



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 2015

No. 105

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 8, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING 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.

DOES THE U.S. HAVE A PLAN TO DEFEAT ISIS?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President "avoids the battle, complains, and misses opportunities." Those were the words of Leon Panetta, President Obama's former Secretary of Defense and CIA Director, in 2011.

At the time, Panetta, along with military commanders and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recommended that the United States leave 24,000 troops in Iraq to prevent that country from fall-

ing apart and becoming chaotic. According to Panetta, the administration was "so eager to rid itself of Iraq that it was willing to withdraw rather than lock in arrangements that would preserve American influence and our interests."

So the President ignored the advice of his own Secretary of Defense and top commanders and pulled troops out of Iraq in 2011. The timing, just before the 2012 Presidential election, to me, appeared to be based on the politics of political convenience, not our own national interests.

In any event, what is taking place today in 2015? Enter the Islamic State, ISIS. ISIS took advantage of the power vacuum left by America's absence. So today ISIS is stronger than ever, spreading its reign of terror throughout the region.

ISIS practices religious genocide against people that don't agree with it. They have redefined the term "barbarian" to an all new low. They rape, pillage, loot, behead, and burn those in this ISIS war against the world's people.

ISIS not only controls a massive amount of territory in the Middle East, it also controls the minds of thousands of foreign fighters, many from the United States. It is a sophisticated criminal enterprise that uses any and all ways to recruit, fundraise, and spread terror. It even uses American social media companies to promote its cause. Through American companies like Twitter, ISIS is instantly and freely spreading its cancer of Islamic extremism to teenagers, recruiting them to join the jihad and then launch attacks on the streets of America.

Since the President announced his campaign against ISIS, we have seen embarrassing results. Even the President admitted that the United States did not have a complete strategy.

The ISIS terror has been going on for over a year and we don't have a plan to

defeat them? This doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

The United States must answer this question: Is ISIS a national security threat to us? If the answer is yes, then we must defeat them; and Congress needs to weigh in on this and make this decision.

If we decide that ISIS is a national security threat, then, of course, we need strategy, a complete strategy. The administration's plan so far is to train mercenaries to fight ISIS. However, just this week, Secretary of Defense Carter admitted that the United States has trained, get this, 60 so-called moderate Syrian rebels to fight ISIS—just 60.

The \$500 million program that was supposed to fund 3,000 fighters before the end of 2015 has trained 60. So if I do my math correctly, Mr. Speaker, we are spending about \$8 million per fighter right now. That is abysmal. That is no way to fight and win a war against terror.

Also, there are more Americans fighting with ISIS rebels than we have trained fighters to fight against ISIS. Meanwhile in Iraq, just 8,800 fighters have been trained to fight ISIS compared to the goal of 24,000.

This administration's strategy to defeat ISIS seems to be in chaos. Even the Kurds want to do their own fighting, and they have asked us for military support. Our allies want to send direct aid to the Kurds, but the administration won't let them do that. They have to send it through Baghdad for some reason.

It is time for the administration to stop being indecisively weak and do the obvious. It needs to lead in this war against ISIS, and it needs to listen to the commanders.

The United States needs to act and have a plan to defeat this determined, well-financed enemy. It is a terrorist enterprise that is at war with us.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 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.

H4867

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last month Congress dealt with a trade package that centered on trade promotion authority; and those actions, while important, were really just the beginning of a very long process.

Many important provisions of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the TPP, are still unresolved. There is a meeting at the end of this month in Hawaii where the finance ministers of 12 countries come together in an attempt to resolve these final questions.

As I pointed out in my last meeting with the President, while I think trade promotion authority is important and worthy of support, that support does not imply support for the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Indeed, because of the protections we built into the trade promotion authority, it sets an appropriately high standard for approval. Everybody in America will have several months to examine the proposal if an agreement is reached to see if it measures up before the treaty can even be voted on by Congress.

I am hopeful that we can use this time to clarify and refine areas, for example, the investor state dispute process. While the United States' investor state protections for public health and consumers are stronger than for most countries and are separate from the foreign investor state models that are being used by the United States Chamber of Commerce to promote the interests of Big Tobacco to undercut efforts to discourage smoking, there is still room for us to improve and clarify the American model, and we should do so.

Another important area deals with trade enforcement. Agreements that look good on paper, if they are not enforceable or enforced, are essentially meaningless. It is extremely important for the administration to demonstrate its commitment to enforcement.

We are trying to help with legislation that I have introduced in the House that we have been able to get in part of the Senate package that would create a trade enforcement fund dedicated to help make sure agreements are enforced.

Another step the administration could take immediately is to deal with disturbing actions in Peru that seem to undercut commitments that were made in the existing Peru free trade agreement dealing with illegal logging. It appears that Peru has backtracked on its commitments and that illegally harvested timber is finding its way into international markets and, indeed, into the United States. It would be a simple act for the administration to take that would demonstrate its commitment to strong enforcement by starting with Peru right now.

Another area that I am working on deals with access to medicines. It appears that the TPP draft falls short on

incentives for affordability and consumer protections and the trade promotion authority objective to "ensure that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines." We need some work here.

