mission. It would take away our right to carry

out our mission through personnel policies and practices that are rooted in our faith. The D.C. bill carries no exemption or language of tolerance.”

Again, I would agree with former Mayor Vincent Gray in that it raises serious First Amendment concerns in the Constitution.

APRIL 29, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, I am writing to urge your support of the House Joint Resolution 43, disapproving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act in the United States House of Representatives.

The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act would force religious institutions, including the 20 Catholic schools in the District of Columbia that I oversee, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of the mission of their employer. It would subjugate the Church's moral teaching to the moral views of the government, violating the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and result in discrimination against religious believers. Practically speaking, Catholic schools would be obliged to keep teachers that sow confusion among schoolchildren by engaging in conduct that is contrary to Catholic teaching on the fundamental dignity of human life from the moment of conception. The Archdiocese of Washington has long respected home rule for the District of Columbia and, therefore, advocated for our constitutional rights with the D.C. Council and Mayor. However, they moved forward despite our objections forcing us to appeal to the United States Congress to restore our freedoms.

Accordingly the Archdiocese of Washington joins other religious institutions, faith-based organizations and pro-life advocacy groups urging you and your colleagues to defend our freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of association in the Nation's Capital.

Please vote for House Joint Resolution 43 disapproving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. Thank You.

Sincerely,

THOMAS W. BURNFORD, D.MIN.
Secretary for Education.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, I urge you to vote for House Joint Resolution 43 when it reaches the floor today. The bill would express the House's disapproval of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act passed by the D.C. Council.

That bill would require all employers, including religious schools such as ours, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of our mission. It would take away our right to carry out our mission through personnel policies and practices that are rooted in our faith.

The D.C. bill carries no exemption or language of tolerance that would acknowledge or accommodate the religious and associational freedoms protected by the First Amendment. It places the preferences of the government above the Church's teaching on important matters.

I recognize the significance of Congress's acting to disapprove a bill passed by the D.C. Council and urge you to take this unusual step only because of the great impact the bill

would have on our ability freely to operate this University. I am grateful for your support

Sincerely,

JOHN GARVEY,
President.

NOVEMBER 5, 2014.

Hon. PHIL MENDELSON,
Council of the District of Columbia,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MENDELSON: We are college and university professors opposed to the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014 (RHNDRA). It seeks to amend Sec. 2, Section 211 (D.C. Official Code §2-1402.11) of the Human Rights Act of 1977, effective December 13, 1977 (D.C. Law 2-38; D.C. Official Code §201401.01 et seq) (the Act) to read: “An employer or employment agency shall not discriminate against an individual with respect to compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of or on the basis of the individual's or a dependent's reproductive health decision making, including a decision to use or access a particular drug, device or medical service, because of or on the basis of an employer's personal beliefs about such services.”

We are convinced that RHNDRA violates the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which governs the District's policies on the restriction of religious freedoms. RFRA is not limited to institutions owned by religious organizations, but extends to closely-held corporations whose owners' free exercise of religion is burdened by state regulation. *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, No. 13-354* (U.S. June 30, 2014).

The Act currently contains an exemption for religious organizations and organizations “operated, supervised or controlled by or in connection with a religious . . . organization” (§2-1401.3). RHNDRA appears aimed at owners of entities like Hobby Lobby, whose owners would seek the same exemption offered religious organizations and their subsidiaries. The standard that RFRA stipulates, that the government may burden religious practice of owners of closely-held corporations only when it is advancing a compelling state interest by means that are the least restrictive to the affected religious practice, is ignored by the proposed legislation.

RHNDRA proposes to overturn the long-standing recognition of the right of religious employers to run their enterprises according to their religious beliefs. RHNDRA's attempt to prevent employers from making decisions based on their “personal beliefs” implies that the state has the power to judge what are, and are not, legitimate “personal beliefs” and to conclude that religiously-motivated opposition to state policies is unacceptable. The Supreme Court has unanimously affirmed that employers, not the state, may determine which religious practices they use as the basis for their organizations' policies. *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC*, 132 S. Ct. 6.

We oppose passage of the RHNDRA and urge you and your colleagues to reject this bill.

Signed,

PROFESSOR GEORGE W.
DENT, Jr.,
Case Western Reserve
University School of
Law.

ROBERT A. DESTRO,
Professor of Law, Co-
lumbus School of
Law, The Catholic
University of Amer-
ica.

JOHN FARINA,

Associate Prof. of Reli-
gious Studies,
George Mason Uni-
versity.

ROBERT P. GEORGE,
McCormick Professor
of Jurisprudence,
Princeton Univer-
sity.

JOHN C. HIRSH,
Professor of English,
Georgetown Univer-
sity.

FRANK A. ORBAN III,
Institute of World Pol-
itics (Ret.).

APRIL 30, 2015.

Re nullify the D.C. “Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination” law.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Right to Life Committee, the nationwide federation of state right-to-life organizations, urges you to vote in favor of H. J. Res. 43, a resolution introduced by Congresswoman Black to nullify the so-called “Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act” (RHNDRA) in the District of Columbia. NRLC intends to include the roll call on H. J. Res. 43 in our scorecard of key pro-life votes of the 114th Congress.

The RHNDRA prohibits employers within the District from engaging in “discrimination” on the basis of “decisions” reached by employees, or potential employees, regarding “reproductive health” matters. It is not disputed that abortion is among the matters encompassed by the term “reproductive health” as used in the new law. The scope of the RHNDRA is very broad, covering any “decisions” that are “related to the use . . . of a particular . . . medical service . . .” [emphasis added].

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) advocates for recognition that each unborn child is a member of the human family, and that each abortion stops a beating heart and ends the life of a developing human being. That viewpoint is shared by many women who once believed otherwise and submitted to abortions, and by many men who once believed otherwise and were complicit in abortion; such persons number among the most committed activists within our organization and other pro-life organizations. Yet it would be intolerable for an advocacy organization such as ours to be required to hire, or prohibited from firing, a person who makes a “decision” to engage in advocacy or any other activity that is directly antithetical to our core mission to lawfully advocate for the civil rights of the unborn.

Under the RHNDRA, using any “decision . . . related to” abortion to inform decisions about hiring, firing, or benefits (among other things) would expose our organization both to enforcement actions by the District government bureaucracy, and to private lawsuits (some of which would likely be engendered by “sting” operations by pro-abortion advocates).

Some have suggested that we would be protected from such results by a clause in the pre-existing D.C. Human Rights Act that makes narrow allowance for “giving preference to persons of the same religion or political persuasion” as a controlling “religious or political organization.” But NRLC is neither a political nor a religious organization as those terms are used in the law. NRLC is not “operated, supervised or controlled by” any religious institution or political party, as the law requires to claim the narrow exemption. Moreover, our staff is made up of persons who are personally affiliated with a wide variety of religious bodies,

or with none, and persons who belong to a variety of political parties, or to none.

Article I of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress shall “exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever” with respect to the seat of government, the federal District. Therefore, the RHND Act has been enacted with legal authority delegated to the District Council by Congress; that local body has no other political authority whatever under the Constitution. It follows that members of Congress are responsible for, and accountable for, abuses of the legal authority that Congress has delegated to District officials. The RHND Act is just such an abuse of delegated power—it is a politically motivated attack on our organization and the other organizations that seek to vindicate the human rights of unborn children.

The roll call on H. J. Res. 43, the resolution of disapproval, will be accurately described in our scorecard and in reports to our national membership as a fair reading of where each Member of the House of Representatives stands regarding a blatantly political attack on the pro-life movement.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS D. JOHNSON,
Legislative Director.
SUSAN T. MUSKETT, J.D.,
Senior Legislative
Counsel.

Hon. PHIL MENDELSON,
Council of the District of Columbia,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MENDELSON: We represent the city's broad and diverse faith community. We may believe and practice our faith differently. We may have divergent positions on important issues. However we all agree that faith communities have a right to freely exercise their religion and a responsibility to promote and protect this important freedom. We believe religious freedom is not only our priority, but also a priority in our society.

We come together then to oppose the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014. We believe it would infringe upon religious employers' freedom to make employment decisions when necessary to preserve their religious mission and identity. In doing so, the legislation would allow for unjust and unnecessary government interference into religious employers' governance and operations.

While religious employers do not police employees' or dependents' private reproductive health decisions, these employers must have the freedom to respond to employees' public behavior repudiating their religious mission and identity.

We believe that the legislation would in fact discriminate against religious employers in a manner prohibited by the significant constitutional and legal protections provided to religious organizations in the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

We respectfully request that you oppose the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. We pray that you will be fair and reasonable in your considerations of our sincere concerns. We will follow up with you with regard to these priority concerns.

Sincerely,

Reverend Patrick Walker, President, Baptist Convention of D.C. and Vicinity; Reverend Susan Taylor, National Public Affairs Director, Church of Scientology National Affairs Office; Talib M. Shareef, CMSgt, USAF-Retired, Imam/President, The Nation's Mosque, Masjid Muhammad; Reverend Kendrick E. Curry, Pastor, Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church—DuPont Park; Reverend Dr. George C. Gilbert, Pastor, Holy Trinity United Baptist Church—Hillbrook; Reverend A.C. Durant, Pastor, Tenth Street

Baptist Church—Shaw; Reverend Sylvia Stanard, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Lee Holzinger, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Monsignor Robert Panke, Rector, Saint John Paul II Seminary—Brookland; Reverend William Byrne, Secretary of Pastoral Ministry and Social Concerns, Archdiocese of Washington.

Michael Scott, Director, D.C. Catholic Conference; Reverend Frederick Close, Pastor, St. Anthony Catholic Church—Brookland; Reverend Adam Y. Park, Pastor, Epiphany Catholic Church—Georgetown; Reverend Michael Briese, Pastor, Holy Name Catholic Church—Capitol Hill North; Reverend Monsignor Godfrey T. Mosley, Pastor, St. Ann Catholic Church—Tenleytown; Reverend Mark R. Ivany, Pastor, Assumption Catholic Church—Congress Heights; Reverend Michael J. Kelley, Pastor, St. Martin Catholic Church—Bloomington; Monsignor Raymond G. East, Pastor, St. Teresa of Avila Catholic Church—Anacostia; Reverend William Gurnee, Director of Spiritual Formation, Saint John Paul II Seminary—Brookland.

Monsignor John Enzler, President and CEO, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Henry A. Gaston, Pastor, Johnson Memorial Baptist Church; Reverend Beth Akiyama, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Kay Holzinger, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Mario E. Dorsonville, Vice President of Mission and Immigration Outreach, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Avelino A. Gonzalez, Director, Ecumenical and Inter-Faith Affairs Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Monsignor Ronald W. Jameson, Rector, Cathedral of Saint Matthew the Apostle—DuPont Circle; Reverend Monsignor James D. Watkins, Pastor, Immaculate Conception Catholic Church—Shaw; Reverend Monsignor Paul Langsfeld, Pastor, St. Joseph's Catholic Church on Capitol Hill.

Reverend Gregory Schommer, O.P., Pastor, St. Dominic Catholic Church—Southwest Waterfront; Reverend Andrew F. Royals; Reverend Mark R. Ivany, Pastor, St. Benedict the Moor Catholic Church—Kingman Park; Reverend Ron Potts, Pastor, Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament—Chevy Chase; Reverend Thomas Franks, S.S.J., Pastor, Our Lady of Perpetual Help Catholic Church—Buena Vista; Reverend Cornelius Kelechi Ejigogu, S.S.J., Pastor, St. Luke Catholic Church—Marshall Heights; Reverend Alfred J. Harris, Pastor, St. Mary Mother of God Catholic Church—Chinatown; Reverend Evelio Menjivar, Pastor, Our Lady Queen of the Americas—Kalamazoo; Reverend Richard Mullins, Pastor, St. Thomas Apostle Catholic Church—Woodley Park; Reverend Raymond M. Moore, Pastor, St. Thomas More Catholic Church—Washington Highlands; Monsignor Charles Pope, Pastor, Holy Comforter-Saint Cyprian Catholic Church—Capitol Hill.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, a pro-life organization can hire or fire anyone it wants to. If that person opposes the mission of the pro-life organization, the pro-life organization does not have to hire that person and may fire that person.

Another matter that has to be corrected is that the D.C. discrimination law provides that nothing in the act—the act under discussion here—prohibits religious and political organizations from limiting employment or admission to or giving preference to per-

sons of the same religion or political persuasion as calculated by that organization to promote the religious or political principles for which it is established or maintained.

That is the text.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), my friend.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlewoman from D.C.

Madam Speaker, I stand today in opposition to this resolution.

I want to make clear the consequences of the misguided resolution that we are considering today because it is not about religious freedom; it is about the freedom to make incredibly personal and significant decisions without having to consult your boss.

I have recently experienced the joy of becoming a mother for the first time. This miracle was not possible without the aid of in vitro fertilization. Given the excess radiation exposure I received during treatment for my combat-related amputations, this was the only way I would ever have a child.

Every woman in this country should have the same opportunity to start a family, and no woman should ever be fired for doing so. This should be common sense. Unfortunately, the resolution before us today would remove the legal protections ensuring that this is the case in D.C.

The law we are voting to disapprove today would prevent stories like that of Emily Herx's, a language arts teacher at a Catholic school in Indiana. She was fired after school authorities discovered that she and her husband used in vitro fertilization to try to have a child. They sought IVF treatments after learning that she suffered from a medical condition that caused infertility. She was told that the procedure was contrary to church teachings, and, as a result, her teaching contract would not be renewed. Last December, a jury sided with her, awarding her damages in the case.

Employees like Emily Herx should be judged at work based on their job performances, not on private decisions they make with their families and doctors. That is exactly what the D.C. Council intended to ensure in passing their resolution to protect women in the District.

I urge all Members to oppose this attempt by the majority to limit the rights of the people of the District of Columbia. In this day and age, the last thing we should be doing is punishing couples who are having difficulty in starting a family.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), one of our freshmen and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 43, to protect different organizations from having to choose between their faiths and their jobs.

This is not a war on women. It is an outright war on religious liberties.

Forcing people to participate in offensive acts in order to stay in business is unconstitutional, and the D.C. Council has wholeheartedly interfered with the rights that are guaranteed in our Constitution. It is not a crime for individuals or organizations to exercise their First Amendment right. Respecting religious liberties when it can be reasonably accommodated is both common sense and constitutional.

As Congress, we have a duty to disapprove of what the D.C. Council has done, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 11 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a member of our committee.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, we have an obligation to fight discrimination wherever it exists and in whatever form it exists.

This resolution would allow employers to discriminate against employees who make decisions based on the interests of their health and their families. If employers don't like the personal health care decisions that their employees make, this resolution would allow employers to fire them.

Is it right to allow employers to fire women who use contraception or who try to conceive through in vitro fertilization?

Employees should be judged on their job performances and nothing else, especially not on their private medical decisions. Nobody has the right to interfere with those decisions—nobody—not an employer, not the House of Representatives, not any of us.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I first want to start by thanking my ranking member, Mr. ELIJAH CUMMINGS. I feel for him and for his city and what they are having to go through in Baltimore. I know he would have liked to have been here, but I have the utmost respect for him, and I wish nothing but the best for the people of Baltimore. I thank him for the decorum we have had and for the success we have had thus far on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. We have had good debates. We have disagreed on issues, but I think we have probably agreed on most issues that we have had come before us.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from the District, who cares passionately about her service and the people of Washington, D.C., and I know it comes from her heart as she speaks

about these. We have had good success on our committee in having these vigorous debates but having done so in a professional manner, and I thank her for that kind of discussion that we have had. Again, I know that she speaks from her heart on this.

Madam Speaker, we do believe that this was a timely and appropriate bill to bring up. I know that it doesn't happen very often. It is not a common occurrence. That is because a lot of what Washington, D.C., does and passes is not something that is of any controversy whatsoever. Yet, when you have the attorney general for the District of Columbia saying this has problems with the Constitution and problems in the law and when you have Mayor Gray making the same case that this has problems, I hope that both sides will recognize, no matter how they vote, that this law that was transmitted to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—to Congress—is problematic, and they have admitted as such. They know that it is problematic, and I think we have a role and a responsibility to add our voice to that. That is what the Constitution calls for.

The Constitution makes it clear that Congress does have the ability to exercise the ultimate legislative authority over the District of Columbia. In the typical case, Congress plays no part in it as the overwhelming majority of pieces of legislation that get transmitted to us continue to sail on, but the RHNDL legislation, as passed by the D.C. Council, has left us with no choice but to act.

The bill affects the hiring practices of all D.C. employers, but it provides no exemption for religious or political organizations that work to advance certain beliefs regarding reproductive health. Because of this, the bill fails to ensure that protections are guaranteed under the First Amendment.

As I said before, former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray, a Democrat, wrote the D.C. Council twice, warning that this bill was unconstitutional. To fix the problem, Mayor Gray recommended the council include an exemption for religious or political organizations, but the council and the current mayor ignored Mayor Gray's request, which would have alleviated the constitutional concerns. She ignored that. The current mayor ignored that. If they had taken Mayor Gray's advice, I don't think we would be standing here today, talking about this bill.

Washington, D.C.'s current mayor, Ms. Bowser, also saw the problems with the bill. She requested the council pass temporary—and that is important, “temporary”—emergency legislation clarifying the bill doesn't require an employer to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions that an employer does not agree with. That is an important part of this discussion, but the legislation is only temporary. The bill remains unclear as to what it requires the D.C. employers to cover.

The other point that I would put in place here is that Washington, D.C., has been a city for a long time—for a couple hundred years, I think—and this legislation has not been in place. We are not trying to erase something. We are saying that the bill that was transmitted to us is problematic, and there are ways to remedy and fix that. Some would say, well, it has been fixed by this temporary—again, temporary—piece of legislation, but that hasn't been transmitted to us. The D.C. Council had an opportunity to provide us with that temporary legislation, but they didn't. Maybe they will in the future—I don't know—but that is not the bill that is before us today.

What I am arguing for is the same thing in concept as from the Washington, D.C., attorney general. It is the same thing in concept that D.C. Mayor Gray has said, and it is the same thing, quite frankly, that the current mayor has argued is problematic, because she wanted to clarify that the very arguments we hear back to us are that their bill doesn't actually do that, that we are not trying to effect that—in essence, saying that we are right, that we are not trying to get into this dangerous, unprecedented territory which a lot of us find offensive.

Madam Speaker, I think what we have done is very reasonable in our approach. We have very differing approaches and mindsets. I get that, but I do appreciate the debate. That is what we are supposed to be doing in Congress.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and, certainly, our ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS. He is a good man, and he is in a tough situation. Again, our thoughts and prayers are with him and with the people of Baltimore and of Maryland. I would hope they would look to his leadership and what he is telling the people, which is to calmly, calmly discuss these issues as we are calmly discussing these issues here tonight.

Again, I urge the passage of this. I think it is an appropriate thing to do, and it is a timely thing to do. The clock has run out. We only have 30 days. The time is right upon us, so I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution tonight.

□ 2215

Finally, I will say I really do appreciate Mrs. BLACK for her heart and passion on this issue and the good work that she has done. She cares deeply about these issues. We all do.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and say that I do want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, for the way he has run the committee and especially with respect to this controversial legislation. He has allowed members to speak. It has been a very civil repartee on both sides.

I would like to offer that I have already read the text of D.C. law that exempts both religious and political organizations from limiting employment

in the way that other employers must, that they may hire based on their religious views and their political views. Pro-life organizations are protected; churches are protected.

The continuous citation of the former Mayor and the former attorney general would make you think that they were still in office. The council did, in fact, look once again at their objections, finding that their objections had already been taken care of in prior D.C. law. The council then unanimously passed the bill again.

It is painful to hear the insurance matter cited against the District of Columbia because the only reason it isn't final law is because the District of Columbia has to transmit to this body every law, and it has to lay over for at least 30 days before it becomes final. If we had our way, if we had the same rights that every other Member has whose district is in the United States of America, it would already be law. It shouldn't be cited against us.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a member of the committee.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I address you today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 43. The resolution undermines the purpose of the D.C. Council antidiscrimination bill. D.C. residents deserve to be protected from discrimination in the workplace. Everyone should have the ability to make a private healthcare decision, including when and how they will start a family, and without the fear of losing their jobs or facing retaliation or retribution from their employer.

Unfortunately, women across the country have faced discrimination for personal decisions such as using birth control, becoming pregnant while unmarried, or using in vitro fertilization to become pregnant. Contrary to claims by my Republican colleagues, this bill does not impose any new requirements on employers to cover or to pay for any reproductive health services.

Are women's rights not guaranteed by the Constitution just like those of men in this country? This is not about whether you or I have an abortion or whether you or I use IVF. Madam Speaker, this is about a woman's right to choose what is right for them in the privacy of their homes and doctor's office and with their family. This is not about pro-choice or pro-life. This is about religious freedom. This is about government intrusion.

This resolution, forced on the people of D.C. by a Member of Congress from Tennessee, flies in the face of the democratic debate and vote already heard by the D.C. Council. This resolution preserves the current exemption in the D.C. human rights laws for religious organizations and does not impose any additional requirements on employers based on their religious belief.

I stand here today, Madam Speaker, as a member of the largest number of

women in this Congress, and I can tell you, I am offended by this bill. I stand here today in opposition.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a cosponsor of the bill and one of my colleagues from my State.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her work on this issue, and I also thank Chairman CHAFFETZ for the work that he has done on this issue.