The May 10 agreement that was struck in 2007, which I was pleased to participate in, struck the right balance, creating incentives for innovation in pharmaceutical research and access to timely and affordable medicine for developing countries. This was achieved in part by requiring changes to provisions dealing with patent linkage where it looks like TPP is moving in the wrong direction.

The TPP includes new provisions which, while not addressed in the May 10 agreement, are inconsistent with its spirit and its intent of ensuring timely access to affordable medicines in developing countries. For example, with biologic medicines, it appears the United States is seeking both patent linkage and 12 years of data exclusivity for all countries. The former would require a change in U.S. law, and the latter would prevent America from changing our laws to lower the exclusivity period, as has been proposed in the President's own budget proposal. The combination of these two would have enormous cost implications both at home and abroad.

These are examples where I am working to make sure the final agreement measures up to the criteria we have established in the trade promotion authority.

I urge the administration and my colleagues to be clear about our intent and our expectations in order for any final agreement to be worthy of broad support.

BACKPACK BUDDIES

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of meeting with Doug Erwin. Doug is an extraordinary member of our West Virginia community who started the charitable organization called Backpack Buddies.

In the summer, Backpack Buddies gives meal supplements to children in elementary, middle, and high schools who received free or reduced lunches during the school year. Oftentimes, the meal that they receive at school is the only food that they eat all day.

Doug became concerned about what these children did for food during the summer. That is when Doug started Backpack Buddies.

For the last 3 years, communities in my district in the great State of West Virginia have come together to raise money to provide food to these children so they can get the extra help they need during the summer. Backpack Buddies is serving, now, over 1,600 children in Putnam, Boone, Cabell, and Kanawha Counties this summer.

I would like to thank Doug, the business leaders in our community, and the volunteers who help make Backpack Buddies possible.

WAR ON COAL

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. On a separate issue, Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, President Obama sent two of his top cronies in his war on coal, Interior Secretary Sally Jewell and Office of Surface Mining Director Joseph Pizarchik, to my home State of West Virginia.

The apparent purpose of their visit was to seek input for a new Obama regulation that is estimated to kill 80,000 coal jobs, but their rule had already been submitted for final review. They are not interested in hearing from West Virginians about the impact of their policies. Instead, they are checking a box.

It is clear that nothing will stop this President from trying to implement his radical environmental agenda, and I will continue to do everything in my power to fight back on behalf of all West Virginians. That is why, this year, I introduced H.R. 1644, the STREAM Act, which will stop the President's antimining regulations. I also included a provision in the House budget resolution that calls for defunding that regulation, and I will work with the appropriators to make sure it is not funded.

I hope my colleagues in this Chamber will join me in this fight.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United, we have seen a massive wave of secret spending in our political system. There was over \$100 million in dark, unregulated, and anonymous money spent in the 2014 midterm election cycle; and with the Presidential race right around the corner, that number is expected to balloon to over \$600 million.

While the problem is easy to identify, the solution is far more difficult to achieve. Reluctantly, I have concluded that it is necessary to amend our Constitution to address a long line of case law that began before Citizens United and prevents the Congress from meaningfully regulating campaign expenditures. The constitutional amendment must not only overturn Citizens United, but the Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club PAC v. Bennett decision, which struck down an Arizona law that allowed public financing of a candidate if their opponent exceeded certain spending limits.

The amendment is simple. It would allow Congress to set reasonable limits on expenditures and allow States to set up public financing for candidates if they choose to do so.

□ 1015

I first ran for Congress in 2000, in a campaign that turned out to be the

most expensive in U.S. history and helped propel new campaign finance reform. It was this first-hand experience which convinced me that our elections have increasingly come to be polluted by ever-increasing amounts of unregulated outside spending.

Millions of dollars in soft money, spending that avoided limits because of misguided legal distinctions between contributions to a candidate and independent expenditures in support of a candidate, plagued that 2000 race and almost every major Federal race since.

On my very first day in Congress, I cosponsored the McCain-Feingold Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, which attempted to ban soft money expenditures and allowed for public financing of campaigns. The bill passed, and for a brief window, the campaign finance system became more transparent and limited. That was, sadly, short lived.

With Citizens United, the Supreme Court struck down decades of restrictions on corporate campaign spending and freed corporations to spend unlimited funds to run campaign advertisements.

The court has also allowed wealthy individuals and groups to spend with impunity, with only a theoretical restriction that they do not coordinate with campaigns, but the reality is that the FEC has dismissed 29 cases in which super-PACs were suspected of illegally coordinating with candidates without even investigating the claims.

Frustrating as it is for a candidate to contend with attacks by super-PACs or soft money, as I was, disclosure laws at least allow us to alert voters to the special interest which is behind those expenditures. Candidates being drowned out in attacks paid for by dark money, however, don't have that luxury.

Groups who raise dark money do so by exploiting IRS regulations, designating them "social welfare nonprofits," which allow them to operate tax exempt and raise unlimited money completely anonymously.

Nothing about funneling millions in secret dollars to support campaigns could be construed to be in the interest of social welfare—nothing. Social welfare nonprofits are supposed to limit their political activity, but IRS audits, even of groups that spend vast amounts of their time and budget in support of candidates, are extremely rare.

Investigations into complaints of abuse can take years, at which point an election will long be over, the damage done.

The Supreme Court has overturned decades of legal precedent, the regulatory process is at a standstill, and still, we watch billions pour into campaigns and in increasingly anonymous fashion.

Sadly, we are left with one option, a constitutional amendment that allows Congress to set reasonable limits on both donations and expenditures and shines the light of day on both.

IRAN

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues to express a deep concern about the ongoing negotiations with Iran over the country's nuclear capabilities.

As many of my colleagues have noted on the floor of this House, preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is critical to securing peace in the region and protecting U.S. interests, including our close ally Israel.

It was good to hear Secretary Kerry's recent commitment not "to shave anywhere at the margins in order to just get an agreement" and to work for an agreement that will pass scrutiny. However, media reports from the negotiations in Vienna indicate that Iran has tried to renegotiate the previously released framework and continues to demand further concessions from international negotiators.

Among the latest demands from Tehran is that all United Nations sanctions against the country, including the ban on the import or export of conventional arms, be lifted as part of any deal.

Well, I have a response to that demand: unacceptable. Lifting the arms embargo would serve only to further destabilize the Middle East and accelerate Iran's arming of Shiite militias.

The Iranians have also sought to keep hidden Iran's current and previous efforts to gain nuclear weapons capability. How can the international community know with certainty that Iran is complying with an agreement to reduce significantly its enrichment activities if the full extent of these activities is kept secret?

It defies logic that such a request should be made and makes far less sense for such a request to be given any serious consideration.

Likewise, demands to limit IAEA inspectors to select sites, to install absurd bureaucratic processes to access additional sites, and to prohibit altogether inspections of so-called military sites should be fully rejected.

Ultimately, it is critical that any deal prevents Iran from gaining nuclear weapons capabilities and ensures that international inspectors can validate their adherence to an agreement's negotiated terms. If Iran cannot negotiate in good faith, then perhaps it is time to leave the negotiating table altogether.

STRONG STEM EDUCATION POLICY

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in a few short hours, we are going to be voting in this Chamber on a rewrite of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is long overdue.

It has been 13 years since the No Child Left Behind Act was passed, and many educators and probably all Members have heard a lot of the clumsy and unworkable provisions that need a rewrite. More importantly, there are other reasons why it is time for a new law for our K-12 system.

Educating our children is a dynamic process, and everything from technology in the classroom, as well as the workforce needs of our national economy, have drastically changed in the last 13 years.

Clearly, as a nation, we need to use this rewrite of Federal education law as an opportunity to equip our Nation, and particularly our children and grandchildren, with the tools they need to succeed.

One area which we all know needs updating and strengthening is the area of STEM education—science, technology, engineering, and math. Employers all across the country are desperate to try and find incoming young people into our workforce who have these skills to succeed.

The good news is, in the last 13 years, STEM occupations have grown three times faster than non-STEM occupations. In addition, the average income is two times higher in terms of the wages of STEM-educated workers compared to non-STEM. That is the good news.

The bad news is that only 16 percent of graduating high school seniors are interested in STEM. If you drill down deeper, young girls and young minorities are woefully underrepresented in the single digits.

Clearly, we need to move stronger as a nation in the area of STEM. If you look globally, China is producing 23 percent of the world's STEM degree graduates—the U.S., only 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, if you go back 58 years ago, our 34th President, Dwight Eisenhower, confronted a similar moment of crisis in terms of our education system.

In October 1957, the Soviet Union launched the Sputnik satellite, which shocked our Nation. We realized we were falling behind and that we needed to step up our game in terms of our educational and research system. This Republican President led the charge to pass the National Defense Education Act in 1958, which boosted and set a national goal, a national priority, for science and research across our country.

At the time that he signed the bill in 1958, he said that, in both education and research, we needed to redouble our exertions, which will be necessary on the part of all Americans if we are to rise to the demands of our times.

He also noted that this bill, the National Defense Education Act, back in 1958, would "do much to strengthen our American system of education so it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by considerations of basic national security."

Fast forward 57 years, we now have a national STEM education coalition

made up of employers like Microsoft, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Farm Bureau, who have come together with a core set of principles on how we can today, in 2015, boost teachers with these hard science degrees in our elementary and high schools, how we can drill down and encourage, again, underrepresented groups such as young girls and minorities to get involved and engaged in education.

We came forward on the Education and the Workforce Committee with an amendment supported by the STEM coalition, and it was rejected on a party-line vote by the Republican majority, who said that the national government had no business being involved in local and State education policy. That is totally unacceptable in terms of the challenges that our Nation faces today.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee rejected our amendment from even being voted on today as part of the update of the No Child Left Behind bill.

Again, it is the ultimate measuring stick of the failure of this bill to address the needs our Nation faces in terms of K-12 education policy. We should follow the example of this gentleman. He understood that at times, we have to rise up as a full nation.