Both the gentlewoman and the chairman have mentioned the work and the comments by Mayor Gray regarding this policy and the policy by the RHNDAA. You can say the reason that we are here tonight is to correct a wrong. I think you could also say that it is here to protect one of those first principles that we hold so very dear in this country and one of the reasons that our country was founded: to celebrate and enjoy religious freedom. So that is what brings us to the floor tonight. One of the things that we hear from our constituents all the time, Madam Speaker, is that we should never pass bills that are going to compromise or limit our freedoms.

Now, it is important to note that what the District has done with the RHNDAA would prevent organizations of faith—including schools, churches, and pro-life groups established explicitly to uphold their moral and ethical views—from making personnel decisions consistent with the mission of their very establishment. So that is a prohibition that we are addressing with this resolution that we are bringing forward tonight.

I think it is important to note the resolution doesn't take away any rights and it doesn't add any new rights. What it does is to maintain what has been current law. That is something that is important for us to remember. I also think it is important to note that in 2012 the Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the rights of religious organizations, and we stand tonight with that affirmation.

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I insert for the RECORD two letters, one from Americans United for Separation of Church and State, and the other from over 20 organizations, including the Anti-Defamation League, Catholics for Choice, People for the American Way, United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society, over 20 organizations. Both letters are in opposition to the resolution.

AMERICANS UNITED, APRIL 30, 2015.
Re: Oppose Attempts to Curtail Civil Rights in the District of Columbia

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Americans United for Separation of Church and State, we write to urge you to oppose efforts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H.J. Res. 43, the resolution to disapprove of D.C.'s Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014

(RHNDAA). This bill, which the D.C. Council recently passed unanimously, expands civil rights and effectuates the will of the people of D.C. It should not be nullified by Congress.

Founded in 1947, Americans United is a nonpartisan educational organization dedicated to preserving the constitutional principle of church-state separation as the only way to ensure true religious freedom for all Americans. We fight to protect the right of individuals and religious communities to worship—or not—as they see fit without government interference, compulsion, support, or disparagement. Americans United has more than 120,000 members and supporters across the country.

THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT

The RHNDAA protects D.C. employees and their dependents from discrimination based on their personal reproductive health care decisions. This bill strengthens existing protections against employment discrimination and ensures that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, including whether, when, and how to start a family and what the size of their family should be, without fear of losing their jobs or facing retribution from their employers.

Our nation's laws have long protected the freedom of religion and belief, ensuring every person has the right to follow the dictates of his or her own conscience. Contrary to opponents' claims, the RHNDAA does not violate religious freedom protections.

In accordance with the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, religious beliefs do not excuse compliance with valid and neutral laws of general applicability. Courts deem laws neutral unless they "target religious beliefs" or "if the object of [the] law is to infringe upon or restrict practices because of their religious motivation." The RHNDAA does not single out religious beliefs or practices. Instead, the bill treats all employers the same.

The RHNDAA would also survive a challenge under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which applies to D.C. RFRA prohibits the government from "substantially burden[ing] a person's exercise of religion" unless the government can demonstrate that the burden is justified by a compelling government interest and is the least restrictive means of furthering that interest. RFRA is not triggered when there is just "the slightest obstacle to religious exercise." And, burdens are permissible when the government's interest is important, including combatting discrimination.

The bill does not compel any employer to endorse any actions that may be in conflict with their religious tenets. This act merely ensures that employees and their families face no employment consequences for their private health care decisions. Eradicating employment discrimination against women is a compelling government interest and there is no less restrictive means of preventing discrimination.

Furthermore, this bill protects women who choose to exercise their constitutionally protected rights to make "personal choice[s] in matters of marriage and family life." Business owners are absolutely entitled to their religious beliefs—but they cannot use their beliefs to justify discrimination against their employees. The RHNDAA would make sure that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, based on their own consciences and in consultation with their own physicians, without fear of losing their job.

Finally, it's important to remember that the RHNDAA does not override existing protections for religious employers in hiring.

The D.C. Human Rights Act already contains an exemption for employers “operated, supervised, or controlled by or in connection with a religious . . . organization” to give preference or limit employment to those of the same faith. Moreover, as the Supreme Court held in *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & Sch. v. E.E.O.C.*, the First Amendment protects religious institutions’ right to make decisions about employees in ministerial positions—those who preach and teach the faith. The RHNDAA does not alter these already-existing protections.

THE HUMAN RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT

Although the House will be voting on H.J. Res. 43, which would prevent the RHNDAA from taking effect, H.J. Res. 44, a resolution of disapproval of D.C.’s Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014 (HRAA), has also been introduced. This is another attempt to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia and should likewise be rejected.

The HRAA would ensure that LGBT students in the District are not subject to discrimination by educational institutions. Under the HRAA, religiously affiliated educational institutions would have to provide LGBT student groups with the same equal access to school facilities and services as all other student groups, but they would not be required to provide LGBT student groups with funds or official recognition.

The HRAA, like the RHNDAA, has also been attacked by opponents claiming it violates religious freedom protections under the First Amendment and RFRA. But religiously affiliated educational institutions have neither a constitutional nor statutory right to discriminate against LGBT student groups in the name of religion. The HRAA is a neutral law of general applicability that has the effect of ensuring all schools and universities provide equal access and services to LGBT students. It would not compel the schools to fund or recognize LGBT student groups and serves a government interest that the D.C. Court of Appeals long ago held was compelling. As explained by the Court, eradicating discrimination against LGBT students serves to “foster[] individual dignity, . . . creat[e] a climate and environment in which each individual can utilize his or her potential to contribute to and benefit from society, and [promote the] equal protection of the life, liberty and property that the Founding Fathers guaranteed to us all.”

CONCLUSION

The D.C. Council, supported by the people it represents, passed the RHNDAA and the HRAA to protect members of the D.C. community from discrimination. Contrary to the rhetoric surrounding this bill, it does not violate religious liberty protections. Rather, the RHNDAA stands to protect all employees in the District from discrimination. Accordingly, we urge you to reject any attempts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H.J. Res. 43.

Religion should never be used as an excuse to justify discrimination. Yet that is what opponents of these measures would like to do. We know there will be other attempts to misuse religious liberty in Congress. We urge you to reject this one and those to come.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

MAGGIE GARRETT,
Legislative Director,
Americans United
for Separation of
Church and State

ELISE HELGESEN AGUILAR,
Federal Legislative
Counsel, Americans
United for Separation

tion of Church and
State.

APRIL 30, 2015.

Re: Oppose Attempts to Curtail D.C. Civil Rights

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned religious, interfaith, and civil liberties organizations that advocate for freedom of religion and belief write to urge you to reject any and all congressional efforts, including resolutions of disapproval, that would prevent two D.C. civil rights bills from taking effect. The D.C. Council unanimously passed both the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (RHNDAA) and the Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014 (HRAA) to support one basic underlying principle: fairness. The bills help ensure that others are treated fairly—as we all would like to be treated. These bills do not violate religious freedom, but instead protect freedom of conscience and ensure equal treatment for all students and employees.

We urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 43, which seeks to overturn the RHNDAA. The RHNDAA strengthens the District’s existing nondiscrimination protections so that employees in D.C. and their dependents do not face employment discrimination because of their personal reproductive health care decisions.

The RHNDAA would ensure that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, based on their own consciences and in consultation with their own physicians, without fear of losing their job. Business owners are absolutely entitled to their personal religious beliefs—but they cannot use their beliefs to justify discrimination against their employees.

Similarly, we urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 44, which would repeal the HRAA. The HRAA ensures that all educational institutions in D.C. provide access to school facilities and services for all student clubs equally. Contrary to opponents’ claims, the HRAA does not require religiously affiliated schools to provide LGBT student groups with funding or official recognition. The HRAA simply upholds students’ freedom of conscience by repealing a congressionally imposed exemption to D.C. law that allows religiously affiliated educational institutions to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

Despite opponents’ claims, neither bill violates the religious freedom protections found in the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment or the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA). The two bills are neutral and generally applicable because they have the effect of applying nondiscrimination protections to all employers and all educational institutions in the District; neither single out a faith group or religious practice. Moreover, neither bill requires a religious organization to endorse any action that conflicts with its religious teachings. Finally, each bill furthers the government’s compelling interest in eradicating discrimination in the District.

Religious freedom is a fundamental American value. It guarantees us the freedom to hold any belief we choose without government interference. It cannot, however, be used to trump others’ civil rights, and it should not justify striking down laws that ensure people are treated fairly. We should strive to expand civil rights protections, not curtail them.

We urge you to oppose any attempts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H. J. Res. 43 and H. J. Res. 44.

Sincerely,

Americans United for Separation of
Church and State, Anti-Defamation
League, Catholics for Choice, Center

for Inquiry, Disciples for Choice, Disciples Justice Action Network, Equal Justice Task Force of African American Ministers in Action, Equal Partners in Faith, Hindu American Foundation, Institute for Science and Human Values, Inc., Interfaith Alliance, Methodist Federation for Social Action, Metropolitan Community Churches, National Council of Jewish Women, People For the American Way, Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Secular Coalition for America, Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF), Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society, Unitarian Universalist Association.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a member of the committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this extreme and misguided resolution.

I am deeply troubled that this Chamber continues to waste its time attacking women’s health rather than crafting solutions for the American people. Instead of addressing the real challenges facing our Nation, this resolution is yet another attempt by House leaders to inject ideology into women’s personal medical decisions. A woman’s healthcare choices should be made between her and her doctor, not by her boss.

By overturning D.C.’s new anti-discrimination protections, this resolution would give employers the right to fire workers based on the decisions they make about their birth control. This is simply unacceptable. All Americans should be free to make medical decisions without the fear of being fired or demoted.

Now is the time for House leaders to stop undermining women’s reproductive rights and focus on the actual needs of working families. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, let me repeat the opinion of former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray and his attorney general. They believe that this law we are considering tonight is legally problematic and raises serious concerns under the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, many organizations in the District have asked Congress for help, including Cardinal Wuerl of the Catholic Diocese. I include for the RECORD the April 17, 2015, letter to the editor of The Washington Post from Cardinal Wuerl and President Garvey from Catholic University.

[From the Washington Post, April 17, 2015]

DISAGREEMENT IS NOT DISCRIMINATION

(By Donald Wuerl and John Garvey)

Cardinal Donald Wuerl is the archbishop of Washington. John Garvey is the president of Catholic University of America.

Last month, Pope Francis announced that the Catholic Church would celebrate a Holy Year of Divine Mercy. God’s mercy has been a theme of his pontificate.

We all need God's forgiveness. The pope has said, "I am a sinner." The Catholic Church's response to our human frailty is not condemnation but mercy. There may be no institution that understands this better.

Recent laws enacted by the D.C. Council would have us believe otherwise. The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act and the Human Rights Amendment Act purport to address "discrimination" by institutions such as ours, the Archdiocese of Washington and the Catholic University of America. The putative victims of this discrimination are people who part ways with church teaching about unborn life and sexual autonomy.

Consider the reproductive health law, which the council says is designed to prevent discrimination against employees who have abortions, have sex outside marriage or seek sterilization or other means to prevent pregnancy. Given the effort expended and ink spilled on this purported civil rights measure, you would think the church was hunting out sexual offenders and fining or firing them. But the church understands that we are all sinners, all equally deserving of punishment (if it comes to that) and all equally in need of God's mercy. We are not in the business of privileging some sinners over others.

The church's message, though, is one of mercy, not moral indifference. That is why we object to these two laws. They ask for much more than mercy and understanding. Consider again the reproductive health law. It forbids an employer to "discriminate against an individual" on the basis of her "reproductive health decision making." Suppose your job is pro-life education in the archdiocese's Department of Life Issues. We can imagine a woman who had an abortion working effectively in that office. (Dorothy Day, founder of the Catholic Worker movement and a great witness to life, had an abortion when she was 21.) But suppose you continue to believe that abortion was the right choice for you to make and honesty compels you to share that opinion with other women in your circumstances. A law forbidding discrimination on the basis of "reproductive health decision making" would seem to prevent the church from challenging or dismissing such an employee, even though she is working at odds with the mission of the office that hired her.

We have similar concerns about the Human Rights Amendment law. It says that religious institutions are guilty of discrimination against gay and lesbian student groups if, in the words of the committee report, they deny them the same "rights and facilities as other officially recognized student groups." The Catholic Church's views about sexual autonomy, like its views about reproductive health, are more traditional than those held by the D.C. Council. But it seems peculiar to say that the church discriminates, in some morally objectionable way, by declining to give official support to groups that hold views opposed to its own.

Mercy is not the same as moral relativism. Disagreement is not the same as discrimination. The law goes too far when it demands that the church abandon its beliefs in the pursuit of an entirely novel state of equality.

The D.C. Council has failed to appreciate this point. Reluctantly, we turned to Congress for a resolution of disapproval. This procedure is in keeping with the American tradition of political appeal against political decisions. If that course of action fails, we have no doubt we will eventually prevail in court. The respect for religious freedom that we ask for is enshrined in the Constitution. But we hope that our elected officials can also see that it's a matter of common sense.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, our history has a long history of tolerance

toward religious institutions. Indeed, one of the words inscribed on the rostrum here in the center of it is "tolerance." We need to approve this resolution to be tolerant of our religious institutions. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. May I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 5 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her outstanding service and leadership on behalf of the District of Columbia and the people of the District of Columbia. As well, let me acknowledge the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for his kind words of deliberation, and certainly the ranking member for his leadership, Mr. CUMMINGS, who, as we all know, is addressing some of the very heavy concerns in his own city.

Let me give all the facts, Madam Speaker. I happen to believe in statehood for the District of Columbia. I think that is important to state on the record. But I realize that the Constitution has a framework for the Congress to address the issues of the laws here in the District of Columbia. I realize, as well, that home rule has been given under that authority, and this Congress, in the right thinking, has allowed basically for the District of Columbia to rule its city on the basis of good governance of the citizens of this particular community. That is the right thing to do. They are taxpaying Americans.

So I am disturbed by H.J. Res. 43 because it seeks to cause confusion where there is no need for confusion. Let me first start by saying that the Ninth Amendment gives a right to privacy to all Americans, and Washingtonians are Americans. The right to privacy has indicated, through the Supreme Court, that *Roe v. Wade*, the right to choose, is the law.

Yes, the First Amendment gives the freedom of religion, but our gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has indicated that the District of Columbia clarified that this law does not violate and will not force someone to go against their political views or their religious views.

Why are we here tonight when this resolution that the District of Columbia passed simply prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions, protects the reproductive health decisions of the spouses and dependents, and prohibits an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control?

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

Ms. NORTON. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady.

So, in essence, Madam Speaker, this resolution is not in order.

If I might make another analogy, what is not given to the Federal Government is left to the States in the Tenth Amendment. I know that D.C. is not a State, but what I would say is that this law has been clarified in the District of Columbia. We are intruding. The rights are protected under the Ninth Amendment, and this resolution is out of order. I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition of H.J. Res. 43 disapproving the District of Columbia government's approval of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act also known as RHNDA.

As I have before, I maintain that the right of a woman to privacy must remain sacrosanct because the well being and protection of women is the nucleus of a healthy America and a healthy world.

Indeed, in most parts of our country, the woman is the constant that keeps all the variables of family together, organized and on track.

Thus, for three key reasons I oppose H.J. Res. 43.

First, it is in derogation of DC's local autonomy, an autonomy that we enjoy in our respective states, pursuant to the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

In relevant part, the Tenth Amendment states that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I find it ironic, as duly elected officials that some of us seek to trample upon the rights that we enjoy vis a vis the separation of the federal and state powers, as delineated in our Constitution.

To add insult to injury, some of us are even able to look the congressional representative from Washington, DC in the eye, while we take adverse decisions that affect the livelihood of her constituents.

Second, the District of Columbia government's action does good without infringing on the First Amendment and religious freedoms of American citizens.

Third, this recent iteration of the war on the rights of women underscores our misplaced priorities where we have numerous pressing issues.

Among others, we continue to have unemployment, national security concerns with the continued proliferation of terrorist organizations across the globe.

We continue to grapple with how we need to work in a bipartisan manner on the issues of education, healthcare and infrastructure building to protect children, our elderly, veterans and other groups.

Our focus ought to be on bettering the quality of life for everyday American people.

Let us zoom in on one of what should be our major priority areas: jobs.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that over 8 million Americans are unemployed.

Specifically, among the major worker groups affected by the current unemployment rates

are adult men who account for 5.1 percent, adult women who account for 4.9 percent and teenagers who account for 17.5 percent.

Whites make up 4.7 percent, African Americans 10.1 percent, Asians 3.2 percent and Hispanics make up 6.8 percent.

Should we really be focusing our attention on a measure that blocks the District of Columbia's effort to make laws that protects the privacy rights of women and their spouses when we have more pressing priorities?

But back to H.J. Res. 43.

What does this legislation do to undermine DC's autonomy, attack women's rights and waste precious tax payer resources?

H.J. Res. 43 seeks to undermine an underlying Bill: the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act considered, voted upon by the duly elected officials of the District of Columbia and signed into law by Mayor Muriel Bowser of Washington, DC in January of this year.

The underlying bill signed into law in Washington, DC would do the following:

Prohibit employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions.

Protect the reproductive health decisions of spouses and dependents.

Prohibit an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control.

Contrary to assertions by my colleagues across the aisle, let us look at what RHND A does not do:

First, it does not impose any new requirements on employers to provide health insurance coverage;

In fact, the D.C. Council considered this issue and clarified that RHND A's protections do not reach insurance coverage by passing a temporary clarification;

Second, the RHND A does not infringe on First Amendment rights;

Indeed, the RHND A does not impact an organization or church's ability to make hiring decisions based on religious or political views.

Opponents may claim that the bill might require churches or religious organizations to hire pro-choice candidates.

This can hold no water because it is simply not within the scope of RHND A.

The RHND A strikes the balance of protecting personal decisions a woman makes regarding her reproductive health while not overreaching related to personal religious beliefs as it relates to a woman's reproductive health.

In my view, H.J. Res. 43 is another jab at the voice of women, their rights to self-determination and reproductive freedoms articulated in our nation's highest court's ruling in *Griswold v. Connecticut* and *Roe v. Wade*.

My friends, this week, 100 years ago, over 1000 women activists congregated at the Hague to ask for peace, protesting World War I and asserted their right to self-determination.

Dr. Aletta Jacobs, Jane Addams and sociologist Emily G. Balch were some of the champions of women's rights a century ago at the Hague.

Similar to their counterparts a century ago, today, in our era, we are blessed with women who are champions of a woman's right to self-determination and privacy.

Wendy Davis, Sandra Fluke and Lilly Ledbetter, just to name a few.

Notwithstanding the sacrifices made by all these women of courage, women and girls continue to be at the mercy of people who fail

to try to show empathy towards their mothers, their sisters, their daughters, and loved ones.

Take for example the case of Emily Herx, a married woman who was terminated for using in vitro to become pregnant.

With her husband by her side, fortunately she was awarded a \$1.9 million judgment against her employer.

Then there's the case of Jennifer Maudlin, a single unmarried mother working to support her children, who worked for an employer hostile towards unmarried women who became pregnant.

Maudlin was terminated as well, but was able to enter a settlement with her employer after she fought her illegal termination.

Then there is the case of Apryl Kellam, who was threatened with termination for being a single mother.

And the stories go on and on.

Clearly, as these real life stories reflect, H.J. Res. 43 affects all: significant others, spouses and daughters.

If passed, Republicans seek to empower employers to fire a woman because she has an abortion after experiencing the violent act of rape.

That is immoral.

Republicans seek to empower employers to demote a woman or pay her less if she chooses to take birth control pills.

That is unfair.

Indeed, Republicans seek to empower employers to fire a male worker because he uses condoms and because his wife uses birth control pills.

That makes no sense.

Republicans seek to empower employers to terminate a male employee because his teenage daughter becomes pregnant out of wedlock.

That is irrational.

In other words, Madam Speaker, H.J. Res. 43 is immoral, unfair and irrational.

It is also in derogation of women's privacy rights, violative of family rights and economic empowerment issues affecting the livelihood of millions of families across our nation.

Thus, I stand in solidarity with my colleagues in opposing this Bill.

I also stand in solidarity with the Administration which has urged Congress in this Statement of Administration Policy to adopt the President's FY 2016 Budget proposal allowing the District to enact local laws and spend local funds in the same way as other cities and States.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose H.J. Res. 43.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), who is a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today and want to reach out to my colleague, the Delegate from D.C. to, one, say that I appreciate the tone and tenor of this debate. I have great respect for her and, actually, during this debate have grown to admire her even more.

I would like to point out, however, that much of what has been talked about tonight about there being clarity is simply not the case, Madam Speaker.

□ 2230

We do know that, if we just broaden the ministerial exception, where we can look for items of conscience and make sure that those fundamental rights are protected, Madam Speaker, that this particular legislation would indeed do exactly what the Delegate from D.C. has said that it would do.

I stand here tonight to offer, again, my willingness to work with not only the Delegate from D.C., but the Mayor and the city council, to hopefully provide that clarifying language.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

May I say how much I appreciate that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MEADOWS, made every effort to try to find some accommodation with the District of Columbia. I certainly appreciated that so much.

We were, unfortunately, unable to do so because the exemption he sought would have swallowed the equal employment laws. There would have been nothing left to them, but he tried very hard, and I appreciate the spirit in which he has acted as our subcommittee chair.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 43.

This resolution would express Congress' disapproval of the District of Columbia's legislation that would protect employees from discrimination based on their reproductive health decisions.

Just last month, the States of Indiana and Arkansas attempted to pass so-called "religious freedom" bills that are really an attempt to permit discrimination.

Tonight, we are debating a resolution that would allow employers to fire or refuse to hire workers because of their private reproductive medical decisions, notwithstanding the protection provided to the employees by the District of Columbia.

Madam Speaker, in 1993, when Congress passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, better known as RFRA, it did so with the intent to expand protections for religious exercise; but since then, we have seen attempts by Congress and some States to use so-called "religious liberty" or "religious freedom" measures to undermine otherwise valid protections against discrimination provided in the Civil Rights Act.

This resolution would allow claims of a "sincerely held religious belief" to justify otherwise illegal discrimination. The reasoning in this resolution would also undermine all civil rights laws because anyone could claim a sincerely held religious belief to justify discrimination based on anything—race, religion, or any other protected class.

The District of Columbia got it right. This law protects Washington, D.C.,

citizens from invidious discrimination based on reproductive health decisions. We should not overrule this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.J. Res. 43.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, which will stop the so-called Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This bill, passed by the D.C. City Council, discriminates against religious and pro-life advocacy groups in the District of Columbia.

The D.C. government forces employers to provide abortion coverage for their employees. This law represents a flagrant disregard for the conscience rights of all D.C. employers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow Members of the House to vote “yes” on this important resolution of disapproval.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to disapprove the action of the D.C. Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, which I believe clearly violates the constitutional freedoms of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

This is not just about the citizens of one city. It is about protecting the freedoms and liberties enshrined in our Constitution for all Americans. This is about making sure the government does not force employers with deeply held religious beliefs and values to act against their conscience.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTEMBER).

Mr. PITTEMBER. I thank Mrs. BLACK for her leadership.

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

Madam Speaker, will we dare vote tonight to uphold the free exercise of religion? Will we dare vote tonight to ensure that no church or religious institution in the District of Columbia is forced to violate their beliefs and convictions?

Yes, we have a solemn obligation to support our constitutional commitment to religious liberty, so I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 43, the disapproval resolution to block the D.C. Council’s disregard of fundamental constitutional rights.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, the question tonight is clearly the evisceration of the U.S. Constitution by the District of Columbia.

Don’t take my word for it. Even the former Mayor of D.C., who agrees ideologically with the D.C. Council, warned his colleagues that the D.C. bill was “legally insufficient,” “legally problematic,” and “raises concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.”

RHND discriminates against mission-driven organizations located in the Nation’s Capital, impinging on the freedom of association and religion for advocacy groups, particularly religious and pro-life affiliates, our neighbors right here in the District of Columbia.

I ask we vote “yes.”

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. This resolution represents tyranny on two levels: the tyranny the Framers most feared, by the Federal Government interfering with local government; and the tyranny Americans especially fear today, interference with the most private decision they make, the decision concerning their reproductive health.

Vote “no.” Stop this tyranny in the District of Columbia before it spreads throughout the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the robust debates that we have had here today on this important issue.

As I close, I would like to remind everyone, Madam Speaker, that this is legislation that has constitutional problems. We have said this over and over again since its inception, and the constitutional problems have been recognized by both the Democrats and the Republicans.

There has been a lot of conversation tonight about what this bill does and does not do. This resolution is about allowing religious and political organizations to hire employees who agree with their core mission as protected by the First Amendment.

It is imperative that this body adopt this resolution of disapproval to ensure the protections granted to each and

every American by the First Amendment of our Constitution.

As a matter of fact, folks tried to say what this resolution would do. It is a very simple resolution. It is a 1-page resolution. It has a few sentences to it, and I would like to just read those sentences. It is “disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.” That is simply what it does.

We have the constitutional authority to give an up-or-down vote. We are not amending. If this resolution of disapproval is adopted by this body, it simply will put back into place what is already law in the District of Columbia. It will not be taking away any rights.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, which would disapprove of the D.C. Council’s passage of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This resolution infringes on the reproductive rights of American citizens.

It allows employers to discriminate against employees based on their personal health decisions.

And it tramples on the rights of the people of the District of Columbia to govern themselves.

In January, the Mayor of the District of Columbia signed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This Act was passed by the District’s elected representatives on the D.C. Council.

The Act prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions.

It also protects the reproductive health decisions of their spouses and their dependents.

By passing this resolution, congressional Republicans are impinging on the rights of women in the District of Columbia to make their own reproductive health decisions without fear that their bosses will punish them.

This resolution would permit an employer to fire a woman because she has an abortion after being raped.

It would allow an employer to demote a woman—or pay her less—if she chooses to take birth control pills.

This resolution would not affect only the rights of women.

It would allow an employer to fire a male worker because he uses condoms, because his wife uses the pill, or because his teenage daughter becomes pregnant out of wedlock.

As I told my colleagues in the Oversight Committee when we marked up this resolution, this is the same Committee that brought the world Sandra Fluke.

She wanted to come before the House Oversight Committee to testify about contraceptives on February 16, 2012.

But she was not allowed to speak. She was deemed “unqualified.”

Today, this is exactly what House Republicans are doing to the people of the District of Columbia.

They want a voice in their own governance. They expressed their will. And their elected officials passed a law protecting their rights.

But now, House Republicans are trying to silence the voters of the District of Columbia, just as they tried to silence Sandra Fluke.

This approach will backfire, just as it did with Sandra Fluke.

She gave a voice to millions of women across the country, and she was heard far and wide.

The simple fact is that, regardless of what House Republicans do here today, this resolution has no chance of becoming law.

We all know this is nothing more than a symbolic gesture. But it reveals very clearly what Republicans stand for.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it is simply shocking that in this day and age employees are still being discriminated against because of their reproductive health choices, such as whether or not to use birth control, undergo in vitro fertilization to get pregnant, or for having sex without being married.

The Council of the District of Columbia recently passed a law protecting D.C. women and families from such discrimination, making it clear that they cannot be penalized or retaliated against because of the employee's personal reproductive health care choices. The District of Columbia Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act takes a stand and makes a statement that this sort of discrimination will not be tolerated in the District of Columbia.

The House Majority wants to overturn the D.C. Council's law. H.J. Res. 43 is not only a slap in the face of the women of D.C. but also to their families. It affects whether people can choose to wait to have children, have children at all, and when they can or cannot have sex. Frankly, it's none of our business. Is there anything more private than someone's child-bearing decisions? Than who to get intimate with? In a country that will spend \$166 million on the movie *50 Shades of Grey*, the Republican Majority thinks imposing their own Puritanical ideology and theology on District residents is acceptable?

House Republicans constantly argue for limiting the power of the federal government and to respect the rights of the state and local governments. However, once again, they feel it is necessary to usurp the decision that the D.C. government unanimously voted on for its own citizens. Do unto others but don't do unto me. That is about as hypocritical as you can get.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject H.J. Res. 43 and to support D.C.'s local government and the women of D.C. to make their own reproductive choices.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose the Republican Majority's unilateral, and rather extraordinary, effort to undermine democracy in the District of Columbia.

A majority that claims to oppose big government and fancies itself as the champion of

State and local rights; astonishingly finds itself on the precipice of wielding the Federal Government's power to overturn the decision of a local government solely because it can. Not because it should; but because it can.

Never mind that the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act was appropriately considered, passed, and enacted by the duly elected representatives of the District of Columbia. The majority has decided that democratic principles take a back seat to pleasing its anti-reproductive rights base.

Make no mistake; this disgraceful vote represents a strike against the right to self-governance. It is an affront to D.C. home rule and a regrettable regression by the majority to a previous era, when Republicans of the 1990's abused congressional power to advance intrusive, anti-democratic legislation that meddled in the District's local affairs. Indeed, this resolution is emblematic of efforts by certain segments of the conservative movement that intended or not, would actually have the effect of enshrining bigotry into our laws in the name of fighting it.

Let us have no illusions about what the majority seeks to do this evening. In making a mockery of the D.C. Home Rule Act, the majority is seeking to repeal a local government statute that prohibits discrimination on the basis of reproductive health decisions and protects its citizens against prejudice in the workplace.

This law has absolutely nothing to do with health insurance coverage. As the Chairman of the D.C. Council stated in a letter to Congress, “The purpose and intent of this bill is to prevent an employer, through our Human Rights Act, from firing an employee for that employee's personal decision regarding his or her reproductive health.”

In closing, it is true that the United States Constitution grants the Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the affairs of the District of Columbia. Yet, just because we can does not mean we should.

I implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who loudly proclaim to be the part of limited government, to recognize that Congress should always strive to treat the District of Columbia like any other State, and respect the rights of all Americans to exercise democratic self-governance.

I urge all my colleagues to strongly oppose this anti-democratic resolution.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 43 to overturn the D.C. Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

To be clear, this Resolution is not about protecting freedom of religion and beliefs. No, House Joint Resolution 43 is about allowing discrimination.

Despite misleading rhetoric, this Resolution would allow an employer to discriminate against an employee based on the employee's personal health care decisions—decisions which have nothing to do with the employer.

Everyone should have the ability to make private health decisions including whether, when, and how to start a family, without fear of losing their jobs or facing retribution from employers.

The D.C. Council understands this and, by passing the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act, seeks to ensure fair and necessary employment protections for the people of the District of Columbia.

The Council deserves our respect when protecting the rights of their constituents . . . the people who elected them. The oversight of this body should not extend to overturning legislation passed by democratically-elected representatives of the people of D.C.

The freedom of religion is a fundamental freedom established by our founding fathers that we should fiercely protect, but to suggest that it extends to employers imposing their beliefs on the people that work for them, as this Resolution does, is just plain WRONG, particularly when it comes to something as personal as reproductive health.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 43, Disapproving the Action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. While this resolution is certainly an abuse of Congress' authority over the District of Columbia, it more importantly undermines the right of a woman to make personal, private healthcare decisions.

The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014 (RHNDNA) was passed by the D.C. Council in order to protect employees and their families from discrimination. RHNDNA ensures that an employee cannot be terminated based on personal reproductive healthcare decisions. For instance, the use of birth control, the decision of when to start a family, or the use of in vitro fertilization are not grounds for termination in the District of Columbia.

The RHNDNA does not impose any new requirements on employers to provide health insurance coverage or to pay for any reproductive or abortion services nor does it discriminate against pro-life organizations. The RHNDNA actually clarifies that every employee in D.C. is able to follow their own moral or religious beliefs, including when and how to start a family, without fear of facing consequences at work.

Religious liberty is of the utmost importance and the RHNDNA respects religious and moral decision-making without impacting anyone outside of the person making their own decisions. We must allow religious liberty to also mean allowing people to work in an environment that respects their dignity and private life and is free from discrimination.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.J. Res. 43 because it not only infringes upon the personal decision-making of an individual, it also blatantly disregards D.C.'s local laws.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 43, a joint resolution of Congress, which is needed to protect the conscience rights of pro-life employers that operate in the District of Columbia. Under DC's home rule law, Congress has a time period in which to review DC-passed legislation.

In January, DC Mayor Bowser signed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act (RHNDNA). This measure would, in part, ban employers from making personnel decisions based on an individual's decisions relating to abortion and other reproductive health issues.

RHNDNA would have the force of law and specifically discriminate against pro-life employers by potentially forcing them to hire and retain individuals who advocate for policies that run counter to the employer's mission.

Pro-life organizations, including those who exist to advance pro-life policies, should not be forced by the DC government to hire individuals who hold and advocate for positions

that run counter to the core values of that organization. Christian schools and pro-life organizations should not be required to cover “re-productive health decisions” in their health care plans that are counter to their core pro-life convictions.

This DC law amounts to coercion and should have no place in the nation’s capital, or any jurisdiction for that matter. This is a step too far and H.J. Res. 43 restores these fundamental conscience rights.

I rise in strong support of this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (KS)
Aderholt	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Amodei	Ellmers (NC)	Jones
Babin	Emmer (MN)	Jordan
Barletta	Farenthold	Joyce
Barr	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Barton	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Benishek	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Fleming	Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (MI)	Flores	Kline
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Knight
Black	Fortenberry	Labrador
Blackburn	Fox	LaMalfa
Blum	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Bost	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Boustany	Garrett	Latta
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Lipinski
Brat	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	Long
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Loudermilk
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Love
Buchanan	Granger	Lucas
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Graves (LA)	Lummis
Byrne	Graves (MO)	MacArthur
Calvert	Griffith	Marchant
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Marino
Carter (TX)	Guinta	Massie
Chabot	Guthrie	McCarthy
Chaffetz	Hardy	McCaul
Clawson (FL)	Harper	McClintock
Cole	Harris	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	McKinley
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Comstock	Hensarling	Rodgers
Conaway	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows
Cook	Hill	Messer
Cramer	Holding	Mica
Crawford	Hudson	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Moolenaar
Culberson	Hultgren	Mooney (WV)
Davis, Rodney	Hunter	Mullin
Denham	Hurd (TX)	Mulvaney
DeSantis	Hurt (VA)	Murphy (PA)
DesJarlais	Issa	Neugebauer

Newhouse	Rooney (FL)	Tipton
Noem	Ros-Lehtinen	Trott
Nugent	Roskam	Turner
Nunes	Ross	Upton
Olson	Rothfus	Valadao
Palazzo	Rouzer	Walberg
Palmer	Royce	Walden
Paulsen	Russell	Walker
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Walorski
Perry	Salmon	Walters, Mimi
Peterson	Sanford	Weber (TX)
Pittenger	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Pitts	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Posey	Sessions	Whitfield
Price, Tom	Shimkus	Williams
Ratcliffe	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Simpson	Wittman
Renacci	Smith (MO)	Womack
Ribble	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Rigell	Smith (TX)	Yoho
Roby	Stewart	Young (AK)
Roe (TN)	Stivers	Young (IA)
Rogers (AL)	Stutzman	Zeldin
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)	Zinke
Rohrabacher	Thornberry	
Rokita	Tiberi	

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—11

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Poliquin	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Hinojosa	Wagner	Young (IN)

□ 2308

Mr. BARLETTA changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 2028.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2310

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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 57, line 11.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. RUIZ of California.

Amendment by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 295, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—126

Allen	Guthrie	Pitts
Amash	Harris	Poe (TX)
Babin	Hartzler	Poliquin
Benishkek	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Black	Holding	Price, Tom
Blackburn	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rokita
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (GA)	Issa	Roskam
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Royce
Coffman	Jordan	Russell
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Knight	Salmon
Cook	Labrador	Sanford
Cramer	LaMalfa	Scalise
Culberson	Lance	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Long	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Sessions
Duffy	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	McCauley	Smith (TX)
Emmer (MN)	McClintock	Stutzman
Farenthold	McHenry	Thornberry
Fleming	Meadows	Walberg
Flores	Messer	Walker
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gosar	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Gowdy	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Nugent	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Olson	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Palmer	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Paulsen	Yoho
Grothman	Perry	Zinke

NOES—295

Abraham	Brown (FL)	Collins (NY)
Adams	Brownley (CA)	Comstock
Aderholt	Buchanan	Connolly
Aguilar	Bucshon	Conyers
Amodei	Bustos	Cooper
Ashford	Butterfield	Costa
Barletta	Byrne	Costello (PA)
Barr	Calvert	Courtney
Barton	Capps	Crawford
Bass	Capuano	Crenshaw
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crowley
Becerra	Carney	Cuellar
Bera	Carson (IN)	Curbelo (FL)
Beyer	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	DeFazio
Blum	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Blumenauer	Cicilline	Delaney
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bost	Clarke (NY)	DeBene
Boustany	Clay	Denham
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	Dent
F.	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Deutch
Brooks (IN)	Cole	Diaz-Balart

Dingell	Langevin	Rice (NY)
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Dold	Larson (CT)	Rigell
Doyle, Michael	Latta	Roby
F.	Lawrence	Roe (TN)
Duckworth	Lee	Rogers (AL)
Edwards	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Ellison	Lieu, Ted	Ros-Lehtinen
Ellmers (NC)	Lipinski	Rothfus
Engel	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Eshoo	Loeback	Ruiz
Esty	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Farr	Love	Rush
Fattah	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Fincher	Lowe	Sanchez, Linda
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	T.
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Sanchez, Loretta
Fortenberry	Lujan Grisham	Sarbanes
Foster	(NM)	Schakowsky
Fox	Luján, Ben Ray	Schiff
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Schrader
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Schweikert
Fudge	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	MacArthur	Scott, David
Gallego	Maloney,	Serrano
Garamendi	Carolyn	Sewell (AL)
Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Gibson	Marino	Shimkus
Goodlatte	Matsui	Shuster
Graham	McCarthy	Simpson
Grayson	McCollum	Sinema
Green, Al	McDermott	Sires
Green, Gene	McGovern	Slaughter
Griffith	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Grijalva	McMorris	Speier
Guinta	Rodgers	Stefanik
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Stewart
Hahn	McSally	Stivers
Hanna	Meehan	Swalwell (CA)
Hardy	Meeks	Takai
Harper	Meng	Takano
Hastings	Moolenaar	Thompson (CA)
Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Moore	Thompson (PA)
Higgins	Moulton	Tiberi
Hill	Mullin	Tipton
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Tonko
Hoyer	Nadler	Torres
Huffman	Napolitano	Trott
Hurd (TX)	Neal	Tsongas
Israel	Newhouse	Turner
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Upton
Jeffries	Norcross	Valadao
Jenkins (WV)	Nunes	Van Hollen
Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke	Vargas
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vela
Jolly	Pascrell	Velázquez
Joyce	Payne	Visclosky
Kaptur	Pearce	Walden
Katko	Pelosi	Walz
Keating	Perlmutter	Waters, Maxine
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Watson Coleman
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Welch
Kennedy	Pingree	Wenstrup
Kildee	Pittenger	Westerman
Kilmer	Pocan	Whitfield
Kind	Polis	Williams
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley	Womack
Kirkpatrick	Rangel	Young (AK)
Kline	Reed	Young (IA)
Kuster	Reichert	Zeldin
Lamborn	Renacci	

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2314

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ

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

poned and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 249, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—172

Adams	Fudge	Neal
Aguilar	Gabbard	Nolan
Amash	Gallego	Norcross
Bass	Gibson	O'Rourke
Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Bera	Guinta	Pelosi
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pingree
Bonamici	Heck (NV)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Polis
F.	Higgins	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Himes	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Honda	Ribble
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Huffman	Richmond
Butterfield	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jackson Lee	Royce
Capuano	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Carson (IN)	Jones	Sanchez, Linda
Cartwright	Keating	T.
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sanford
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Schrader
Clay	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Lawrence	Scott, David
Clyburn	Lee	Serrano
Cohen	Levin	Sherman
Connolly	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Conyers	Lipinski	Sires
Cooper	Loeback	Slaughter
Costa	Lofgren	Speier
Courtney	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Crowley	Lowe	Takai
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	(NM)	Titus
Delaney	Lynch	Tonko
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Torres
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Tsongas
Deutch	McCollum	Van Hollen
Doggett	McDermott	Vargas
Duckworth	McGovern	Veasey
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Walters, Mimi
Engel	Meng	Walz
Eshoo	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Farr	Mulvaney	Welch
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Nadler	Yoho
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	

NOES—249

Abraham	Boustany	Cole
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Allen	Brat	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Bridenstine	Comstock
Ashford	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Barletta	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Barr	Bucshon	Cramer
Barton	Burgess	Crawford
Benishkek	Byrne	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cuellar
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Black	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chaffetz	DeLauro
Blum	Clawson (FL)	Denham
Bost	Coffman	Dent

DeSantis King (IA)
DesJarlais King (NY)
Diaz-Balart Kinzinger (IL)
Dingell Kirkpatrick
Dold Kline
Doyle, Michael F. Knight
Duffy Labrador
Duncan (SC) LaMalfa
Duncan (TN) Lamborn
Ellmers (NC) Lance
Emmer (MN) Larsen (WA)
Farenthold Larson (CT)
Fincher Latta
Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
Fleischmann Long
Fleming Loudermilk
Flores Love
Forbes Lucas
Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
Foxy Lummis
Franks (AZ) MacArthur
Frelinghuysen Maloney, Carolyn
Garamendi Marchant
Garrett Marino
Gibbs Massie
Gohmert McCarthy
Goodlatte McCaul
Gosar McClintock
Gowdy McHenry
Graham McKinley
Granger McMorris
Graves (GA) Rodgers
Graves (LA) McSally
Graves (MO) Meadows
Green, Al Meehan
Green, Gene Messer
Griffith Mica
Grothman Miller (FL)
Guthrie Miller (MI)
Hanna Moolenaar
Hardy Mooney (WV)
Harper Mullin
Harris Murphy (PA)
Hartzler Neugebauer
Hensarling Newhouse
Hice, Jody B. Noem
Hill Nugent
Holding Nunes
Hudson Olson
Huelskamp Palazzo
Huizenga (MI) Palmer
Hultgren Pascarell
Hunter Paulsen
Hurd (TX) Pearce
Hurt (VA) Perry
Issa Peterson
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger
Jenkins (WV) Pitts
Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)
Johnson, Sam Poliquin
Jolly Pompeo
Jordan Posey
Joyce Price (NC)
Kaptur Price, Tom
Katko Ratcliffe
Kelly (PA) Reed

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
Cummings Smith (WA)
Herrera Beutler Wagner
Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2317

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 244, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—177