We can't rely on one local wealthy school district to invest in science and technology and engineering and math and leave behind other populations in this country because, as a nation, we need to come together to address and succeed and face this challenge. It will bring good things in terms of higher income and more growth for our country if we embrace these types of policies.

The good news is that the Republican chairman of the Senate Education Committee did embrace the STEM education coalition provisions, and they have put it in their bill.

Today, unfortunately, we are going to go do this exercise, this theater of passing a bill which woefully fails the test in terms of what our Nation faces today, but hopefully, later in the process, a conference committee will come together, and we will follow the example of Dwight Eisenhower and our bipartisan coalition of the 1950s to allow this Nation to have the tools to succeed.

We need to pass strong STEM education policy for our young children.

513TH AIR CONTROL GROUP DEPLOYMENT

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

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute more than 40 citizen airmen of the 513th Air Control Group deploying to Southwest Asia this month in support of Operation Inherent Resolve in Iraq and Syria and also continuing operations in Afghanistan.

The 513th is the Nation's only Reserve unit flying the E-3 AWACS air-

craft. I am proud that the 513th is based at Tinker Air Force Base in my home State of Oklahoma, and it is commanded by Colonel David W. Robertson.

I flew the Navy version of the AWACS, the E-2 Hawkeye, both on Active Duty and as a reservist. The AWACS is the Air Force's "quarterback in the sky," calling the plays and managing the fight from an airborne platform.

I know firsthand that the AWACS is absolutely essential to projecting air power. Without it, our forces would be like an orchestra with no conductor.

Mr. Speaker, we just celebrated yet another year of independence. We should remember that our war of independence was fought almost exclusively by citizen warriors, ordinary citizens who put their lives on hold and at risk, many of them giving the ultimate sacrifice for our independence.

The 513th continues our great citizen warrior tradition. Among the citizen airmen deploying are Realtors, IT specialists, and even a pastor. We should recognize that this is a voluntary assignment. These reservists have raised their hands and answered the call voluntarily, when less than 1 percent of our fellow citizens serve in the military.

Mr. Speaker, the 513th demonstrates the value of our military's Reserve component and National Guardsmen. Looking across the 513th, you will find skill standards, capabilities, and operational readiness rates equal to or better than the Active component.

When I was in the Reserves flying the E-2 Hawkeye, I can tell you that the amount of talent that we held in the Reserve component was amazing. It was very clear that these folks had the confidence, the capability, and the institutional knowledge to carry on the tradition of excellence that was in the Navy when they moved to the Reserves.

The amount of talent and skills is also true with the Air Force. We saw it when you think about the fighter squadrons that fought in the opening days of the war in Afghanistan. The Reserve fighter squadron was the one that had the highest percentage of bombs on target.

The Reserve and the Air National Guard are critical to our Nation's military readiness. It is important to retain and even expand the reserve component size, missions, and capabilities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while I rise to give a special thanks to the 513th reservists deploying to Southwest Asia, let me also mention this unit's other recent accomplishments.

To say that the 513th is in high demand would be a huge understatement. In the past 6 months, the 513th has controlled training missions for over 200 fighters and bombers, supported critical flight tests, managed air operation center support in Germany, and controlled eight large-force exercises, including Felix Virgo in Louisiana,

Northern Edge in Alaska, and CHUMEX in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by once again recognizing the citizen airmen of the 513th Air Control Group from Tinker Air Force Base.

□ 1030

OPPOSE H.R. 5

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the current version of H.R. 5, the House Republican bill which seeks to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and encourage my colleagues to adopt the Democratic substitute offered by Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT.

Let me start by reading you a quote that truly strikes me as telling of where we have come from and where we find ourselves today. On May 22, 1964, at the University of Michigan, President Lyndon Baines Johnson remarked:

In many places, classrooms are overcrowded and curricula are outdated. Most of our qualified teachers are underpaid, and many of our paid teachers are underqualified. So we must give every child a place to sit and a teacher to learn from. Poverty is not a bar for learning, and learning must often escape from poverty.

President Johnson went on to say:

But more classrooms and more teachers are just not enough. We must seek an educational system which grows in excellence as it grows in size. This means better training for our teachers. It means preparing our youth to enjoy their hours of leisure as well as their hours of labor. It means exploring new techniques of teaching, to find new ways to stimulate the love of learning and the capacity for creation.

Let's just take a moment to let that sink in.

Those were words read in 1964, during President Johnson's Great Society Speech. Almost every single point in President Johnson's remarks has direct import of the perils our education system faces today.

Teachers are still underpaid, and in so many areas, underqualified. Classroom sizes are increasing, and the quality of education is continuing to deteriorate.

Hunger and poverty continue to afflict our inner-city students in an alarmingly disproportionate rate, and disparity of resources and access to a quality education seems, at times, to continue expanding. The achievement gap between our most impoverished students remains inextricably tied to the wealth gap, and the numbers are discouraging.

Instead of moving forward by improving on and implementing lessons learned from the failed policies of No Child Left Behind, H.R. 5 guts the core intent of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

H.R. 5 is like a blast from the past and fails our students and their families in a myriad of ways. Among some of the most egregious provisions in this proposed iteration of ESEA, H.R. 5 includes the concept of portability for title I funds.

Sold and messaged as a promotion of choice, portability instead adversely affects students who are in schools and districts with the highest concentration of poverty and need. In short, portability is a ruse, one that takes resources from, rather than gives to our most underserved and needy children.

Additionally, as the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and a longtime advocate of STEM—science, technology, mathematics, and engineering—education, I was alarmed by the utter and complete exclusion of any reference to STEM education within this base text.

We should be retooling our education system to fit the needs of our ever-evolving globalized economy, not running back to the factory-style education that doesn't provide our children with the skills they need to compete.

Education is the ladder to opportunity and central to keeping alive the American Dream. We must fight to ensure that every single child, regardless of their background, is given the opportunity to reach their God-given potential.

No matter what race—Black, White, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American—rich, poor, immigrant or not, we must remain steadfast in our dedication to equality and the equity of opportunity.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take this bill back to the drawing board and make sure that education in America is reflective of our principles as a nation. I urge my colleagues to make sure that we protect the American Dream and keep America the land of equal opportunity.

If you work hard and play by the rules, everyone deserves a fair shot and a fair shake at a fulfilling life. The ZIP Code you grow up in should not determine the life you live.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, although we have recently entered into July, I rise today in recognition of National Dairy Month, which has taken place every June since 1937.

As I travel across Pennsylvania and throughout the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, I am always inspired by our farmers and our farm families. They work hard. They work 7 days a week. Their work is arduous, and the challenges of running a farm are never ending.

Mr. Speaker, farming isn't just a business to these hardworking folks; it

is the fabric of rural America. The Commonwealth's history is rooted in agriculture, and the dairy industry continues to be the largest sector of this industry.

Most, about 99 percent of our dairy farms in Pennsylvania, are family-owned and operated, and our average herd size is about 72 head.

The Commonwealth's robust dairy industry produces 10 billion pounds of milk annually, and that number continues to surge. In fact, Pennsylvania ranks fifth in the Nation when it comes to dairy production.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Dairy Month, in support of our dairy farmers and farm families, and to also say thank you to all of these folks for providing us with food and fiber.

CONGRESS MUST REAUTHORIZE THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today we find ourselves on the House floor yet again debating H.R. 5. After several months of delay, the majority party has yet to realize that this bill is not in the best interest of America's children.

We all agree that Congress must reauthorize a strong Elementary and Secondary Education Act. H.R. 5 does not meet the test.

Any reauthorization must ensure that education is properly funded at the State and Federal level for all of America's children; that all students have access to a well-rounded education, which includes subjects like physical education, music, and the arts; and that students are annually assessed, which allows for parents and teachers to measure students' progress.

H.R. 5 does none of these things. Instead, it fails our students, our teachers, and our families. The bill drastically reduces education funding, eliminates and weakens protections for disabled students, fails to provide a well-rounded education for all students, and generally makes it more difficult to educate those for whom the act was designed to protect.

The bill turns title I funding into a block grant. The program would disproportionately harm disadvantaged and low-income students. Schools across the country, including some in my own congressional district, rely on these funds to help ensure children are given a fair chance to meet State academic standards.

H.R. 5 also allows title I dollars to become portable, which would divert much-needed funds from the highest need poverty schools and districts.

H.R. 5 removes requirements that States ensure students graduate from high school college and career ready. The bill focuses primarily on math and reading assessments, without providing

any programmatic support for literacy, for STEM, and for other subjects that provide a well-rounded curriculum. It eliminates wraparound support services, which are very important to needy students. It eliminates after-school, family engagement, physical, dental, and mental health programs.

This year, we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The bill, essentially a civil rights law, reaffirmed that every child has the right to an equal opportunity for a quality education.

However, H.R. 5 undermines the law's original intent, turning back the clock on equity and accountability in American public education and ignores the needs of America's most vulnerable students. H.R. 5 is a step backward in our country's education system. This legislation fails our students and their families.

America deserves better.

REAUTHORIZE THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will be considering the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior for the upcoming fiscal year.

I rise today to express my support for a robust and continued funding for and the permanent reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Over this past Independence Day weekend, I was particularly reminded of how so many of us enjoy the natural wonders of our hometowns and communities, from picnics at playgrounds, baseball games on municipal recreational fields, honoring our heritage and celebrating our independence with fireworks, music and parades at local historic sites and parks.

That is part of why the Land and Water Conservation Fund is so important. It helps our communities protect critical lands by providing State and local governments with necessary funding and flexibility to develop and improve lands for public access and recreational enjoyment. It is part of highlighting the heritage and character in my district in southeastern Pennsylvania.

My home State of Pennsylvania has received approximately \$295 million in the past five decades from the Land and Conservation Water Fund. It has protected places with national significance, such as Gettysburg National Military Park, Valley Forge National Historical Park, and John Heinz Wildlife Refuge.