Abraham Harper
Aderholt Harris
Allen Hartzer
Amodei Hensarling
Babin Hice, Jody B.
Barletta Holding
Barr Hudson
Barton Huelskamp
Benishek Rigell
Bilirakis Hultgren
Bishop (MI) Hunter
Bishop (UT) Hurd (TX)
Black Hurt (VA)
Blackburn Issa
Bost Jenkins (WV)
Boustany Johnson (OH)
Brat Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger

Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Zinke

NOES—244

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos

Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
Cummings Smith (WA)
Herrera Beutler Wagner
Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2320

Mr. AMODEI changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—173

Adams	Garamendi	Neal
Aguiar	Gibson	Nolan
Bass	Grayson	Norcross
Beatty	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bera	Hahn	Pascarell
Beyer	Hastings	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Peters
F.	Honda	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brat	Huffman	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Price (NC)
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rangel
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Reichert
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cardenas	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Kaptur	Royce
Carson (IN)	Katko	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kildee	T.
Ciциlline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kind	Sanford
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clay	Kuster	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Langevin	Schiff
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Connolly	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee	Scott, David
Cooper	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sires
Davis, Danny	Loftgren	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Speier
DeGette	Lowe y	Stewart
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Swallwell (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Takai
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Deutch	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Titus
Doggett	Maloney,	Tonko
Duckworth	Carolyn	Torres
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Ellison	Matsui	Van Hollen
Engel	McCollum	Vargas
Eshoo	McDermott	Veasey
Esty	McGovern	Velázquez
Farr	McNerney	Visclosky
Fattah	Meeks	Walz
Fortenberry	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moore	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	Yoho
Gallego	Napolitano	

NOES—248

Abraham	Brown (FL)	Cuellar
Aderholt	Buchanan	Culberson
Allen	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Amash	Burgess	Davis, Rodney
Amodei	Byrne	Delaney
Ashford	Calvert	Denham
Babin	Carter (GA)	Dent
Barletta	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Barr	Chabot	DesJarlais
Barton	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Bishop (GA)	Coffman	F.
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Black	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Comstock	Elmers (NC)
Blum	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Bost	Cook	Farenthold
Boustany	Costa	Fincher
Brady (TX)	Costello (PA)	Fitzpatrick
Bridenstine	Cramer	Fleischmann
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Fleming
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Flores

Forbes	Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)
Fox	Love	Ros-Lehtinen
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Roskam
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Ross
Garrett	Lummis	Rothfus
Gibbs	MacArthur	Rouzer
Gohmert	Marchant	Russell
Goodlatte	Marino	Ryan (OH)
Gosar	Massie	Ryan (WI)
Gowdy	McCarthy	Salmon
Graham	McCaul	Scalise
Granger	McClintock	Schweikert
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Scott, Austin
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Sessions
Green, Al	Rodgers	Shimkus
Green, Gene	McSally	Shuster
Griffith	Meadows	Simpson
Grothman	Meehan	Sinema
Guinta	Messer	Smith (MO)
Guthrie	Mica	Smith (NE)
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hardy	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Harper	Moolenaar	Stefanik
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Hartzler	Mullin	Stivers
Heck (NV)	Mulvaney	Stutzman
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (MS)
Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)
Hill	Newhouse	Thornberry
Holding	Noem	Tiberi
Hudson	Nugent	Tipton
Huelskamp	Nunes	Troott
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Turner
Hultgren	Palazzo	Upton
Hunter	Palmer	Valadao
Hurd (TX)	Paulsen	Vela
Hurt (VA)	Pearce	Walberg
Issa	Perry	Walden
Jenkins (KS)	Peterson	Walker
Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Walorski
Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Walters, Mimi
Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Jolly	Poliquin	Webster (FL)
Jordan	Pompeo	Wenstrup
Joyce	Posey	Westerman
Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom	Westmoreland
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Whitfield
King (NY)	Reed	Williams
Kinzie (IL)	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Kline	Ribble	Wittman
Knight	Rice (SC)	Womack
Labrador	Richmond	Woodall
LaMalfa	Rigell	Yoder
Lamborn	Roby	Young (AK)
Lance	Roe (TN)	Young (IA)
Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Zinke
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	
Long	Rokita	

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2324

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 282, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—139

Aderholt	Grothman	Perry
Allen	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amash	Hardy	Pitts
Babin	Harris	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hartzler	Poliquin
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Black	Holding	Price, Tom
Blackburn	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Byrne	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Chaffetz	Jones	Ross
Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	Knight	Rouzer
Conaway	Labrador	Royce
Cook	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Lamborn	Salmon
Crenshaw	Long	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Scalise
DeSantis	Love	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Duffy	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	McClintock
Farenthold	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Fincher	McMorris	Stutzman
Fleming	Rodgers	Thornberry
Flores	Meadows	Walberg
Forbes	Messer	Walker
Fox	Mica	Walorski
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gosar	Neugebauer	Williams
Gowdy	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Olson	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Palmer	Yoder
		Yoho

NOES—282

Abraham	Clarke (NY)	Engel
Adams	Clay	Eshoo
Aguiar	Cleaver	Esty
Amodei	Clyburn	Farr
Ashford	Coffman	Fattah
Barletta	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Cole	Fleischmann
Bass	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Beatty	Comstock	Foster
Becerra	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Benishek	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Bera	Cooper	Fudge
Beyer	Costa	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Gallego
Bishop (MI)	Courtney	Garamendi
Blum	Crawford	Gibson
Blumenauer	Crowley	Graham
Bonamici	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Grayson
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Boyle, Brendan	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
F.	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Brooks (IN)	DeGette	Guinta
Brown (FL)	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA)	DeLauro	Hahn
Buchanan	DelBene	Hanna
Bucshon	Denham	Harper
Bustos	Dent	Hastings
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Capps	Diaz-Balart	Higgins
Capuano	Dingell	Hill
Cardenas	Doggett	Himes
Carney	Dold	Honda
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael	Hoyer
Cartwright	F.	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Israel
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Jeffries
Ciциlline	Elmers (NC)	Jenkins (WV)
Clark (MA)	Emmer (MN)	Johnson (GA)

Johnson (OH) Meehan
 Johnson, E. B. Meeks
 Jolly Meng
 Joyce Moolenaar
 Kaptur Moore
 Katko Moulton
 Keating Mullin
 Kelly (IL) Murphy (FL)
 Kelly (PA) Murphy (PA)
 Kennedy Nadler
 Kildee Napolitano
 Kilmer Neal
 Kind Newhouse
 King (IA) Noem
 King (NY) Nolan
 Kinzinger (IL) Norcross
 Kirkpatrick Nugent
 Kline O'Rourke
 Kuster Pallone
 Lance Pascrell
 Langevin Paulsen
 Larsen (WA) Payne
 Larson (CT) Pearce
 Latta Pelosi
 Lawrence Perlmutter
 Lee Peters
 Levin Peterson
 Lieu, Ted Pingree
 Lipinski Pocan
 LoBiondo Polis
 Loeb sack Price (NC)
 Lofgren Quigley
 Lowenthal Rangel
 Lowey Reed
 Lucas Reichert
 Luetkemeyer Renacci
 Lujan Grisham Rice (NY)
 (NM) Richmond
 Lujan, Ben Ray Roby
 (NM) Ros-Lehtinen
 Lynch Roskam
 MacArthur Roybal-Allard
 Maloney, Carolyn Ruiz
 Maloney, Sean Ruppersberger
 Marino Rush
 Matsui Russell
 McCaul Ryan (OH)
 McCollum Sanchez, Linda
 McDermott T.
 McGovern Sanchez, Loretta
 McKinley Sarbanes
 McNerney Schakowsky
 McCally Schiff
 Schrader

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis Wasserman
 Cummings Smith (WA) Schultz
 Herrera Beutler Wagner Yarmuth
 Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2327

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 311, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]
 AYES—110
 Amash
 Babin
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Carter (GA)
 Stewart Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Collins (GA)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Culberson
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Grothman
 Harris
 Hensarling
 Hice, Jody B.
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Jenkins (KS)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 LaMalfa
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Messer
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Mulvaney
 Neugebauer
 Olson
 Palmer
 Perry
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Roe (TN)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ross
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Smith (MO)
 Stutzman
 Thornberry
 Walberg
 Weber (TX)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho

NOES—311

Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Courtney
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gibson
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Graham
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jolly
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Kuster
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo

Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Matsui
 McCaul
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNerney
 McCally
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mica
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pocan
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stivers
 Stewart
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Trott
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Walz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Westerman
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Womack
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis Wasserman
 Cummings Smith (WA) Schultz
 Herrera Beutler Wagner Yarmuth
 Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2330

Mr. PITTENGER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 246, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

AYES—175

Adams Grayson Napolitano
Amash Grijalva Nolan
Bass Grothman Norcross
Beatty Gutiérrez O'Rourke
Becerra Hahn Pallone
Bera Hastings Payne
Beyer Heck (WA) Pelosi
Blumenauer Higgins Peters
Bonamici Holding Pingree
Boyle, Brendan Honda Pitts
F. Hoyer Pocan
Brady (PA) Hudson Poliquin
Brat Huelskamp Polis
Bridenstine Huffman Pompeo
Brownley (CA) Huizenga (MI) Price, Tom
Burgess Israel Quigley
Capps Jackson Lee Rangel
Cárdenas Jeffries Ribble
Carney Johnson (GA) Rice (NY)
Carson (IN) Jones Rice (SC)
Cartwright Jordan Rohrabacher
Castor (FL) Kaptur Rokita
Chabot Keating Roybal-Allard
Chaffetz Kelly (IL) Royce
Chu, Judy Kennedy Ruiz
Cicilline Kilmer Rush
Clark (MA) Kind Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY) T.
Clay Kirkpatrick Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver Kuster Sanford
Cohen Labrador Sarbanes
Conyers Langevin Schakowsky
Crowley Lawrence Schiff
Davis (CA) Lee Schweikert
DeFazio Levin Scott (VA)
DeGette Lieu, Ted Scott, David
Delaney Loeb sack Sensenbrenner
DelBene Lofgren Serrano
DeSantis Love Sherman
DeSaulnier Lowenthal Sires
Deutch Lujan Grisham Slaught er
Dingell (NM) Speier
Doggett Stutzman
Edwards Lynch Swalwell (CA)
Ellison Maloney, Takai
Engel Carolyn Takano
Eshoo Massie Titus
Farr Matsui Tonko
Fattah McCollum Tsongas
Foxx McDermott Van Hollen
Frankel (FL) McGovern Vargas
Franks (AZ) Meadows Velázquez
Fudge Meeks Walz
Gabbard Meng Waters, Maxine
Gallego Miller (FL) Watson Coleman
Garamendi Moore Welch
Garrett Moulton Wenstrup
Gibson Mulvaney Woodall
Gohmert Murphy (FL) Yoho
Gowdy Nadler

NOES—246

Abraham Clawson (FL) Ellmers (NC)
Aderholt Clyburn Emmer (MN)
Aguilar Coffman Esty
Allen Cole Farenthold
Amodei Collins (GA) Fincher
Ashford Collins (NY) Fitzpatrick
Babin Comstock Fleischmann
Barletta Conaway Fleming
Barr Connolly Flores
Barton Cook Forbes
Benishek Cooper Fortenberry
Bilirakis Costa Foster
Bishop (GA) Costello (PA) Frelinghuysen
Bishop (MI) Courtney Gibbs
Bishop (UT) Cramer Goodlatte
Black Crawford Gosar
Blackburn Crenshaw Graham
Blum Cuellar Granger
Bost Culberson Graves (GA)
Boustany Curbelo (FL) Graves (LA)
Brady (TX) Davis, Danny Graves (MO)
Brooks (AL) Davis, Rodney Green, Al
Brooks (IN) DeLauro Green, Gene
Brown (FL) Denham Griffith
Buchanan Dent Guinta
Bucshon DesJarlais Guthrie
Bustos Diaz-Balart Hanna
Butterfield Dold Hardy
Byrne Doyle, Michael Harper
Calvert F. Harris
Capuano Duckworth Hartzler
Carter (GA) Duffy Heck (NV)
Carter (TX) Duncan (SC) Hensarling
Castro (TX) Duncan (TN) Hice, Jody B.

Hill Himes Meehan
Huntgren Messer Scott, Austin
Hunter Mica Sessions
Nolan Miller (MI) Sewell (AL)
Hurd (TX) Shimkus
Hurt (VA) Mooney (WV) Stuster
Issa Mullin Simpson
Jenkins (KS) Murphy (PA) Sinema
Jenkins (WV) Neal Smith (MO)
Johnson (OH) Neugebauer Smith (NE)
Johnson, E. B. Newhouse Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam Noem Smith (TX)
Jolly Nugent Stefanik
Joyce Nunes Stewart
Katko Olson Stivers
Kelly (PA) Palazzo Thompson (CA)
King (IA) Palmer Thompson (MS)
King (NY) Pascrell Thompson (PA)
Kinzinger (IL) Paulsen Thornberry
Kline Pearce Tiberi
Knight Perlmutter Tipton
LaMalfa Perry Torres
Lamborn Peterson Trott
Lance Pittenger Turner
Larsen (WA) Poe (TX) Upton
Larson (CT) Posey Valadao
Latta Price (NC) Veasey
Lipinski Ratcliffe Vela
LoBiondo Reed Visclosky
Long Reichert Walberg
Loudermilk Renacci Walden
Lucas Richmond Walker
Luetkemeyer Rigell Walorski
Lujan, Ben Ray Roby Walters, Mimi
(NM) Roe (TN) Weber (TX)
Lummis Rogers (AL) Webster (FL)
MacArthur Rogers (KY) Westerman
Maloney, Sean Rooney (FL) Westmoreland
Marchant Ros-Lehtinen Whitfield
Marino Roskam Williams
McCarthy Ross Wilson (FL)
McCaul Rothfus Wilson (SC)
McClintock Rouzer Wittman
McHenry Ruppertsberger Womack
McKinley Russell Yoder
McMorris Ryan (OH) Young (AK)
Rodgers Ryan (WI) Young (IA)
McNerney Salmon Zeldin
McSally Scalise Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis Wasserman
Cummings Smith (WA) Schultz
Herrera Beutler Wagner
Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2332

Mr. ASHFORD changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 219, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—202

Adams Foster Nadler
Aguilar Frankel (FL) Napolitano
Ashford Fudge Neal
Bass Gabbard Nolan
Beatty Gallego Norcross
Becerra Garamendi O'Rourke
Benishek Gibson Pallone
Bera Graham Pascrell
Beyer Grayson Payne
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene Pelosi
Blum Griffith Perlmutter
Blumenauer Grijalva Peters
Bonamici Gutiérrez Peterson
Boyle, Brendan Hahn Pingree
F. Harris Pocan
Brady (PA) Hastings Polis
Brooks (AL) Heck (NV) Posey
Brownley (CA) Heck (WA) Price (NC)
Bustos Higgins Quigley
Butterfield Himes Reichert
Capps Honda Rice (NY)
Capuano Huffman Richmond
Cárdenas Israel Roybal-Allard
Carney Jackson Lee Ruiz
Carson (IN) Jeffries Ruppertsberger
Cartwright Johnson (GA) Rush
Castor (FL) Jones Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX) Kaptur T.
Chu, Judy Katko Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline Keating Sarbanes
Clark (MA) Kelly (IL) Schakowsky
Clarke (NY) Kennedy Schiff
Clay Kildeer Schrader
Cleaver Kilmer Scott (VA)
Clyburn Kind Scott, David
Cohen Kirkpatrick Sensenbrenner
Connolly Kuster Serrano
Conyers Lance Sewell (AL)
Cooper Langevin Sherman
Costa Larsen (WA) Sinema
Costello (PA) Larson (CT) Sires
Courtney Lawrence Slaught er
Crowley Lee Speier
Cuellar Levin Stefanik
Curbelo (FL) Lieu, Ted Stivers
Davis (CA) Lipinski Stivers
Davis, Danny Loeb sack
DeFazio Lofgren Swalwell (CA)
DeGette Lowenthal Takai
Delaney Lujan Grisham Takano
DeLauro (NM) Thompson (CA)
DelBene Luján, Ben Ray Thompson (MS)
Denham Lynch Titus
Dent (NM) Torres
DeSaulnier Lynch Tsongas
Deutch MacArthur Van Hollen
Dingell Maloney, Varg as
Doggett Carolyn Veasey
Dold Maloney, Sean Vela
Doyle, Michael Matsui Velázquez
F. McCollum Visclosky
Duckworth McDermott Walz
Edwards McGovern Waters, Maxine
Ellison McNeerney Watson Coleman
Engel McSally Welch
Eshoo Meeks Wilson (FL)
Esty Meng Woodall
Farr Moore Yoho
Fattah Moulton Yoho
Fitzpatrick Murphy (FL) Zeldin

NOES—219

Abraham Byrne Duncan (TN)
Aderholt Calvert Ellmers (NC)
Allen Carter (GA) Emmer (MN)
Amash Carter (TX) Farenthold
Amodei Chabot Fincher
Babin Chaffetz Fleischmann
Barletta Clawson (FL) Fleming
Barr Coffman Flores
Barton Cole Forbes
Bilirakis Collins (GA) Fortenberry
Bishop (MI) Collins (NY) Foxx
Bishop (UT) Comstock Franks (AZ)
Black Conaway Frelinghuysen
Blackburn Cook Garrett
Blum Cramer Goodlatte
Bost Crenshaw Gosar
Boustany Crawford Gowdy
Brady (TX) Davis, Rodney Granger
Brat Brooks (IN) DesJarlais Graves (GA)
Bridenstine Brown (FL) Diaz-Balart Graves (LA)
Buchanan Buchanan Graves (MO)
Bucshon Duffy Green, Al
Burgess Duncan (SC)

Grothman	McClintock	Rothfus	Boyle, Brendan	Griffith	Nolan	Long	Pearce	Smith (MO)
Guinta	McHenry	Rouzer	F.	Grijalva	Norcross	Loudermilk	Perry	Smith (NE)
Guthrie	McKinley	Royce	Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke	Love	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Hanna	McMorris	Russell	Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Pallone	Lucas	Pittenger	Smith (TX)
Hardy	Rodgers	Ryan (OH)	Bustos	Hastings	Pascarell	Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Stefanik
Harper	Meadows	Ryan (WI)	Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Payne	Lujan Grisham	Poe (TX)	Stewart
Hartzler	Meehan	Salmon	Capps	Higgins	Pelosi	(NM)	Poliquin	Stivers
Hensarling	Messer	Sanford	Capuano	Himes	Perlmutter	Luján, Ben Ray	Pompeo	Stutzman
Hice, Jody B.	Mica	Schalise	Cárdenas	Honda	Peters	(NM)	Posey	Swalwell (CA)
Hill	Miller (FL)	Schweikert	Cicilline	Hoyer	Pingree	Lummi	Price, Tom	Thompson (MS)
Holding	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin	Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Pocan	MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)
Hoyer	Moolenaar	Sessions	Cartwright	Huffman	Polis	Maloney, Sean	Reed	Thornberry
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	Castor (FL)	Israel	Price (NC)	Marchant	Reichert	Tiberi
Huelskamp	Mullin	Shuster	Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Quigley	Marino	Renacci	Tipton
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Simpson	Cicilline	Jeffries	Rangel	McCarthy	Richmond	Tipton
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Ribble	McCauley	Rigell	Tonko
Hunter	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)	Clarke (NY)	Jones	Rice (NY)	McClintock	Roby	Trott
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)	Clay	Kaptur	Rice (SC)	McHenry	Roe (TN)	Turner
Hurt (VA)	Noem	Smith (TX)	Cleaver	Keating	Rohrabacher	McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Upton
Issa	Nugent	Stewart	Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard	McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Stutzman	Connolly	Kennedy	Royce	Rodgers	Rokita	Vela
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Thompson (PA)	Conyers	Kildee	Ruiz	McSally	Rooney (FL)	Walberg
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Thornberry	Cooper	Kilmer	Rush	Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Johnson, E. B.	Palmer	Tiberi	Crowley	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Meehan	Roskam	Walker
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Tipton	Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda	Messer	Ross	Walorski
Jolly	Pearce	Trott	Davis, Danny	Kuster	T.	Mica	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi
Jordan	Perry	Turner	Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta	Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
Joyce	Pittenger	Upton	DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sanford	Miller (MI)	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Valadao	DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes	Moolenaar	Russell	Wenstrup
King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Walberg	Delaney	Lawrence	Schakowsky	Mooney (WV)	Ryan (WI)	Westerman
King (NY)	Poliquin	Walden	DeLauro	Lee	Schiff	Moulton	Salmon	Westmoreland
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Walker	DeBene	Levin	Scott (VA)	Mullin	Scalise	Whitfield
Kline	Price, Tom	Walorski	DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David	Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Williams
Knight	Rangel	Walters, Mimi	Deutsch	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Labrador	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)	Dingell	Loebach	Serrano	Neugebauer	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
LaMalfa	Reed	Webster (FL)	Doggett	Lowenthal	Sires	Newhouse	Sessions	Wittman
Lamborn	Renacci	Wenstrup	Doyle, Michael	Lowe	Speier	Noem	Sewell (AL)	Womack
Latta	Ribble	Westerman	F.	Lynch	Takai	Nugent	Sherman	Woodall
LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Whitfield	Duckworth	Maloney,	Takano	Nunes	Shimkus	Yoder
Long	Rigell	Westmoreland	Duncan (TN)	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)	Olson	Shuster	Young (AK)
Loudermilk	Roby	Williams	Edwards	Massie	Titus	Palazzo	Simpson	Young (IA)
Love	Roe (TN)	Wittman	Ellison	Matsui	Torres	Palmer	Sinema	Zeldin
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Yoder	Engel	McCollum	Tsongas	Paulsen	Slaughter	Zinke
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)	Eshoo	McDermott	Van Hollen			
Lummi	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)	Esty	McGovern	Vargas			
Marchant	Rokita	Zinke	Farr	McNerney	Veasey			
Marino	Rooney (FL)		Fattah	Meeks	Velázquez			
Massie	Ros-Lehtinen		Foster	Meng	Visclosky			
McCarthy	Roskam		Frankel (FL)	Moore	Walz			
McCauley	Ross		Fudge	Mulvaney	Waters, Maxine			
			Gallego	Nadler	Watson Coleman			
			Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch			
			Grayson	Neal	Yoho			