In addition, in my congressional district, we can thank the Land and Water Conservation Fund for helping fund the building of the Birdsboro Waters Forest Legacy project, protecting critical woodlands at the East

Coventry Wineberry Estates, expanding Shaw's Bridge in East Bradford Township, and enhancing Pottstown Borough Memorial Park with a new dog park, pavilions, restrooms, ball fields, and walking trails.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that was apparent this past weekend was just how integral our public lands and outdoor recreation areas are to our heritage, civic identity, and local community.

I believe the Land and Water Conservation Fund is one of our most important conservation programs and an excellent example of a bipartisan commitment to safeguarding natural resources, promoting our cultural heritage, and expanding recreational opportunities not just for a moment in time, but for future generations as well.

I also believe it is a program that allows our local communities to dream big about how to best go about enhancing their communities for their residents.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 1814, which would permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund, I am looking forward to working with my colleagues in an effort to help communities across this country create lasting legacies of public access to the cultural and recreational opportunities identified by officials in their local communities as being worthy of funding for future projects.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT FAILS STUDENTS

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 5, the so-called Student Success Act. I am deeply disappointed in the majority for bringing such an economically careless and socially egregious bill to the floor today.

If passed, H.R. 5 would take more than \$7 million from the highest need schools in my home State of Alabama. It is really an abomination that this body would do this to our constituents and do this to our students.

H.R. 5 abandons the Federal Government's historic role in elementary and secondary education. Furthermore, this bill neglects our sacred responsibility to ensure that all children, irrespective of race, class, disability, or socioeconomic class, are given the opportunity to attain a high quality education.

Each of us in this body has the opportunity to send our own children to the finest K-12 institutions in this country, but our privilege isn't universal, and we shouldn't legislate as if it is.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, that privilege, the ability to send our children to the private schools or public schools of choice, is nearly nonexistent.

□ 1045

More than 70 percent of the public school students in my district receive

free or reduced lunch, and they live in families that live below the poverty line. And of the 26 school districts that serve my constituents, only two of them have a poverty rate that is less than 56 percent.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was first written in recognition of the impact that concentrated poverty has on a school system's ability to adequately support the educational programs needed to serve vulnerable communities.

But H.R. 5 would strip the ESEA of the protections for these students by diverting title I funds. This approach is backwards, and our children deserve better. If I were grading this bill, I would definitely give it an F.

As a proud product of Selma High School, this is deeply personal to me. Today more than 90 percent of the Selma High School students in my district, from my old high school, receive free and reduced lunch. Under H.R. 5, this school would lose nearly 20 percent of its Federal funding.

The greatest opportunity that we can give any child is a quality education. This is why I cannot support this bill, which diverts title I funds from 92 percent of the schools in my district. This would further tilt the playing field against poor kids.

These children belong to all of us. Unfortunately, this bill is proof that somewhere along the line we have abandoned the most sacred American principle, that all children—I mean all children—are our children.

We cannot deny that a rising tide lifts all boats. The economic and social costs of refusing to accept these facts are steep.

When President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1964, he stated, "As President of the United States, I believe deeply no law I have signed or will ever sign means more to the future of America than this bill." President Johnson was right then, and he is right now.

To promote our educational progress, we must replace No Child Left Behind with a strong bipartisan bill, one that advances what works and improves upon what does not. Unfortunately, this bill does neither.

I urge this body to oppose this reckless bill, H.R. 5. Our children deserve better. Our constituents deserve better. This Nation deserves better.

KELO V. NEW LONDON

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to highlight an issue that I believe we must pay closer attention to in this Chamber and in this Congress. You see, on June 23, Mr. Speaker, we marked the tenth anniversary of an important Supreme Court case. That case was *Kelo v. New London*.

Now, the title of the case really means nothing. But I point to Susette

Kelo, who I have here depicted in this picture. She was the plaintiff in that case. And what happened in that case was this, Mr. Speaker, a real tragedy:

She was told by her government that they were going to take her home and give it to another private owner for development. You heard me right, Mr. Speaker. She was told that her home was going to be taken by our government because they were picking the winners and losers because they felt they knew best how to utilize her property and give it to another private owner to develop it the way that private owner wanted to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Susette Kelo stood up. She fought this fight. She was told by her friends, she was told by her real estate agents, she was told by her lawyers: Just roll over. The government always wins, and they are going to win this battle.

But she fought it all the way to the Supreme Court. And what happened, however, is that that advice from her friends and from her real estate agent and her lawyers came true. The government won.

But that day we all lost, as American citizens. Because here is what happened after that case. She lost her home. And this is a picture of her property—well, no longer her property—but that property, as it exists today. They demolished her home. They took her property. She lost her piece of the American Dream. And the result of it is a vacant lot that sits in New London.

Mr. Speaker, I highlight this case today because it reminds us of an issue that we must fight for, and that is a fundamental freedom that we all enjoy as American citizens, to own and to use our property.

It is something that is fundamental to our U.S. Constitution. It is something fundamental to us as American citizens. And it is time for us to unite, as Republicans and Democrats, and say enough is enough. We must push back on Big Government. We must stand with individuals.

This land belongs to them, not our government. And that is something that I am afraid that started 10 years ago and continues to this day with actions of Big Government day in and day out, where government regulations, government overreach—local, Federal, State level—act in a way that takes away these fundamental property rights that so many have fought for.

So in Congress I have led the fight. I formed the Private Property Rights Caucus, with Members from Maine to Alabama to California. I have sponsored and authored the Defense of Property Rights Act to say enough is enough. We are going to stand with individuals, and we are going to fight this Big Government overreach.

Mr. Speaker, these hard-fought rights have come at the expense of so many, the blood of those who fought to preserve our freedoms, the blood of our Founding Fathers and the vision they

set forth in our Constitution. And this Kelo case was a moment in time at a drop of a gavel when those fundamental rights were threatened and lost.

So I stand today and ask my colleagues and all of the people across America to stand with us, to stand with me, to make sure we coordinate our efforts to make sure that our fundamental property rights are protected and individuals like Susette Kelo are rewarded for her bravery in taking the fight.

Though she may have lost that battle, I stand with her to win this war to protect our fundamental property rights that so many have fought for over the years.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT FALLS SHORT

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 5.

Education is a civil right. And when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965, its purpose was to ensure access to a quality education for our neediest students that are often low income and minority.

We can all agree that ESEA reauthorization is long overdue. However, the proposal put forth by Republicans falls short and makes a bad situation worse.

Each day that No Child Left Behind is law is one more day that we are, in fact, leaving children behind.

H.R. 5 is not the answer. Voting for this bill means voting against our students, our teachers, and our schools. A vote for H.R. 5 is a vote to take money from our poorest and most at-risk students. It is a vote to erase the educational gains we have made over the past 50 years. It is a vote to deny many of our students a chance at real success.

It is time to wake up. It is time to vote "no" on H.R. 5.

Congress passed ESEA 50 years ago with the intent of protecting our students by providing quality and equal education. Today, instead of putting forth a bipartisan bill that moves us closer to equal and quality education for every child, Republicans have introduced a bill to roll back the hands of time and undo our progress.

H.R. 5 turns its back on some of our most vulnerable student populations. It lacks the accountability measures to ensure student success.

A report from the Southern Education Foundation found that more than 50 percent of our public school students live in poverty. Title I has always been the main source of Federal funding for our country's poorest students.

H.R. 5 would reverse this long-standing practice and, instead, remove

money from our school districts with the greatest need, diluting their ability to meaningfully fund programs that serve low-income students.

At a time when 40 percent of college students take remedial courses and employers continue to complain of inadequate preparation for high school graduates, we must ensure that all students are college ready and are career ready. H.R. 5 allows States to lower standards that lead to students graduating unprepared.

So how can we expect our students to compete in a global economy when they aren't prepared? We need to invest in the future of our children, support our teachers and our principals, ensure the success of our neediest students.

And that is why I am proud to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), and I thank him for his leadership in challenging H.R. 5.

This amendment reaffirms the Federal Government's proper role in education, addressing many of the problems that surround No Child Left Behind.

Students in low-income families already have obvious disadvantages. This amendment prioritizes early education to help our students start out strong. It puts protections in place against bullying, and it supports the physical, mental, and emotional stability of students. It gets rid of AYP and also makes important investments in STEM education.

Education should be an issue that unites us, not divides us. The Scott amendment is exactly what our schools and our students and our teachers need.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Scott amendment and not for H.R. 5 because H.R. 5 fails on all accounts. It fails our neediest students. It fails to invest in our teachers and principals. And it fails to prepare students for college and careers and to address the core principles of Federal education policies.

H.R. 5 deserves an F. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

CONGRATULATING THE U.S. WOMEN'S WORLD CUP SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, the day after our Independence Day, the U.S. women's World Cup team gave us the best fireworks show ever. They lit up the team that beat them 4 years ago in the World Cup, Japan.

We scored in the third minute, the fifth minute, the 14th minute, and the 16th minute. 4-0 in 16 minutes. We had gone over 5½ hours without giving up a goal. Japan was done.

Our women won every game because they left their egos in the locker room. When they jogged onto that field, they were a team full of love, love of soccer,

love of America, and love of each other, their teammates.

The best example of that love was a small blue arm band. It is worn by our team captain. If you missed this band's journey through our victory on Sunday, I will recount it for you.

It was on Christie Rampone's left arm as her gold medal was placed around her neck. It was her second gold medal in a World Cup match. She is closer to my age than all of her teammates. Sunday was her last World Cup game.

She got that blue band from Abby Wombach, the greatest woman soccer player in American history. That is her picture beside me. Abby has scored 23 goals in World Cup matches, but she had only had a silver medal from World Cup matches, never a gold. She knew that was changing when she jogged onto that field in the 79th minute of play.

□ 1100

She also knew that, like Christie, this was her last World Cup match. A teammate stopped Abby before she entered the game. Team Captain Carli Lloyd stopped her idol, Abby, to make sure Abby's uniform was complete. There was a problem that Carli had to fix up, so she helped Abby by putting that blue armband on her left sleeve as our team captain.