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2335

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 257, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—164

Adams	Beatty	Beyer
Amash	Becerra	Blumenauer
Bass	Bera	Bonamici

NOES—257

Abraham	Cook	Green, Al
Aderholt	Costa	Green, Gene
Aguilar	Costello (PA)	Grothman
Allen	Courtney	Guinta
Amodei	Cramer	Guthrie
Ashford	Crawford	Hanna
Babin	Crenshaw	Hardy
Barletta	Cuellar	Harper
Barr	Culberson	Harris
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Benish	Denham	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	Dent	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Hill
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Black	Dold	Hudson
Blackburn	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bost	Ellmers (NC)	Hunter
Boustany	Emmer (MN)	Hurd (TX)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Hurt (VA)
Brat	Fincher	Issa
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brown (FL)	Flores	Johnson, E. B.
Buchanan	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Jolly
Burgess	Fox	Jordan
Byrne	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Katko
Carter (GA)	Gabbard	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Garrett	King (IA)
Castro (TX)	Gibbs	King (NY)
Chabot	Gibson	Kinzing (IL)
Chaffetz	Gohmert	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Goodlatte	Knight
Clyburn	Gosar	Labrador
Coffman	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Cole	Graham	Lamborn
Collins (GA)	Granger	Lance
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Latta
Comstock	Graves (LA)	LoBiondo
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lofgren

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2339

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 272, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—149

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Amash	Bustos	Clay
Bass	Capps	Cleaver
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cohen
Becerra	Carney	Conyers
Bera	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeGette
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	Delaney

DeLauro	Keating	Price (NC)	Miller (FL)	Renacci	Stewart	Harper	Meadows	Ryan (WI)
DeBene	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	Miller (MI)	Rice (NY)	Stivers	Harris	Messer	Salmon
DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Ribble	Moolenaar	Richmond	Stutzman	Hensarling	Mica	Sanford
Deutch	Kildee	Rice (SC)	Mooney (WV)	Rigell	Swalwell (CA)	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Dingell	Kilmer	Rohrabacher	Moulton	Roby	Thompson (MS)	Hill	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Doggett	Kind	Rokita	Mullin	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)	Holding	Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner
Doyle, Michael F.	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard	Mulvaney	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry	Hudson	Mullin	Sessions
Duckworth	Kuster	Ruiz	Murphy (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi	Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Langevin	Rush	Murphy (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Tipton	Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Shuster
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Neal	Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Torres	Hunter	Palmer	Smith (MO)
Ellison	Larson (CT)	Neuhouse	Neuhouse	Roskam	Trott	Hurd (TX)	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Engel	Lawrence	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Noem	Ross	Turner	Hurt (VA)	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Eshoo	Lee	Sarbanes	Norcross	Rothfus	Upton	Jenkins (KS)	Perry	Stivers
Esty	Levin	Schakowsky	Nugent	Rouzer	Valadao	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	Stutzman
Farr	Lieu, Ted	Schiff	Nunes	Royce	Walberg	Jordan	Pitts	Thornberry
Fattah	Loeb	Schiff	Olson	Ruppersberger	Walden	Kline	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Foster	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)	Palazzo	Russell	Walker	Knight	Poliquin	Walberg
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Scott, David	Palmer	Ryan (WI)	Walorski	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Walker
Fudge	Maloney	Sensenbrenner	Pascrell	Salmon	Walters, Mimi	Lamborn	Posey	Walters, Mimi
Galleo	Carolyn	Serrano	Paulsen	Sanford	Weber (TX)	Lance	Price, Tom	Weber (TX)
Garamendi	Massie	Sherman	Pearce	Scalise	Webster (FL)	Long	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)
Grayson	Matsui	Sires	Perlmutter	Schrader	Westerman	Loudermilk	Ribble	Westerman
Green, Gene	McCollum	Speier	Perry	Schweikert	Westmoreland	Love	Rice (SC)	Williams
Griffith	McDermott	Takai	Peterson	Scott, Austin	Whitfield	Lummis	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Grijalva	McGovern	Takano	Pittenger	Sessions	Williams	Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Grothman	McNerney	Thompson (CA)	Pitts	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)	Massie	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Gutiérrez	Meeks	Titus	Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)	McCarthy	Rokita	Woodall
Hahn	Meng	Tonko	Poliquin	Shuster	Wittman	McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Yoder
Hastings	Moore	Tsongas	Pompeo	Simpson	Womack	McClintock	Rothfus	Yoho
Heck (WA)	Nadler	Van Hollen	Posey	Sinema	Woodall	McHenry	Rouzer	Zinke
Higgins	Napolitano	Vargas	Price, Tom	Slaughter	Yoder	McMorris	Royce	
Himes	Nolan	Veasey	Rangel	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)	Rodgers	Russell	
Honda	O'Rourke	Vela	Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)			
Hoyer	Pallone	Velázquez	Reed	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin			
Huelskamp	Payne	Visclosky	Reichert	Smith (TX)	Zinke			
Huffman	Pelosi	Walz		Stefanik				
Jackson Lee	Peters	Waters, Maxine						
Jeffries	Pingree	Watson Coleman						
Jones	Pocan	Welch	Buck	Lewis	Wasserman			
Kaptur	Polis	Yoho	Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz			
			Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth			
			Hinojosa		Young (IN)			

NOES—272

Abraham	Crawford	Hultgren
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hunter
Aguilar	Cuellar	Hurd (TX)
Allen	Culberson	Hurt (VA)
Amodei	Curbelo (FL)	Israel
Ashford	Davis, Danny	Issa
Babin	Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)
Barletta	Denham	Jenkins (WV)
Barr	Dent	Jenkins (GA)
Barton	DeSantis	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	DesJarlais	Johnson, E. B.
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Jolly
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Black	Ellmers (NC)	Katko
Blackburn	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Blum	Farenthold	King (IA)
Bost	Fincher	King (NY)
Boustany	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Fleischmann	Kline
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Knight
Brat	Forbes	Labrador
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Brooks (AL)	Fox	Lamborn
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Brown (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Buchanan	Gabbard	Lipinski
Bucshon	Garrett	LoBiondo
Burgess	Gibbs	Lofgren
Butterfield	Gibson	Long
Byrne	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Calvert	Goodlatte	Love
Capuano	Gosar	Lucas
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Graham	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Granger	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Graves (GA)	Luján, Ben Ray
Chabot	Graves (LA)	(NM)
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Clawson (FL)	Green, Al	MacArthur
Clyburn	Guinta	Maloney, Sean
Coffman	Guthrie	Marchant
Cole	Hanna	Marino
Collins (GA)	Hardy	McCarthy
Collins (NY)	Harper	McCaul
Comstock	Harris	McClintock
Conaway	Hartzler	McHenry
Connolly	Heck (NV)	McKinley
Cook	Hensarling	McMorris
Cooper	Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers
Costa	Hill	Smith (WA)
Costello (PA)	Holding	Smith (NE)
Courtney	Hudson	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Smith (TX)

NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR
The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2342

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON
The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 278, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—143

Allen	Carter (GA)	Fleming
Amash	Carter (TX)	Flores
Babin	Chabot	Forbes
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Garrett
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Gibbs
Black	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Blackburn	Conaway	Goodlatte
Blum	Cook	Gosar
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gowdy
Brat	DeSantis	Granger
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Graves (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Emmer (MN)	Grothman
Burgess	Farenthold	Guthrie
Byrne	Fincher	Hardy

Abraham	Delaney	Joyce
Adams	DeLauro	Kaptur
Aderholt	DeBene	Katko
Aguilar	Denham	Keating
Amodei	Dent	Kelly (IL)
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Kelly (PA)
Barletta	Deutch	Kennedy
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Kildee
Barton	Dingell	Kilmer
Bass	Doggett	Kind
Beatty	Dold	King (IA)
Becerra	Doyle, Michael F.	King (NY)
Benishek	F.	Kinzinger (IL)
Bera	Duckworth	Kirkpatrick
Beyer	Duncan (SC)	Kuster
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Labrador
Blumenauer	Ellison	Langevin
Bonamici	Ellmers (NC)	Larsen (WA)
Bost	Engel	Larson (CT)
Boustany	Eshoo	Latta
Boyle, Brendan F.	Esty	Lawrence
Brady (PA)	Farr	Lee
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Levin
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Bustos	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Butterfield	Foster	Loeb
Calvert	Fox	Lofgren
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Cárdenas	Fudge	Lucas
Carney	Gabbard	Luetkemeyer
Carson (IN)	Galleo	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Garamendi	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Gibson	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Graham	(NM)
Chu, Judy	Grayson	Lynch
Cicilline	Green, Al	MacArthur
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Maloney
Clarke (NY)	Griffith	Carolyn
Clay	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cleaver	Guinta	Marino
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Cohen	Hahn	McCollum
Cole	Hanna	McDermott
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	McGovern
Comstock	Hastings	McKinley
Connolly	Heck (NV)	McNerney
Conyers	Heck (WA)	McSally
Cooper	Higgins	Meehan
Costa	Himes	Meeks
Costello (PA)	Honda	Meng
Courtney	Hoyer	Moolenaar
Cramer	Huffman	Moore
	Hultgren	Moulton
	Israel	Mulvaney
	Issa	Murphy (FL)
	Jackson Lee	Murphy (PA)
	Jeffries	Nadler
	Jenkins (WV)	Napolitano
	Jones	Neal
		Newhouse
		Noem
		Nolan
		Norcross

NOES—278

Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
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)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)

Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner

Wasserman
Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2345

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—171

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy

Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Dobson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zinke

NOES—250

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benish
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Guthrie
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Dobson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)

DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Knight
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus

Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner

Wasserman
Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2347

Mr. GUTHRIE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
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
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman

Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
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
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock

McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
McCaul
Rothfus

NOES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
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
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner

Wasserman
Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 2350

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the Account "Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works." After the dollar amount, insert (increased by \$30,000,000) (decreased by \$30,000,000).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I had offered an amendment for the RECORD that was a very specific amendment, and I am going to read that:

The Secretary shall accept from the Trinity River Authority of Texas, if received by October 31, 2015, \$30,191,026 as payment in full of amounts owed to the United States, including any accrued interest, for water supply storage space in Joe Pool Lake, Texas, previously known as Lakeview Lake, under contract No. DACW63-76-C-0106.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was approved by the Corps of Engineers, approved by the Trinity River Authority, and approved by the municipalities that are obligated to purchase water that is stored in this lake. However, only one of those municipalities is actually taking the water, and because of a very high interest rate, it would never be feasible for the water to be taken by the three municipalities that are not taking it. Under this agreement, the Trinity River Authority would pay all principal and accrued interest but at an interest rate of a little over 2 percent.

The Corps has accepted it. The municipalities have accepted it. The State of Texas has accepted it. It has all been accepted. The committee of authorizing jurisdiction is supportive of it, which is the Transportation Com-

mittee. In principle, on policy, the appropriators of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle are supportive.

However, there is a point of order against the amendment as originally drafted. I respect that point of order. I respect the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member, and I respect the full committee chairman, so I have drafted the substitute amendment, which there is no point of order against. I am told that, if accepted, this will have an effect that, if the appropriators support it in principle, the Corps will accept it, and the municipalities will accept it, and we will get this problem solved.

I want to emphasize that the United States Government is going to get all of its money back with interest at the prevailing market rate of the little over 2 percent that exists today. This is not a giveaway. This is literally found money that goes back to the Corps of Engineers, and they, under the leadership of the subcommittee that Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR are responsible for, can designate that money however they think it is best to be obligated.

I ask for the chairman of the subcommittee to enter into a colloquy to see if he accepts this amendment in principle and is willing to work with me and Ms. JOHNSON to implement it in the appropriate fashion at the appropriate time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman would like to do and how it would be helpful to his constituents. I would be happy to continue the discussion of this issue to see if there is anything that this subcommittee can do. I will not oppose this amendment, and I will try to help accomplish this goal that the gentleman is trying to achieve. It is amazing to me that, when everybody agrees on something, how hard it can still be to get it done.

Mr. BARTON. In reclaiming my time, we are trying to give money to the Federal Government that your subcommittee can use. It is a good amendment. I appreciate your support, Mr. Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank my friend and colleague from my home State of Texas (Mr. BARTON), who I share the lake with.

This is a commonsense amendment. I want to thank all of those who have

helped to arrive at this acceptable language for this amendment.

The language of the amendment has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office and has a zero score. More importantly, the amendment would provide a revenue for the government. It would make good on unintended consequences that came as a result of a now antiquated metric of calculating costs for such projects.

In the 1986 WRDA bill, Congress recognized this mistake in its formulas for rates and added a provision allowing for the recalculation of such project rates for ever 5 years, but it was not retroactive.

This amendment will enable the Trinity River Authority to make a final payment to the Corps of Engineers, begin providing water supply and storage, and allow the Federal Government to finally begin collecting revenue on this investment.

I will remind my colleagues these contracts are congressionally approved, but this contract was agreed to on terms no longer favorable to the U.S. Government.

The original formula has tripled the valuation of the project, and as it stands, the project will never be completed, and we will never collect on the contract. There is no existing obligation to pay for the completion of the project, so what we have now is a half-completed project and no path forward for the government to collect on its investment.

This is revenue for our government. It has a zero CBO score, and it is a commonsense amendment.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I thank all those who helped us to arrive at this point.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not true there literally is an escrow account in Texas with \$30 million in it that they wish to send to the Federal Government?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. That is true. They are ready to pay it.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not true that this is what we would call found money?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, indeed; \$30 million is a lot of money for the government these days.

Mr. BARTON. Is it also not true that, if Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR and their subcommittee and the full committee accepts this and works in good faith to actually implement it, that the subcommittee and the full committee can use these unobligated funds in whatever fashion they see best for programs within the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. That is true.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and thank you to our ranking member and the chair for the good work that they have done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those in support of water power and the Bonamici-Perry-Pingree amendment.

This amendment provides a modest increase in funding for the Department of Energy's Water Power Program, but that modest increase will make a big difference in developing new sources of clean energy, tidal power, and hydro-power from all across the country.

I have seen this program work firsthand in the State of Maine. Ocean Renewable Power Company has taken advantage of this program and leveraged these modest investments into a company that has created or retained over a hundred jobs in every part of our State and directly pumped over \$25 million into our economy.

Tidal and river power projects create jobs in areas where they are needed most, in Eastport, Maine, for example, or in rural villages in Alaska. These projects lower energy prices and create jobs. For some remote communities, creating these new forms of clean energy is a matter of survival.

These projects are examples of American technology and know-how at work. By creating homegrown solutions to our energy needs, we are investing in our communities and developing technology that the rest of the world wants to buy from us. Most importantly of all, this allows us to keep the money we spend on energy right here in America.

This Department of Energy program supports private sector research and development and implementation of water power technology that creates these jobs and these new sources of clean energy. This modest increase in funding will translate directly into jobs and an increase in the supply of clean renewable energy across the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congresswoman PINGREE of Maine for her efforts here this evening and for her dedication to renewable energy, including in the tidal arena.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ABRAHAM

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, carry out, modify, revise, or enforce Executive Order 13690 (entitled "Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input").

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are here today because, with the stroke of a pen, President Obama has threatened decades of work by Americans and local governments to combat flooding.

Executive Order No. 13690 establishes a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard that greatly expands the area defined as flood plain and imposes unreasonable standards on any Federal activities in that expanded flood plain.

The administration crafted this policy in secret, without input on its merits from local officials or stakeholders, those stakeholders that will have to live with this policy.

The Office of Management and Budget predicts that this standard will significantly increase the cost of living and doing business in all areas that are at any risk of flooding.

This is just another case of the President imposing his climate change politics on hard-working Americans. This new standard will have a real devastating impact on communities throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will prohibit funding for this woefully shortsighted executive order.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY, my good friend.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, the administration continues to rule using executive orders and a top-down approach without taking stakeholder voices into account. That is arbitrary, and it is just wrong.

This Federal Flood Risk Management Standard is a case in point established by executive order. The President solicited no public input on its merits before charging full speed ahead. This is horrible for Louisiana. It will be devastating for our coastal communities, inhibiting their ability to grow and develop.

This order affects critical programs like disaster preparedness assistance and Federal highway and housing aid; yet no cost-benefit analysis was ever undertaken. This is just not the way things are supposed to work around here.

I encourage all my colleagues who are concerned not only with the content of this, but the fly-by-night process by which this revision was proposed, to support our amendment and send a message to the administration that this will not stand.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr.

SCALISE), our great friend and majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. ABRAHAM, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at this proposal, the way it came about, there was not the right kind of planning and the right kind of feedback, the right kind of working with people who have been working hard on flood protection structures.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal by the President, if it were implemented, would actually make it harder to build flood protection projects. Why would the President want to bring forward a proposal that is going to make it harder for people to protect their homes from flooding?

This isn't just a south Louisiana problem; this impacts the entire Nation. There are people all around the country that would not only be threatened by the inability to build stronger flood protection, but this would also lead to dramatic increases in insurance rates on homeowners.

This proposal by the President is not only a solution in search of a problem; this is going to be a dangerous proposal that will have dramatically devastating impacts on families all across this Nation.

This is a proposal that needs to be reversed. I support it.

□ 0010

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman ABRAHAM for bringing this amendment up.

I strongly support resiliency efforts, making our communities more resilient and our ecosystem more resilient. In this case, we are taking a standard that is universally considered to be a 100-year standard and bumping it, in many cases, to a 500-year standard.

In the State of Louisiana, FEMA has gone through and tried to establish maps to determine a 100-year standard. We found areas where they are 6 feet off where they should be, yet we are going to try and go to a 500-year standard. I remind you, our Nation hasn't even been around that long.

Most concerning, Mr. Chairman, is when you combine this proposed executive order with the Waters of the U.S. proposal that clearly states that flood plains are within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, you suddenly grossly expand the Federal Government's jurisdiction over private property and prevent or obstruct or increase the cost of development on that private property.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that in December of last year, Congress raised strong concern about this, about the huge implications of this and, therefore, they put a provision in law that required that input from stakeholders occur before this executive order be put forth, and that was ignored.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition the gentleman's amendment.

It doesn't take a mental giant to see that floods are among the most costly and frequent of all nature's hazards.

Between 1980 and 2013, the United States suffered more than \$260 billion worth of flood-related damages. Flooding accounts for approximately 85 percent of all disaster declarations in the country. And on average, more people die annually from flooding than any other natural disaster. I can tell you that even in the Midwest, which isn't one of the coastal communities, we have more significant storms of late and more rainfall and more flooding to deal with.

The costs borne by the Federal taxpayer by flooding exceed any other natural hazard. Losses caused by flooding impact our economic prosperity, public health and safety, and our national security by straining disaster response resources and increasing the frequency and cost of disaster relief.

When you look at the cost of what FEMA has to spend to try to clean up everything from basements to neighborhoods, oh, my goodness. The millions and millions of dollars that go out, the billions of dollars that go out the door because of these disasters around the country related to flooding is huge.

Flooding risks are anticipated to increase over time due to the continued occupation of flood-prone areas, the impacts of climate change, and other threats. That damage can be particularly severe to our Nation's infrastructure, including our buildings, roads, ports, industrial facilities, and even our coastal military installations.

I actually have traveled to Louisiana, and my heart goes out to the people of New Orleans and all of the surrounding areas for what they suffered. But I can tell you, I was shocked to see that there were decisions made for land planning to absolutely rebuild where all the damage had occurred. I even made suggestions in the Ninth Ward inside New Orleans. I said: Why don't you leave that open for agriculture, so that when you get another big threat from the ocean, you won't harm as many people? It was as though no one wanted to listen.

Well, God bless everyone, because nature we can't control. She does what she wants.

Federal agencies will be given the flexibility to select the best approach for establishing the flood elevation and hazard area they use in siting, design, and construction: utilizing the best available actionable data and methods that integrate current and future changes in flooding based on science and experience; 2 or 3 feet of elevation, depending on the criticality of the

building itself, above the 100-year, or 1 percent, annual chance flood elevation; or a 500-year, or 0.2 percent, annual chance flood elevation.

The new flood standard will help reduce the risk and costs and, frankly, loss of life of future flood disasters by providing a margin of safety so that federally funded structures, facilities, and infrastructure last as long as intended.

Why should we ask people who are living responsibly with the land and the forces of nature to pay for those who want to live irresponsibly with those same forces?

It seems to me that one of the most cost-effective things we can do is to be sensible about our land planning for the future, so that we avoid the harm to human life and our built environment. We are more intelligent, we hope, than we were a century ago. We have a lot more data. We have a lot more experience, and it should influence our decisions from now into the future.

I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to join me. Let's be responsible in this new century and minimize the harm, both to human life as well as taxpayers' pocketbooks.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, the good, hard-working people that live in these areas that would be affected now have not incurred floods in their lifetimes or in their generations of lifetimes before them, but this would impact some States up to 40 percent of their total landmass.

This is unacceptable. Cost of flood insurance would go astronomically high in some cases. Federal overburden would again be an issue, and businesses could not function. Even existing businesses would be put out of business.

This administration has violated the congressional intent in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2015 by crafting the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard without consulting the necessary officials and basing it on some climate issues that have no scientific basis at this point.

This standard will affect both private and federally financed development in areas considered flood plain. This means certification and accreditation of new and improved levees, issuance of section 404 Clean Water Act permits, issuance of federally backed mortgages, issuance of grants, construction of new transportation projects, and on and on would be affected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science" may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank again the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their courtesy and, as well, for the work that they have done on this legislation.

This amendment was in this bill in the 113th in the FY 2013 Energy and Water Resources. It is a continuing effort to ensure that we focus on the need for science, technology, engineering, and math among minority populations in the United States.

The amendment prohibits the use of funds made available for science in title III of the Department of Energy programs to be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act, and addresses the need to increase programs that educate minorities in science, technology, engineering, and math.

Some almost 20 years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton, in an executive order, directed Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chairman, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders. This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the Nation's demographics are shifting, as more and more of our children come of age, it is important that we continue to focus on improving the numbers of minorities who seek STEM opportunities. It is good for the country.

I applaud Energy Secretary Moniz' commitment, which will increase the Nation's economic competitiveness and enable our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chairman, there are still a great many scientific riddles to be solved, and the more people we have trained in the sciences, the more competitive our Nation will be; and the more we invest in underserved communities, the more competitive our Nation will be.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them. So I ask my colleagues to ensure that we continue this very important focus and emphasize the continued investment improving access to science, technology, engi-

neering, and math to, in essence, solve, or help solve, the scientific riddles that continue to be before us to improve the quality of life of all Americans.

□ 0020

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which invests in STEM in America for those who are underserved and whose lives could be enhanced by these programs.

Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to describe my amendment, which simply provides that: "None of the funds made available by this Act for 'Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science' may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.)."

This amendment was approved and adopted in identical form on June 5, 2012, during the 112th Congress as an amendment to H.R. 5325, the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act of 2013.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman Simpson and Ranking Member Kaptur for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

Mr. Chair, twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chair, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students, but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders.

This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the nation's demographics are shifting and now most children under the age of one are minorities, it is critical that we close the gap in the number of minorities who seek STEM opportunities.

I applaud the Energy Secretary Moniz's commitment which will increase the nation's economic competitiveness and enable more of our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chair, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved—and perhaps one of these days a minority engineer or biologist will come-up with some of the solutions.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them.

The energy and science education programs funded in part by this bill will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environmental sustainability, preservation, and health.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefitted by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into

energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can increase diversity, provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities, and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

But most importantly businesses will have more consumers to whom they may engage in related commercial activities.

My amendment will help ensure that underrepresented communities are able to participate and contribute equitably in the energy and scientific future.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, printed as No. 5 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The 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 Department of Energy to apply the report entitled "Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States", published in the Federal Register on June 4, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 32260), in any public interest determination under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will keep America's energy economy growing and keep good-paying jobs coming to gas-producing regions across the country, including western Pennsylvania.

The natural gas boom is transforming local economies across the country, and it is creating a new wave of opportunity for hard-working Americans who want to earn a living and provide for their families.

American ingenuity has empowered us to safely harness our tremendous energy resources, turning the United States into a breakout success story as the world's top natural gas producer. Countries in Europe and Asia, many of which are our allies, are eager to tap this abundant supply of affordable American energy. They consider America to be a much more attractive business partner and a safer alternative to their reliance on belligerent, energy-rich countries, like Russia.

Given the abundance of domestic natural gas resources, especially in the

Marcellus shale region, American energy companies are eager to accept more business and stand ready to fulfill the global demand.

We must do everything we can to help energy producers succeed so they can continue to grow, hire more workers, and bring prosperity back to our American cities.

Congress must work to lift barriers to energy exports and help domestic energy producers cut through the bureaucratic red tape that threatens to put a stranglehold on continued economic growth.

My amendment seeks to eliminate unnecessary challenges to these increased energy exports on environmental grounds. Specifically, my provision would prevent the Department of Energy from using its report entitled "Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas" in any public interest determination under the Natural Gas Act.

There are legitimate concerns that this DOE report and many of its arbitrary determinations may now be used to slow-walk or completely block much-needed liquefied natural gas export approvals. Identical language was proposed and included in last year's Energy and Water and Related Agencies appropriations bill by then-Representative BILL CASSIDY from Louisiana.

I thank Chairman SIMPSON for his hard work and support, and I urge all my colleagues who support an all-of-the-above approach to American energy independence to vote "yea" on this amendment so we can keep our energy sector booming.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, when a company wants to export liquefied natural gas, LNG, it has to submit an application with the Department of Energy. For export to countries with a free trade agreement with the United States, the Department of Energy must grant the applications without modification or delay. For export to countries without a free trade agreement, the Department of Energy must approve an export application unless it finds that the proposed export will not be consistent with the public interest.

To make this determination, the Department of Energy evaluates a range of factors when reviewing an application, including economic impacts, international considerations, U.S. energy security, and environmental effects.

The Rothfus amendment prohibits the Department of Energy from even considering one of the most important factors; that is, the impact of LNG exports on climate change.

The world's leading scientists are unequivocal: climate change is already happening on all continents and across

the oceans and will get much worse if we do not act to cut our emissions of carbon and other greenhouse gas gases. That means that we need to scrutinize the energy infrastructure decisions that we make today for their impacts on climate change in the future.

Every decision to build a new LNG export terminal has climate implications. We need to understand and weigh those effects.

Whether exporting LNG will have a positive or negative impact on global greenhouse gas emissions is a complex but critical question. Natural gas combustion for electricity emits less carbon pollution than coal. And that is good. Proponents of LNG exports argue that these exports will displace coal consumption in other countries, which could produce a climate benefit. That is good.

But LNG exports will raise natural gas prices in the United States, which could increase coal consumption and carbon pollution from coal-fired power plants. LNG exports also would drive new domestic natural gas production in the United States.

Coming from Ohio, I can guarantee you, this would increase emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, unless we take measures to control that pollution at the wellhead and throughout the natural gas system. It is a great problem to have but one we need to meet.

In a carbon-constrained world, we need to understand and consider the climate impacts of key energy policy decisions, such as building new LNG export terminals and exporting America's natural gas.

The Rothfus amendment takes a head-in-the-sand approach, I am sorry to say. The Department of Energy has completed a report examining lifecycle carbon emissions from LNG. This amendment says that the Department of Energy can't consider those findings of climate impacts when making a public interest determination. Considering climate impacts is not going to slow down the review process. It makes no sense to require the Department of Energy to make a determination without the benefit of all the facts.

Let's make enlightened decisions. Ignoring climate change will not make it go away. Quite the opposite.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Let's move to the future, not the past.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice of this administration to stall, stall, stall, delay, delay. We have had tremendous growth in our economy in western Pennsylvania and in Ohio, for that matter, given the natural gas boom that is going on.

The price of gas is suppressed right now. We see drillers even slowing down, which is affecting jobs in the gas areas. Fewer wells are being drilled.

And to take a report that the DOE has, with its arbitrary determinations,

to, again, slow-walk approvals, which is what we have been seeing with the administration—meanwhile, allies in Eastern Europe are literally being held hostage to Russia—this natural gas will be used. Natural gas will be used by these countries in Eastern Europe. They are going to use Russia's natural gas or they want to use American natural gas.

So, again, I would encourage adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are procured from a manufacturer that is part of the national technology and industrial base.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a simple and straightforward amendment to this year's Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Every year since 1991, Congress has included a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill to require that military agencies purchase anchor and mooring chain from American manufacturers.

□ 0030

My amendment simply clarifies that this requirement also applies to anchor and mooring chain purchased by the Army Corps of Engineers. Everyone in this Chamber can agree that taxpayer dollars should be used to buy goods manufactured right here at home whenever possible.

While our economy continues to recover, it is imperative that we protect and support Americans' production capabilities. Doing so not only supports employment opportunities for Americans, but also reinforces our national security.

Both Congress and the Pentagon have long recognized the importance of maintaining a strong industrial base

right here in America. While I understand that we must balance our procurement needs with shrinking budgets, we should not be putting foreign workers ahead of Americans.

My amendment is a commonsense way to protect a critical production capability, support our manufacturing industry, and put American workers first. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the removal of any Federally owned or operated dam.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will help prevent future floods, as well as protect valuable water storage and hydropower systems throughout the country.

Specifically, the Gosar-Newhouse amendment will prevent any funds in this bill from being used to remove any federally owned or operated dams. In recent years, extremist environmental groups have increased efforts to dismantle and remove Federal dams. These efforts defy common sense, particularly at a time of major water challenges across the West and with an increasing need for clean, renewable hydropower.

The gentleman from Washington has seen these attempts firsthand, and I am grateful for Congressman NEWHOUSE's leadership in coleading this amendment.

Electricity generated from the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation operated dams is utilized by millions of Americans every day and represents the largest source of renewable energy in this country.

These dams are multiuse facilities that provide navigation, hydropower, and important recreational benefits. Fringe efforts to remove these dams are not only misguided, but extremely dangerous. Many of these dams are essential components for flood controls, strategic water storage, and life-sustaining irrigation for millions of acres of American agriculture.

Tens of millions of Americans rely on these dams to supply their drinking water and to support their livelihoods. The vital water, energy, economic, and ecological benefits provided by these federally owned and operated dams must be protected.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Corps of Engineers infrastructure and to support this amendment. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have both indicated they have no plans to remove any dams in fiscal year 2016, and both agencies don't have any issues with this amendment.

Both committees of jurisdiction have also signed off on and support the amendment. Any emergency removals will be made by a different authorization or appropriation.

With one of the worst droughts in 100 years currently transpiring in the West, there is no logical reason to oppose the commonsense Gosar-Newhouse amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my friend.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the good gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Gosar-Newhouse amendment which would prohibit any funds in this act from being used for purposes of removing Federal dams, which are a vital component of the water infrastructure in the West.

I would like to thank my good friend and colleague Congressman GOSAR for his hard work on this issue which is so important, given the devastating drought conditions facing most of the Western United States. According to the U.S. Drought Monitor for March 31, 2015, all or significant portions of 11 Western States, including the State of Washington, are suffering from severe to exceptional drought.

Given the current drought conditions facing my State and many other States in the West, now is not the time to consider removing Federal dams. These dams provide important hydropower in my State and also have conservation, recreation, and navigation benefits.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, these dams play a pivotal role in water storage, irrigation, and flood control. They also help ensure many rural and agricultural communities in the West have access to clean water supplies, providing critically important irrigation for countless agricultural operations and millions of acres of farmland.

We have fought these dam wars for decades; and, with the West facing a possible 100-year drought, now is not the time to destroy and remove these assets which benefit all of us. Removing this vital infrastructure would have a devastating impact on communities, farms, and businesses throughout the West.

This commonsense amendment will help ensure States like mine are not additionally burdened as we work to deal with impacts of mounting water shortages and drastic drought conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, and I would like to thank my good friend from Arizona for his hard work on this.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express the opinion, though I will not oppose the amendment, because there are no funds in the bill for dam removal, and I wanted to just clarify that for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that were inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill that was considered under an open rule during the 113th Congress, as well as one yesterday.

My amendment would expand the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of contractors.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to save taxpayer money, help the Department of Energy avoid duplicative programs, and ensure the agency's limited resources are focused on programs directly related to its mission to ensure energy security for the United States.

This simple amendment would prohibit the use of funds to be used for the proposed Climate Model Development and Validation program within the Department of Energy. This exact same amendment passed this body by a voice vote last year, and this year, I am also proud again to offer this commonsense policy.

The duplicative and wasteful nature of this new program has been recognized by several outside spending watchdog groups. This amendment proposal has been supported in the past by the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, The American Conservative Union, Eagle Forum, and the Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives already declined to fund the proposed climate model program in fiscal years 2014 and 2015. In previous years, the committee has proactively included language in the committee report to prohibit funding for this new program. However, such language does not exist in this year's report, making this amendment even more necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that the House of Representatives must continue its firm position that we should not be wasting precious taxpayer resources on new programs that compete with the private sector and are funded by private investment.

If funded, this program would be yet another new addition to the President's ever-growing list of duplicative global programs that have been instituted and funded all over the Federal Government in recent years.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service estimates this administration has already squandered \$77 billion from fiscal year 2008 through fiscal

year 2013 studying and trying to develop global climate change regulations.

While research and modeling of the Earth's climate and how and why Earth's climate is changing can be of value, it is not central to the Department's mission and is already being done by dozens of government, academic, business, and nonprofit organizations across the globe.

□ 0040

Considering the extensive work that is being done to research, model, and forecast climate change trends by other areas in the government, in the private sector, and internationally, funding for this specific piece of President Obama's climate agenda is not only redundant, but is also inefficient.

I thank the chairman, ranking member, and committee for their work on this bill. This amendment is about effective use of taxpayer money, and I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that passed this same body just last year.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. The Gosar amendment blocks funding for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program. This is climate science denial at its worst.

The world's top scientific institutions are telling us that we have a rapidly closing window to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change cannot be avoided.

So far, the world already warmed by 0.8 degrees Celsius, and we are already seeing the effects of climate change. Most scientists agree that 2 degrees Celsius is the maximum amount we can warm without really dangerous effects, although many scientists now believe that even 2 degrees is far too much, given the effects we are already seeing. But absent dramatic action, we are on track to warm 4 to 6 degrees Celsius by midcentury. That is more than 10 degrees Fahrenheit.

The International Energy Agency has concluded that if the world does not take action to reduce carbon pollution by 2017, just 3 years from now, then it will be virtually impossible to limit warming to 2 degrees Celsius.

How do we know all of this? There are multiple lines of evidence, including direct measurements. But scientists also use sophisticated computer models of how the atmosphere and oceans work and how they respond to different atmosphere concentrations of heat-trapping gases. For projections of future emissions and their impacts, scientists have made numerous advances by collaborating across academic fields, including climatology, chemistry, biology, economics, energy dynamics, agriculture, scenario building,

and risk management. These projections are critical, as they provide guideposts to understand how quickly and how steeply the world needs to cut carbon pollution in order to avoid the worst effects of climate change.

The goal of the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program is to further improve the reliability of climate models and equip policymakers and citizens with tools to predict the current and future effects of climate change, such as sea level rise, which we know is happening, extreme weather events, and drought.

Mr. GOSAR's amendment scraps this program. It says no to enhancing the reliability of our climate models. It says no to improving our understanding of how the climate is changing. It says no to informing policymakers about the consequences of unmitigated climate change. That is absolutely irresponsible.

The amazing thing is the base bill already zeroes out funding for this program. But apparently that wasn't enough to satisfy the Republicans' climate denial. So Mr. GOSAR has offered this amendment to just reiterate the point that the House Republicans reject the overwhelming scientific evidence about climate change.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this redundant amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that we have numerous universities already doing this duplicative study, like the University of Michigan, like the University of Colorado Boulder, like Harvard University, the University of Arizona, the University of Chicago, the University of California—Berkeley—hardly squandering research.

This is a duplicative problem and program, and that is exactly what we are doing. I want to find out exactly this climate model change that we have been seeing over and over with time, but it is best to be done by those universities and those who are already there.

We have also got a dire emergency in regards to the finances that we find this country in. Duplicative services from the Department of Energy should be on their mission statement, and that is dependable energy for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) For an additional amount for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Construction" for additional funding for ongoing work on authorized projects (except for Flood and Storm Damage Reduction, Navigation, and Environmental Infrastructure projects) there is appropriated, and the amount otherwise made available for such account is hereby reduced by, \$10,000,000.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Construction" in excess of \$276,117,000 may be used for additional funding for ongoing work on Flood and Storm Damage Reduction projects.

Mr. SIMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Army Corps of Engineers construction general account permits the Corps to enter into agreements with local governments and municipalities to reimburse these entities for certain funds. This allows cities across the country in both Republican and Democratic districts to take on public works projects and leverage the fact that they will later be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

The problem we face today is that millions, hundreds of millions of dollars are owed to localities across the country, and the account to pay them back this year is slated to have only \$10 million in it. Last year, that amount was \$25 million. It has gone down by \$15 million.

So for just a second, I want to give you an example of a wonderful public project in my hometown of San Antonio, Texas. The San Antonio River Authority, or SARA, recently undertook a sizable project along the San Antonio River, called the Mission Reach Ecosystem Restoration project. It has been an effort to extend, both to the north and the south, the wonderful San Antonio River Walk in San Antonio, Texas, one of the crown jewels for tourism and culture in our city. Despite the fact that this project was completed some time ago, the city is still owed much money from the Corps.

This is just one example of a wonderful public project where the Federal Government owes our cities or local entities a substantial amount of money. There are other examples in Texas, in Harris County, the Brays Bayou project in Harris County, where \$146,885,000 is pending; the White Oak Bayou project in Harris County, where \$73 million is pending; also, the Lower

Colorado River Basin, Onion Creek, in Austin has \$5 million pending. I know there is a big project in Florida.

So my effort, my amendment, is an attempt to expedite getting these local agencies paid back because they are owed so much money. I know that as we do our budget and we do our appropriations, we are talking about doling out money in the future to fund programs, but these are projects that were already completed with the promise that they would be reimbursed. They have not been reimbursed to the tune of millions and millions of dollars.

I hope that as a gesture of good faith we can increase this account by \$10 million. Bear in mind, that would still be \$5 million less than was dedicated to this account in the last year.

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

□ 0050

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. I object. I am going to be opposed.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman claim time in opposition?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman have time remaining?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I reserved the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. You reserved your time. So you could yield time to the gentleman.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I would be glad to yield time. How much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, where I am from in Texas, when you make a deal with someone, you look him in the eye and shake his hand, honor the agreement, and keep your word.

For years, the United States Army Corps of Engineers has been making deals throughout the country. Yet, in many instances, despite project co-operation agreements, the Corps has failed to honor its end of the bargain. Many State, local, and municipal entities have advanced funding or paid out of their pockets to help better their communities with the understanding that the Federal Government would reimburse them. This is what happened in my hometown of San Antonio.

This amendment would limit expenditure on flood and storm damage reduction to \$10 million less and would add \$10 million to the "other authorized

purposes" item in the committee report. This is a matter of fairness to our communities, and if we cannot proceed with this bipartisan amendment, I hope the chairman will work with us going forward.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

First, let me assure my colleague that I am sympathetic to the intention of what he is trying to do here. The gentleman seeks to show support for additional funding for projects that are important to his district and to his constituents, and I understand that.

Unfortunately, although I know it is not the gentleman's intent, the amendment would limit all funding for the construction of flood control projects to no more than \$276 million. That is a cut of almost \$500 million in flood control projects. I would hope that we would all agree that that is unacceptable. Even as intended, though, I must oppose the amendment.

The President's budget request increased funding for environmental projects above the fiscal year 2015 level while slashing funding for flood control projects by almost \$300 million. In this bill, on the other hand, we were able to restore the flood control funding, and we did it without slashing the funding for environmental projects.

I would, respectfully, ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment even though I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. We would be more than willing to work with him—with both of you—in trying to address this issue as we move this process forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I know the appropriations process is a tough one. You are making difficult choices among many things.

I would just point out that, in this account, as you know, there have been funds that have gone unallocated in recent years in this very account from which I withdraw. Again, our local agencies in Republican and Democratic districts have already committed these funds with the promise that they would be reimbursed. A failure to reimburse them is essentially saying that we are going to stiff them on money that we said that we would pay them. This is a very small amount given the amount of money that is owed by the Corps to our local agencies.

I would ask you for your reconsideration now, and certainly, as I know how Congressman HURD feels and many others, I would ask for your help in remedying this situation.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, again, I understand what he is trying to do, and I sympathize with what you are trying to do. You are correct in that the funds remain unallocated in the

flood control account. That is because, for some reason, the administration is dragging its feet on allocating these funds. It is not because the funds are not needed or cannot be used. In fact, the bill includes language to try to correct this problem. But I can't support increasing funding for environmental projects at the expense of projects that improve public safety and protect our communities.

I would offer both of the gentlemen the opportunity to work with the committee, and I will work with you to try to address this issue as we move forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, promulgate, or enforce the Department of Energy's proposed rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnaces" (80 Fed. Reg. 48: March 12, 2015).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy has proposed new rulemaking that will eliminate the use of noncondensing natural gas home furnaces.

On average, condensing furnaces cost \$350 more than noncondensing furnaces and require as much as \$2,200 in additional installation costs. The DOE itself has estimated that it will cost the American consumer up to \$12 billion to install condensing furnaces nationwide. The upfront costs of installing a natural gas condensing furnace may force families to switch to alternative furnaces which are cheaper to install but that cost more to operate. Home furnaces fail and need to be replaced when people are most likely to use them—in the middle of the winter when it is cold outside. Families shouldn't have to face increased costs to replace their natural gas furnaces to get the heat flowing back into their homes.

Furthermore, the proposed rule creates a nationwide standard that fails to take into account the different climate zones throughout the country. The Department of Energy has proposed a one-size-fits-all approach that unfairly punishes Americans living in warmer climate zones such as the Southeast. This means that the payback period for

the installation of condensing furnaces in the warmer climate zones will be much longer than in the colder zones.

My amendment to this appropriations bill will prevent the Department of Energy from using funds to finalize, promulgate, or enforce the proposed rule.

My amendment has been supported by the American Gas Association, the American Public Gas Association, the Home Builders Association, the Indoor Environment and Energy Efficiency Coalition, the Air Condition, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute, and the heating and air-condition and refrigerating distributors.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Blackburn amendment because it would prevent the Department of Energy from issuing long-needed efficiency standards for residential furnaces. In the end, that will only hurt consumers and needlessly waste energy.

The current standards, which are essentially 25 years old, leave consumers with higher utility bills than are necessary. Further delays to the furnace rule will allow this situation to continue indefinitely. The new DOE standard would cut energy waste, saving consumers more than \$600 over the lifetime of their furnaces. On a national level, that will work out to savings between \$4 billion to \$19 billion. The proposed DOE standard does not apply to furnaces that are already in use. It grandfathers them or it doesn't apply to repairs that can be made to existing furnaces.

It is also worth mentioning that the Blackburn amendment would be especially negative for low-income households. Many low-income people who are renters do not get to choose the furnaces that heat their homes. Property owners will generally choose the lowest cost furnace even if that furnace will result in higher energy bills. In the end, it is the low-income renters who are stuck with the gas bills from the inefficient furnace. The DOE standard would help ensure all Americans can benefit from lower energy bills thanks to increased efficiency.

Finally, the proposed rule would save more natural gas than other rules to date and would, therefore, deliver large, cumulative greenhouse gas emission reductions at a cost savings to everyone. The Blackburn amendment would throw away that opportunity.

□ 0100

It is true that there are still some things to be worked out with the regulation, and we should move toward that end, but what the industry needs and what the consumers need is certainty going forward, so everyone can plan to build and install the latest and

most efficient technology. We should let the Department of Energy do its job.

Let's not waste time; let's not waste energy, and let's not waste money and consumer savings that will result.

I urge a "no" vote on the Blackburn amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased that my friend and colleague mentioned cost because I want to point out, again, what it would cost. These furnaces cost \$350 more and require as much as \$2,200 additional in installation cost.

In addition to that, there are alterations that are needed to existing homes for venting purposes. Those cost estimates are \$2,550 per home just for the venting that is necessary for these.

This is one of those regulations, Mr. Chairman, that is too expensive to afford. The cost on this is astronomical. Even DOE itself says the cost to the American consumer is \$12 billion to install these furnaces.

Then you say that, maybe over the lifetime of this, you are going to save an amount. I think that this is one of those areas where you look at how much it is going to cost.

This is why this amendment is so widely supported. I encourage support for the Blackburn amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I bring every year. I told Chairman SIMPSON that I knew he was delighted to see me back on the floor again this year with the amendment for the 1 percent across-the-board spending cut.

I do want to thank the committee for its hard work in cutting, and it is important to note that the proposed funding levels for this appropriations bill this year is \$35.4 billion, which is \$633 million below the President's budget request.

I have got to say, with the situation in our Nation with our debt, I think my 1 percent spending reduction, which will save taxpayers an additional \$356 million, is something that is necessary, and it is a step that we need to take.

I am really fully aware that some of the appropriators aren't standing in favor of the 1 percent across-the-board cuts. In fact, when I offered this amendment to last year's bill, I was told that cuts of this magnitude, quite honestly, go far too deep.

Well, I think that, when you look at the fact that we need to be cutting another penny out of a dollar, that is not too deep because our debt is something that is damaging our Nation's security.

Even Admiral Mullen has said that the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our growing national debt. Because of that, we need to do a little bit more every time we come to the floor for appropriations to get this \$18.2 trillion debt under control.

As I have said before, across-the-board spending cuts effectively control the growth and cost of the Federal Government. They not only give agencies flexibility to determine which expenses are necessary, but more importantly, they don't pick winners and losers.

Not only do I support the across-the-board cuts, many of our Governors support them, Republican and Democrat. When I was in the State senate in Tennessee, we couldn't adjourn that until we balanced the budget. That is why our States are controlling their debts, reining in their expenses, and our Federal Government is not.

We kick the can down the road, go print more money, run up more debt. It is time to get it under control. Saving another penny on a dollar is a necessary step.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Tennessee's consistency.

We have seen a lot of these amendments. The problem is with the debate. You would think that we were not doing anything to reduce this deficit, that we were not cutting spending. The reality is the only committee in Congress that is actually cutting spending is the Appropriations Committee, and we have been cutting spending for the last 4 years.

Now, this bill that we have before us today meets with and falls within the budget resolution that was just adopted earlier this day, and, if we had wanted to reduce everything by 1 percent again, then we should have adopted a different budget resolution.

It is easy to say let's just take one penny out of every dollar. Who can't do that? We have taken much more than one penny out of every dollar as we have cut spending more and more in the appropriations process by the Appropriations Committee.

It is not that we don't want to reduce spending; we are reducing spending, but, of course, we could cut one more cent out of every dollar we spend. Who couldn't do that? Then we will have a

new baseline. You know what? Then we ought to cut one penny out of every dollar at that baseline. You know what? Then we will have another baseline, and we can cut one more penny out of that.

We are trying to do it smarter. We are trying to look at the needs of the agencies that we fund, reduce spending, and set priorities.

While I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayers dollars, this is not an approach that I can support.

While the President may have proposed a budget that exceeds this bill, the increases were paid for with proposals and gimmicks that would never be enacted. This bill makes the tough choices within an allocation that adheres to the current law.

While difficult tradeoffs had to be made—and difficult tradeoffs were made—there are accounts in this bill that I think we ought to be spending more money on. There are accounts in this bill that I think we ought to be spending less money on that are a higher priority to some other Members of Congress. That is kind of the nature of how the appropriations process works. Nobody gets everything they want.

One thing we have been consistent on for the fifth year in a row is that we have been reducing spending. We prioritize funding for critical infrastructure and our Nation's defense. Most of the increases that are in this budget this year that will be coming out of the overall 302(a)'s went to the national defense, the NNSA, our nuclear weapons programs.

We prioritize funding, as I said, for critical infrastructure. The President cut \$750 million—around that—out of the harbor maintenance trust fund. In trying to secure our inland waterways and our harbors for the commerce that our economy needs, we replaced that, which means we had to make even more difficult cuts in a lot of these agencies.

These tradeoffs were carefully weighed for their respective impacts and their responsibility; yet the gentlelady's amendment would propose an across-the-board cut on every one of these programs.

This makes no distinction between where we need to be spending or investing our infrastructure, promote jobs, and meet our national security needs and where we need to limit spending to meet our deficit reduction goals.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Let me say again, I appreciate the gentlewoman's consistent effort in making sure that we keep focused on addressing what is the number one problem in this country, and that is the debt this country faces, and this committee has been doing that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

The way you balance budgets is to have a robust economy, where everybody is helping to pull the ship forward. That isn't the case right now.

What we have dug out since 2008 was the largest recession since the Great Depression. America's chief strategic vulnerability throughout this period of time—for actually over a quarter century now—and our largest area of economic loss is energy.

□ 0110

It rests in energy. Since 2003, just since 2003, our country has spent \$2.3 trillion importing foreign petroleum. That is just petroleum. That is not a country that is self-reliant. That is a country that deeply needs energy security here at home.

The result of this amendment will be less investment in the sector most critical to helping us right this hole that we have dug for ourselves.

Can you imagine if that \$2.3 trillion had been spent in this country, the number of jobs we would have, the greater amount of income and revenue we would have flowing into people's pockets and also into the public sector where we have to pay the bills?

In addition to moving us backwards on the energy front, this amendment will be less investment in water resources, and we have \$62 billion worth of Army Corps projects alone that have sat on the shelf. We have no new starts in this bill. That is not a country on the grow. That is a country in retrenchment.

So this amendment, it isn't a 50 percent cut. It is meant to send a signal. I say to the gentlelady, as I said to the chair of the Ways and Means Committee today who turned away from me and walked to the back of the Chamber, you know, it is pretty hard to balance a budget when not everybody is at work, their wages have been cut, the middle class has shrunk, but then you don't put revenues on the table.

Some of those lucrative operations, these transnational corporations have operating offshore aren't bringing their money home. They are holding it over there.

Revenues need to be on the table and mandatory spending has to be on the table.

He walked away from me, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It was a rather interesting conversation.

The Appropriations Committee can't do this alone, and we certainly shouldn't do it in sectors where America truly is hurting.

At a time when unemployed Americans are losing jobless benefits and many young families struggle just to survive, we should be creating jobs and securing the American Dream, starting with a self-reliant energy future.

This bill underfunds that. The chairman has spoken eloquently to that. And it harms American economic

growth and energy growth and energy security, and it damages those portions of our budget that are critical to our national security: vital weapons programs, our Naval research reactor research, and nonproliferation funding.

We believe our bill builds America forward to achieve progress for our country again and not retrenchment.

So I oppose the gentlelady's amendment. I think she has the right spirit, but I think she is looking in the wrong place in terms of what we face as a country. I oppose her amendment.

I yield back my the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am just so delighted that my friend mentioned what we need is a robust economy because I agree.

The Obama economy has been abysmal and has been terrible for our country. And you are exactly right. The middle class has shrunk. Wages have been cut. All that has happened.

I know the American people are sick and tired of it, and they would like to get this country moving again. And the Obama economy has caused many of the problems that are in front of us.

I am so pleased, too, that she mentioned the \$2.3 trillion that we have spent importing oil. If you look at who has been importing a lot of that oil, OPEC, exporting that to us. OPEC is one of the top five holders of our debt. That adds to both our energy security and our national security problems. Mr. Chairman, it is time to open up our lands and drill here and drill now.

Now, quite frankly, a penny on a dollar is another way to engage rank-and-file employees. I have seen it work at the State level. I know other States have used that, as I said. Both Democrat and Republican Governors have done it. My State of Tennessee did this as we reduced the size and growth of the budget in our State.

By the way, we had to do it because we were the test case for Hillary Clinton's healthcare plan, and that just threw our budget all out of whack.

So yes, we found ourselves cutting about 9 cents across the board per department.

Do across-the-board cuts work? Yes. Do they send the right message? Absolutely. Do they engage the rank and file? You better believe it. Are they a step toward getting out-of-control spending under control? Yes, they are, and we need to do that.

Every man, woman, and child in this country, right now, has over \$56,000 worth of debt that they would be responsible for. That is a per person load for our \$18.2 trillion worth of debt. We have got \$18.2 trillion worth of debt, and we can't cut another penny out of a dollar?

The chairman has done a great job. They have the right focus. I think that what we do is give them another little push, engage the bureaucracy—which, by the way, they are not having to make the cuts that men and women and small businesses are having to make. It is the fair thing to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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 continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, from extreme flooding to extreme drought, the Missouri River basin has been hit very hard over the past few years. The families who live and work along the Missouri River have endured great hardships, and these events serve to highlight the importance of maintaining effective flood control infrastructure.

Though it is one of our region's greatest resources, the Missouri River would produce extreme, erosive, regular flooding and be mostly unfit for navigation if not for aggressive long-term management by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress first authorized the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, BSNP, in 1912, with the intention of mitigating flood risk and maintaining a navigable channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river in St. Louis. Though the BSNP's construction was completed in the 1980s, the Corps' ability to make adjustments as needed remain crucial to this day.

President Obama, in his fiscal year 2015 budget, requested \$47 million for the Missouri River Recovery Program, which would primarily go towards the funding of environmental restoration studies and projects. This funding dwarfs the insufficient \$9 million that was requested for the entire operations and maintenance of the aforementioned BSNP.

It is preposterous to think that environmental projects are more important than the protection of human life. I do

not take for granted the importance of river ecosystems. I grew up near the Missouri River, as did so many of the people I represent, yet we have reached a point in our Nation in which we value the welfare of fish and birds more than the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our priorities are backwards, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment will eliminate the Missouri River Ecosystem Recovery Program, or MRERP, a study that has become little more than a tool of the environmentalists for the promotion of returning the river to its most natural state, with little regard for the flood control, navigation, trade, power generation, or the people who depend on the Missouri River for their livelihoods.

The end of the study will in no way jeopardize the Corps' ability to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. MRERP is one of no fewer than 70 environmental and ecological studies focused on the Missouri River.

The people who have had to foot the bill for these studies, many of which take years to complete and are ultimately inconclusive, are the very people who have lost their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

Our vote today will also show our constituents that this Congress is aware of the gross disparity between the funding for environmental efforts and the funding for the protection of our citizens. This exact amendment has been passed by voice vote during the debate in the last three fiscal year appropriations bills, which were ultimately signed into law by President Obama. It is supported by the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers.

□ 0120

It is time for Congress to take a serious look at the water bill and funding priorities, and it is time we send a message to our Federal entities that manage our waterways.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support our Nation's river communities and encourage more balance and Federal funding for water infrastructure and management.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, after line 11, insert the following: SEC. 507. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase water to supplement or enhance the instream flow requirements in the State of California that are mandated under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, or the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, hydrologists tell us that California is facing the worst drought in 1,200 years. With the rain season officially over, our snowpack is just 3 percent of normal, and many reservoirs are already drawn down perilously. Californians are now threatened with draconian fines if they take too long in the shower.

This amendment forbids the Bureau of Reclamation from purchasing scarce water in California in the midst of this catastrophic drought for the purpose of dumping it in rivers to adjust the water temperature to nudge baby fish to swim into the ocean.

As ridiculous as this sounds, that is exactly what the Bureau of Reclamation has been doing throughout this drought. It is using money taken from families' taxes in order to purchase water that is desperately needed by these same families and then literally dumping it down the drain in front of them.

This exacerbates an already perilous scarcity of water while forcing the price of our remaining supplies even higher. It also makes a mockery of the sacrifices that every Californian is making to stretch every drop of water in their homes. And it undermines the moral authority of the government to demand further conservation from the people when it is squandering water so outrageously itself.

We don't know exactly how much the Bureau is spending for this purpose because they don't account for how their purchased water is used.

This measure would forbid them from wasting any of our water on such frivolities as adjusting water temperatures.

Now if this sounds harsh for the fish, let's remember that in a drought like this one, there would be no water in our rivers. There would be no fish. The dams make it possible to save the water from wet years so that we can get through the dry years. That doesn't work if we open floodgates in an extreme drought like this to make the fish happy.

This month, the Bureau of Reclamation released nearly 30,000 acre-feet of water from the New Melones Dam in my district for that purpose. That is enough water to meet the annual residential needs of a population of nearly 300,000 human beings for the express purpose of encouraging the offspring of some 29 steelhead trout to swim toward the ocean—which, by the way, they tend to do anyway. And to add insult to injury, almost all of these smolts will be eaten by predators before they reach the ocean.

So let me put this again and quite bluntly. In order to benefit a handful of steelhead trout, the Bureau sacrificed

enough water to meet the annual needs of a human population of 300,000. At \$700 per acre-foot, the cost of this exercise amounted to \$21 million.

This is the lunacy of the environmental left and the policies they have imposed on our State and our country. It needs to stop now. And to the extent that we can do so through the power of the purse, we must.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this McClintock amendment because it sounds like a solution in search of a problem.

This amendment seeks to undermine the Endangered Species Act by restricting the Bureau of Reclamation from expending funds on water for the purpose of managing endangered fish populations.

While I oppose the spirit of the amendment, I must also object to it because it does absolutely nothing. The Bureau of Reclamation does not purchase water for the purpose of temperature management. The Bureau of Reclamation does not purchase water now, and they have no plans to do it in fiscal year 2016. In fact, due to water scarcity, the price of water is too high.

The extreme drought in the West presents significant management challenges, and Bureau of Reclamation biologists should have every tool possible to make decisions and provide a safety net for species nearing extinction.

Instead of attempting to undermine the judgment of those professionals, we should be working on solutions to grow the water supply in California. That involves water reuse; increased efficiencies, which have already started; conservation; storm water capture; agricultural practices.

The dry West faces very difficult choices, and we want to walk alongside them but with solutions that make sense and that are capable of being implemented.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, perhaps from the damp State of Ohio, this might look like a solution in search of a problem. I would invite the gentlelady to come to California in the midst of this drought to see the devastation it is causing.

The Bureau just released 10 billion gallons for this stated purpose, to adjust river water temperatures and to nudge steelhead trout smolts to the ocean. They weren't coy about it. They were very, very clear. They have been very clear in their budget requests for this practice.

But let me, just for the sake of argument, accept the gentlelady's point that they have no plans to do so. Well, if that is the case, she should have no objections to this measure. The fact is, they not only have plans to do so, but

they have been doing so, and it is devastating what little precious water is remaining behind our precious reservoirs.

We will run out by the end of the summer if these practices continue. And if they continue and if we do, I think that the gentlelady will need to make an apology to the 38 million suffering people of California.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the requirement in section 323.4(a)(1)(ii) of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, or section 232.3(c)(1)(ii)(A) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, that activities identified in paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (f) of section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A)) must be established or ongoing in order to receive an exemption under such subsection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman from Idaho, Chairman SIMPSON.

Mr. Chair, the House has previously passed language to require the Army Corps of Engineers to apply the Clean Water Act as the Congress has passed it, not as the Corps may wish it to have been written. Unfortunately, the Corps has disregarded these efforts and imposed regulations that could actually prevent farmers from changing crops or fallowing fields during, especially, California's historic drought.

□ 0130

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act exempts from regulation the following: "Normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities such as plowing, seeding, cultivating, minor drainage, harvesting for the production of food, fiber, and forest products, or upland soil and water conservation practices."

No additional requirements are included, and these activities are specifically identified as exempt. However, the Corps and the EPA have used creative interpretations to drastically increase their jurisdiction beyond what Congress has intended.

In fact, the Corps states the following on their Web site:

If a property has been used for cattle grazing, the exemption does not apply if future activities would involve planting crops for food.

An operation is no longer established when the area on which it is conducted has been converted to another use or has lain idle.

Now, under this interpretation, a farmer switching from one crop to another, such as corn or tomatoes, would no longer be engaged in normal activities and could be subject to regulation.

As I mentioned earlier, in this time of record drought in California, a practice such as leaving a field fallow, as is happening now across California due to the historic droughts, means that replanting the following year, if possible, would be seen by the Corps as a new—not existing—activity triggering regulation and permitting requirements. This is not the intention of what Congress had years ago with the Clean Water Act.

This overreach could even prevent farmers from switching to less water-intensive crops, if they saw fit, during California's droughts for fear of an impossible morass of regulatory requirements or, with the involuntary cuts that have been underway, see that they would again be required to have new permits because of this misinterpretation by the Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the House has supported amendments I have sponsored on two other occasions. Language addressing this issue previously passed by voice vote and was included in the CR/Omnibus; yet the Corps has refused to recognize clear congressional intent and abandoned its interpretation.

My amendment, for the third time, will seek to prohibit funding for these creative interpretations. I urge your support of this effort to once again make clear the will of Congress.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). This amendment makes a significant change to the Clean Water Act regulations, one we should not be making late at night in an appropriations bill. It deserves thoughtful consideration. I think the gentleman probably would agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, under current law and regulation, activities that convert wetlands that occur as part of existing, ongoing farming, ranching, and silviculture activities do not require a section 404 wetlands permit.

Let me repeat that for my colleagues. The Clean Water Act explicitly exempts certain activities from regulation, and these include normal agricultural activities like plowing fields, planting and harvesting crops, and maintaining irrigation and drainage ditches.

Those exemptions were added by Congress in 1977. The 1977 law created the list of activity-based exemptions from normal farming, ranching, and forestry activities; but it also included safeguards to ensure that these exempted activities were not exploited by large-scale commercial interests. The regulations implementing those exemptions were completed in 1986 during the Reagan administration.

The underlying fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Appropriations bill before us already includes language in section 106 affirming that these activities exempted by Congress 38 years ago continue to be exempt. It clearly states that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to require a permit when these activities are conducted.

The gentleman from California wants to go further than the language already in the bill with his amendment. In his view, wetlands should be able to be filled even when a farm has been converted to another use or farm fields have lain idle so long that modifications to the hydrology are necessary to conduct operations.

I say to my colleague from California, it is hard to understand how any discharge can be normal for an operation that isn't established.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleague why this concerns me. According to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, in my home State, since the late 18th century, 90 percent of Ohio's wetland resources have been destroyed or degraded through draining, filling, or other modification. Because of the valuable functions the remaining wetlands perform, it is imperative to ensure that all impacts to wetlands are properly mitigated.

Wetlands help filter impurities from water. Sediment settles out of runoff, and contaminants bind to plant surfaces in wetlands resulting in improved water quality. Wetlands perform other valuable functions, including reducing flood flow and shoreline erosion control. They are almost like lungs. They are the lungs of the Earth and connect the land to the water.

In Ohio, we also depend upon our wetlands as haven for rare and endangered plants, and one-third of all the endangered species depends on wetlands for survival. Many wetlands are important fish spawning and nursery areas, as well as nesting, resting, and feeding areas for waterfowl.

We should make certain that any changes we make to wetlands policy that may result in the destruction of these remaining very important ecological areas are evaluated carefully and we do not overturn nearly 40 years of policy lightly.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I must respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments by my

colleague from Ohio on that, but in practice in California, they are already moving well beyond established law in the 404 section that would indeed allow for normal activities to be exempted.

I say "normal activities." It is normal for farmers to change crops, to rotate crops as what fits the land, that fits available water supply, that fits what the farmer deems to do with his or her land. There is this thing called property rights in Ohio and California.

It is amazing to me that the Army Corps continues to misinterpret and creatively interpret the 404 exemptions because, in practice in northern California, we have seen that the ability to switch crops, to do as you see fit with your land within the permit, with the exemptions of the 404, are being violated.

We have attempted to work with the Army Corps in northern California on that when I was told recently that they would ignore this section and ignore the efforts we have made previously.

That is why this amendment is necessary, not only to send a message, but to remove the funding that they would try to use to stop the cultural practices of farmers across the country, especially as it seems to be affecting northern California, to do as they see fit within the exemptions that are already in the law, but seemingly outside of what the wishes of the Army Corps are.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the "aye" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver water to the Trinity River above the minimum requirements of the Trinity Record of Decision or to supplement flows in the Klamath River.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, as was discussed earlier, California is seeing the most severe drought in many, many years. Our own Governor has recently ordered a mandatory 25 percent water rationing across the State.

Despite these dire conditions which have idled hundreds of thousands of productive farmland and caused billions of dollars in economic damage, the Bureau of Reclamation has unnecessarily diverted water from the Central Valley Project which serves the entire State, 20 million or more people, to salmon habitat in the Klamath River. I say “unnecessarily” because the chinook salmon of the Klamath River are not threatened or endangered and have, in fact, been returning in near record numbers.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau has misused over 100,000 acre feet of water over the last 2 years, which will be enough for up to 800,000 people or even 30,000 acres of cropland.

What is more, stakeholders have already reached an agreement. All the stakeholders in the area have a previous agreement to ensure enough water for both humans and for salmon, according to the Trinity Record of Decision.

□ 0140

The Bureau's actions go above and beyond the requirements of the agreement and negatively impact the very stakeholders that agreed to it, including my constituents.

Two years ago, a bipartisan group from this Congress sent a letter urging the Bureau of Reclamation not to carry out this activity. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply prohibits the Bureau of Reclamation from releasing water beyond the record of decision it is a party to and ensures that cities and farms have access to as much water as possible, especially during this acute drought period. It also maintains the river flows that stakeholders have agreed to and forces the Bureau of Reclamation to keep its promises to the people of California.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment but, believe me, with sympathy toward what the people of the West are facing. I just hope that we can get through this situation reasonably and seamlessly somehow. I oppose the amendment because it would lock in a specific operating regime, regardless of facts on the ground.

In 2014, the Bureau of Reclamation made the decision not to release water above the minimum requirement, clearly showing they are realistic and willing to change to meet the circumstances at hand. I hope the gentleman agrees. Reclamation monitored temperatures and fish health to balance risks.

Then last September, the Bureau of Reclamation did release flows because of a deadly detection of a parasite impacting salmon. Yet we must ensure that the massive fish kill of 2002 doesn't happen again. This balancing act is really difficult, but we cannot

sacrifice the environment either. We must find a way to balance the needs of people and the environment in the West.

Further, in the Klamath Basin, we must meet our obligations to the tribes who have relied on the river. None of this will be easy. We should not be locking in an operating regime that ignores science and does not allow us to adapt to changing circumstances.

On this basis, I oppose the gentleman's amendment and honestly hope, as a country, we can do what is necessary to help the West.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, well, I appreciate that sentiment on helping the West. Perhaps a pipeline from Ohio with all that excess water during flood flows would help us out. But short of doing that right now, indeed, coming back to what is happening with the fish we are speaking of in these systems, the salmon in the Klamath River that we are speaking of are not in danger and are near record numbers in that leg.

This amendment will assist actually downstream on the Sacramento River the endangered winter-run chinook with this additional flow. So even though there may have been detected a parasite, it is not affecting natively what we are talking about here.

And this goes beyond the Record of Decision with agreed water flow amounts of the stakeholders involved. So this is more by whim of BOR once again deciding that additional flows, based on no science beyond the Record of Decision, are taking valuable water away, and it could happen again in this record drought year.

We need not lose the opportunity to have these waters, or other ones talked about earlier tonight, based on the whim of a bureaucracy somewhere that really doesn't seem to be paying attention to the needs of California's farms, cities, and that the water is actually being used to the best benefit of the fish being debated in any one of these systems. So diverting more water away from this is not productive. It doesn't fulfill any scientific goals.

With that, I ask the “aye” votes of this Chamber.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, before I make a motion, let me thank you for your excellent stewardship of this bill through general order, through the amendment debate in the wee hours of

the morning. We all appreciate it. It has been fair and helped move it along in an orderly manner.

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. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HONORING THE ARKANSAS TOWNS OF MAYFLOWER AND VILONIA

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, April 27, marked the 1-year anniversary of the devastation that occurred when a tornado struck the Mayflower, Vilonia, and Paron communities in Arkansas, destroying more than 400 homes and costing 16 people their lives. The theme of this year's anniversary is, “Remember our loss, celebrate our recovery.”

I have had the opportunity to visit with folks in these communities and to hear their stories of courage and resilience. While I mourn those that are lost, I am thankful for the health and safety of Martin and Kristin Patton and the miraculous survival of their family. Their home literally disintegrated around them.

I am thankful for the leadership of Vilonia Mayor James Firestone and Mayflower Mayor Randy Holland who, along with county and local leaders, are charting a course toward the future. In the face of this tragedy, they furnish us with an inspirational model of solidarity and hope.

I applaud the recovery efforts and dedication of these great Arkansas communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Paron Community in Pulaski County and the Faulkner County towns of Vilonia and Mayflower, Arkansas have experienced tragedy and disaster over these past years, but their resilience and determination to rebuild and recover has never been more prevalent.

Four years ago, on April 25, 2011, an EF2 tornado struck Vilonia, killing four of its 4,000 citizens.

Not two years after that, on March 29, 2013, the residents of Mayflower were left reeling after being flooded with 5,000 barrels of heavy crude oil that erupted from the burst Pegasus Pipeline.

The ability to bounce back after such misfortune is a testament to the great determination and toughness of the townspeople of Vilonia and Mayflower.

And that ability was put to yet another test when, on April 27, 2014, the Mayflower,

Vilonia, and Paron communities were struck by a monster of a tornado.

That tornado was classified as an EF4 with reported winds approaching 200 miles per hour. The half-mile wide twister left a swath of destruction that stretched for over forty miles. In fifty-six minutes, more than 400 homes were destroyed and sixteen people lost their lives. The National Weather Service stated that this was the single deadliest tornado to hit the state of Arkansas since 1968—nearly fifty years earlier.

This past Monday, April 27, marked the one-year anniversary of the devastation wrecked during this horrific storm. The theme of this year's anniversary is, "Remember our loss; celebrate our recovery."

Over the past few weeks, I have had the opportunity to visit with folks from Mayflower and Vilonia and to hear their stories of courage and resilience.

While I mourn those lost in the April 2014 tornados, I am thankful for the health and safety of Martin and Kristin Patton and the miraculous survival of their family. Their home literally completely disintegrated around them and I certainly join them in counting their blessings of moving into their new home last weekend, 364 days after that frightening evening.

I am thankful of the leadership of Vilonia Mayor James Firestone on the job for six and one half years; four of them in a "recovery mode." I am grateful for his leadership with that of the city council in carefully charting a course toward the future.

I am thankful for Mayflower Mayor Randy Holland, who, with county and local leaders, is crafting new economic development directions for this growing community.

In the face of tragedy, they, along with all those who selflessly provided financial support and thousands of volunteer hours, furnish us with an inspirational model of solidarity and hope.

As these brave communities continue to recover and rebuild, I applaud them for their dedication to their neighbors, economy, and community.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE UNDERLYING OBJECTIVES OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-30)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

My Administration fully supports the underlying objectives of the recommendations that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (the "Commission") offered in January. These recommendations represent an important step forward in protecting the long-term viability of the All-Volunteer Force, improving quality-of-life for service members and their families, and ensuring the fiscal sustainability of the military compensation and retirement systems.

As I directed in my letter of March 30, my team has worked with the Commission to further analyze the recommendations and identify areas of agreement. At this time I am prepared to support specific proposals for 10 of the Commission's 15 recommendations, either as proposed or with modifications that have been discussed among the Department of Defense, other agencies, and the Commission. These include the following:

Survivor Benefit Plan
Financial Education
Medical Personnel Readiness
Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Collaboration
Child Care
Service Member Education
Transition Assistance
Nutritional Financial Assistance
Dependent Space-Available Travel
Report on Military Connected Dependents

In some instances, the Department of Defense is already taking actions to implement these recommendations, and I will direct the Department to develop plans to complete this implementation. In those areas where legislation is required, I expect the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the Congress on my behalf the relevant legislative proposals, which I recommend be enacted without delay.

With respect to the remaining recommendations, given their complexity and our solemn responsibility to ensure that any changes further the objectives above, we will continue working with the Commission to understand how the following proposals would affect the All-Volunteer Force:

Blended Retirement System
Reserve Component Duty Statuses
Exceptional Family Member's Support

Commissary and Exchange Consolidation

I believe there is merit in all of these recommendations and that they deserve careful consideration and study. I will ensure that the Congress is kept apprised of this ongoing work.

Finally, I agree with the Commission that we need to continue to improve the military health care system. The health care reforms proposed in my Fiscal Year 2016 Budget are a good first step and offer service members, retirees, and their families more control and choice over their health care decisions. This remains a critical issue, and my Administration will work with the Commission and interested Members of Congress in the coming months to develop additional reform proposals for consideration as part of my Fiscal Year 2017 Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 2015.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today after 4 p.m. and

May 1 on account of attending the promotion ceremony of her son Raymond Wagner, III to Captain in the United States Army.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.) the House adjourned until today, Friday, May 1, 2015, 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:

1318. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0248; FRL-9926-24] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1319. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Phenol, 2-(2H-benzotriazol-2-yl)-6-dodecyl-4-methyl-; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0418; FRL-9925-78] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1320. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arkansas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Fee Regulations [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0054; FRL-9926-91-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1321. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0969; FRL-9926-81-Region 5] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1322. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, and the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incinerator Units [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0763; FRL-9927-00-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1323. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Stage I Regulations [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0846; FRL-9927-10-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1324. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — General Permits and Permits by Rule for the Federal Minor New Source Review Program in Indian Country for Five Source Categories [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0151; FRL-9919-85-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ95) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1325. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy Labeling Rule (RIN: 3084-AB03) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1326. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Authority of DOE Protective Force Officers That Are Federal Employees To Make Arrests Without a Warrant for Certain Crimes (RIN: 1994-AA03) received April 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1327. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Vermilion Snapper [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XD734) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1328. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD844) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1329. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 32 [Docket No.: 140501394-5279-02] (RIN: 0648-BE20) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1330. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD874) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1331. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 101214615-5254-02] (RIN: 0648-BA61) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1332. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Dela-

ware River; Marcus Hook, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0129] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1333. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor; Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0018] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1334. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Vessel Fire and Escort, Port of New York, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0189] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1335. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electrical Equipment in Hazardous Locations [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0850] (RIN: 1625-AC00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1336. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Ontonagon River, Ontonagon, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0082] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1337. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hoquiam River, Hoquiam, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1029] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1338. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Tesoro Terminal Protest; Port of Long Beach Harbor; Pacific Ocean, California [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0163] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1339. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Helicopter Association (NHA) Red Bull Helicopter Demonstration; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0137] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1340. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Sellwood Bridge Construction, Willamette River, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0187] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1341. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Marina del Rey Fireworks Show, Santa Monica Bay; Marina del Rey, California [Docket No.:

USCG-2015-0155] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1342. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum Fireworks Display; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1343. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Helicopter Association (NHA) Red Bull Helicopter Demonstration; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0137] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1344. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Barge-based Fireworks, Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0213] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1345. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Eastern Branch Elizabeth River; Norfolk, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0202] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1346. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to 38 CFR Part 3 (RIN: 2900-AP33) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1347. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating Certain Delegations of Authority in VA Medical Regulations (RIN: 2900-AP17) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. House Joint Resolution 43. Resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (Rept. 114-99). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr.

BUCHSON, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 2123. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish non-formulary drugs and medicines to veterans diagnosed with mental health disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2124. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; 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. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 2125. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to revise its sponsorship identification rules so as to require the disclosure of the names of significant donors to persons paying for or furnishing broadcast matter or origination cablecasting matter that is political matter or matter involving the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2126. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from replacing ICD-9 with ICD-10 in implementing the HIPAA code set standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. KATKO, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 2127. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to limit access to expedited airport security screening at an airport security checkpoint to participants of the PreCheck program and other known low-risk passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2129. A bill to strengthen the disclosure requirements for creditors under the Truth in Lending Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 2130. A bill to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 2131. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. DOLD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2132. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency retrofit pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SIREs, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide additional training opportunities under the Transition Assistance Program to members of the Armed Forces who are being separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require review of the economic cost of adding a species to the list of endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide certain individuals with information on employment support services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2136. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for quality reviews of benefit decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2137. A bill to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 2138. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified registered nurse anesthetists in such hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Mr.

JONES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2139. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide notice of average times for processing claims and percentage of claims approved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2140. A bill to promote freedom, human rights, and the rule of law as part of United States-Vietnam relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HUIZENG of Michigan):

H.R. 2141. A bill to require consultation with Congress, insurers, and consumers with respect to domestic insurance and international insurance standards, regulations, or frameworks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for facilities using a qualified methane conversion technology to provide transportation fuels and chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2144. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2145. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing shortages and long appointment waiting times; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2147. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding featuring the likeness of a woman on the twenty dollar bill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to require a substance abuse risk assessment and targeted drug testing as a condition for the receipt of unemployment benefits, and for other purposes;

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. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 2149. A bill to establish a grant program to ensure that students in high-need schools have equal access to a quality education delivered by an effective, diverse workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGU, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-

ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SPIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2150. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the calculation, oversight, and accountability of non-DSH supplemental payments under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 2152. A bill to ban meat and poultry products processed in China from school lunches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2153. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinvest in our communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reduce injuries and deaths caused by cell phone use and texting while driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. FUDGE:

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOST, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the practices of recovery audit contractors under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; 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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year tax-free distributions from individual retirement plans for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the

credit for energy-efficient existing homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for one year the credit for energy-efficient new homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the employer wage credit for employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the enhanced charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction for mortgage insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2164. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the 15-year straight-line cost recovery for qualified leasehold improvements, qualified restaurant buildings and improvements, and qualified retail improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the above-the-line deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans, to help restore natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources of the United States, to train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, to promote the value of public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, 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 Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SCHRAEDER):

H.R. 2168. A bill to make the current Dungeness crab fishery management regime permanent and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to require the President to transmit the annual budget of the Social Security Administration without revisions to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2170. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23rd Headquarters Special

Troops, known as the "Ghost Army", collectively, in recognition of its unique and incredible service during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2171. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Pole Creek Wilderness, the Owyhee River Wilderness, and the North Fork Owyhee Wilderness and to authorize the continued use of motorized vehicles for livestock monitoring, herding, and grazing in certain wilderness areas in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 2172. A bill to establish a pilot toll credit market place program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2173. A bill to require States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2175. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to ensure oversight and cost savings in the pricing and contracting of prescription drug benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2176. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2177. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2178. A bill to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from timber sales conducted on National Forest System land, to reduce payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to reflect such counties' receipt of timber sale revenues, to strengthen stewardship end result contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception from the passive loss rules for investments in high technology research small business pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2180. A bill to authorize grantees of Department of Justice grants to set up task forces on policing in local communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 2181. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize certain aliens who have earned a Ph.D. degree from a United States institution of higher education in a field of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics to be admitted for permanent residence and to be exempted from the numerical limitations on H-1B non-immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2182. A bill to deregulate interstate commerce with respect to parimutuel wagering on horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2183. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consider Brunswick County, North Carolina, to be part of the same metropolitan statistical area as Wilmington, North Carolina; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the phasedown of the credit percentage for the dependent care tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2185. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from using extraordinary measures to prevent the Government from reaching the statutory debt limit, or using extraordinary measures once such limit has been reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2186. A bill to establish a pilot grant program to support career and technical education exploration programs in middle schools and high schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2187. A bill to direct the Securities Exchange Commission to revise its regulations regarding the qualifications of natural persons as accredited investors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations to provide specialized housing and supportive services for elderly persons who are the primary caregivers of children that are related to such persons; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 2189. A bill to direct the President to submit to Congress a report on fugitives currently residing in other countries whose extradition is sought by the United States and related matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2190. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve procedures for legal justice for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs.

BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DOLD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LEE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2192. A bill to improve the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating

to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 2194. A bill to reauthorize the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal years 2016 through 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. DELANEY:

H. Res. 236. A resolution expressing condolences to the family of Dr. Warren Weinstein, and commemorating the life and work of Dr. Warren Weinstein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 237. A resolution declaring that achieving the primary goal of the National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease of the Department of Health and Human Services to prevent and effectively treat Alzheimer's disease by 2025 is an urgent national priority; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 238. A resolution promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2015, which includes bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 239. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to childhood stroke and recognizing May 2015 as "National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 240. A resolution recognizing the economic, cultural, and political contributions of the Southeast Asian American community at this time of the 40th anniversary of the Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide, and the end of the Vietnam War and Secret War in Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 241. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2015 as "Alcohol Re-

sponsibility Month" and supporting the goals and ideals of responsible decisions regarding alcohol; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 242. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week, the week of May 3 through 9, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2129.

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 regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 2131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2133.

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. OLSON:

H.R. 2134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2142.

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 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressional power to provide for public financing of presidential campaigns arises under the General Welfare Clause, Art. I, Sec. 8, of the U. S. Constitution.

In *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 91 (1976), the Supreme Court upheld the congressional power to enact public financing of presidential elections under this Clause. The Supreme Court stated with regard to the provisions in the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 establishing a presidential public financing system, "In this case, Congress was legislating for the 'general welfare'—to reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising."

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 6, Congress has the authority to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 2148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2150.

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. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare) and Clause 3 (Commerce) "Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare"

"Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate Commerce"

The Medicare Audit Improvement Act makes several changes to the way hospital audits are conducted which involves at least three parties: a hospital, a private Medicare contractor who conducts audits and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. During the auditing process, transactions take place between these parties which is what constitutes this bill as regulating commerce. Further, Medicare is considered to be constitutional as part of providing for the general welfare and therefore any changes to Medicare would fall under this provision as well.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2157.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2158.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2159.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2160.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2161.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2162.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2163.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2164.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2165.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2166.

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. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 2170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to 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) of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which allows Congress to regulate Commerce among the several States

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 2173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, . . .

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the US Constitution: The Congress shall have power to borrow Money on the credit of the United States; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution. 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. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 2185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . pay the Debts"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . borrow Money on the credit of the United States;"

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties,

Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States . . .

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 156: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 213: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 232: Mr. YOHO and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 251: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 292: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 329: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 335: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 358: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 359: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 379: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 402: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 465: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REED, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 511: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 535: Mr. COFFMAN, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 539: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SIREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 540: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 546: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 563: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 578: Mr. BUCK and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 592: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 606: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 609: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 616: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 619: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 624: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 625: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 649: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 672: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 702: Mr. COLE and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 727: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 738: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 767: Mr. COLE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 774: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 784: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 789: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 793: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 799: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 842: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. GRANGER, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 868: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 879: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 881: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 902: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 911: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 915: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 921: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DENT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 939: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 952: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 980: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 985: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 989: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1060: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1062: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1089: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1094: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1174: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1188: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1192: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HARPER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1203: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1220: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HARDY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1250: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1258: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1266: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1282: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1299: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1300: Mr. ISSA and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1308: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1310: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1323: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1331: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1356: Mr. POLIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1364: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1375: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1384: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1399: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1414: Mr. DELANEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1439: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1462: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1464: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1475: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1476: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1503: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1519: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1555: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1559: Mr. KIND, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1567: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1571: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1598: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1599: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1600: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1602: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 1608: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1610: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1624: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1633: Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1634: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1635: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1664: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1666: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1674: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1713: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1714: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1718: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1728: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1734: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1736: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1737: Mr. TURNER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 1739: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1752: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1768: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1769: Mr. COOK and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1786: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1795: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1801: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1814: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1818: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1853: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1859: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1901: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1908: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1924: Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1937: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1956: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1957: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1958: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1959: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1960: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1961: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1994: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2006: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2007: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2025: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2031: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 2033: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2068: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2109: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2121: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.J. Res. 22: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. HILL.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HILL, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. RUSSELL.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. ZINKE.
H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 14: Ms. GRAHAM.
H. Res. 54: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Res. 56: Mr. TROTT and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 110: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H. Res. 112: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 181: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 186: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 203: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 216: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 224: Mr. STEWART and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 226: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 235: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of April 29, 2015]

OFFERED BY MS. DONNA F. EDWARDS

The amendment to be offered by Representative Donna F. Edwards or a designee to H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. DENT

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits" and identified by regulation identification number 1904-AC87.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$125,000,000)".

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$105,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 26: 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 expand plutonium pit production capacity at the PF-4 facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. ELLISON

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$45,000,000)".

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$45,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MS. TITUS

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 25, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$150,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and

Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. QUIGLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 30: Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$167,050,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$167,050,000)”.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MS. DELBENE

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are procured from a manufacturer that is part of the national technology and industrial base.