Carli plays pro soccer in my hometown of Houston, Texas, and we Texans believe bigger is always better. While Carli has been a Texan for a few months, she knows how to go big, real big. She scored a hat trick—three goals—in the first 16 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the 2015 women's World Cup gold medalists gave us a priceless gift: the joy of being alive, feeling American pride surge through your veins, having that breath—that short breath of excitement—or having that extra heartbeat, knowing that you are alive.

America thanks our gold medal winners, our America's World Cup champions of 2015.

PUERTO RICO'S POLITICAL STATUS AND ITS ECONOMIC CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico, home to 3.5 million American citizens, stands at a crossroads. The Governor recently announced that Puerto Rico cannot pay all of its debts. The Governor's comments were not constructive because they lacked precision.

Puerto Rico's total debt is about \$72 billion, and the structure of this debt is complex. About 17 entities in Puerto Rico have bonds outstanding, from the central government to public corporations. The terms, source of repayment, and the level of legal protection for each bond varies.

For instance, bonds issued by the central government received priority payment under the Puerto Rico Constitution, which was authorized and approved by Congress. Accordingly, when the Governor asserted that Puerto Rico cannot pay its debts, the sweeping nature of his comments raised many practical and legal questions and generated considerable anxiety.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Puerto Rico is real, and it must be confronted with composure, competence, and candor. To this end, I want to articulate a simple truth, but one that is often overlooked: namely, the challenges we face are structural in nature and, therefore, require structural solutions, at both the Puerto Rico and the Federal level.

Within Puerto Rico, more discipline by the territory government is imperative. We must learn to live within our means. Puerto Rico's political leaders have shown the capacity to develop sound strategies, but have not always demonstrated the same ability to effectively execute those strategies. Performance, not planning, is the problem. We can do better, and for the sake of our constituents, we must do better.

Mr. Speaker, honest self-appraisal and self-criticism are essential, but cannot be limited to Puerto Rico. If the American public is under the impression that Puerto Rico is solely to blame for this crisis, it is profoundly mistaken.

The source of the problem in Puerto Rico is not its people, who are talented and hard-working, nor is it our political leaders, who are no better or worse than their counterparts in other U.S. jurisdictions who at times also overpromise and underdeliver; instead, the root cause of the problem is our political status, which has given rise to a system of severe and entrenched inequality that makes it exceptionally difficult to succeed and exceptionally easy to fail.

The direct link between Puerto Rico's political status and its economic problems was explored at a recent congressional hearing. The hearing served to underscore that there are more American citizens in Puerto Rico than in 21 States, that they serve in the U.S. military in large numbers, but that they cannot vote for President or Senators and have only one nonvoting Delegate in this House.

The hearing highlighted that, as a territory, Puerto Rico can be and often is treated worse than the States under Federal laws, from Medicaid to the earned income tax credit to chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code. To compensate for the deficiency in Federal economic support, the Puerto Rico Government has borrowed heavily, which explains the excessive debt.

In recent years, 250,000 island residents have moved to the States, and these numbers are only growing. Once in the States, they are entitled to full voting rights and equal treatment under the law, rights they were denied in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable situation. My constituents have tolerated it for too long, and they will tolerate it no longer. They voted for statehood in a local referendum in 2012, and they will vote for statehood again in even greater numbers in a Federal referendum in 2017.

My message to my colleagues is simple. If you give us the same rights and responsibilities as our fellow American citizens and let us rise or fall on our merits, we will rise; but, if you continue to treat us like second-class citizens, don't profess to be surprised when we fall.

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 6 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

Reverend Shane Hall, First Southern Baptist Church, Del City, Oklahoma, offered the following prayer:

Holy and awesome God,

We give You thanks today for every good gift, for we know that every good gift comes from You.

We give You thanks today for the United States of America and the freedoms found within her borders.

We give You thanks today for the men and women of this Congress whom You have placed in positions of leadership in our Nation

May You give them wisdom, which can only come from You, to legislate in such a way that the laws of this Nation might conform to Your will.

Impart within each of us a desire to seek You in all things pertaining to life and eternal life. May we love You, our God, with all of our heart, soul, strength, and mind; and may we love our neighbor as ourselves.

For it is in the name of Jesus we pray.

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

The SPEAKER. 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. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND SHANE HALL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege today to have with us to provide the opening prayer my pastor and good friend, Shane Hall, from Del City, Oklahoma.

Although Shane was born in Brook, Indiana, he actually grew up in Burns Flat, Oklahoma. He is a graduate of Oklahoma Baptist University, with a secondary in education. He also got a master's of divinity with biblical languages from the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.

He has pastored a half-dozen churches in Oklahoma and Louisiana, and he is currently the pastor of my home church, First Southern Baptist Church of Del City, Oklahoma.

He also serves on the executive committee of the entire Southern Baptist Convention, and he is a member of the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma board of directors.

His wife, Misty, and his two daughters, Macy and Mallory, are wonderful people that, if you are ever in Oklahoma, I encourage you to attend services and get to know them.

Thank you for allowing us to make his introduction this morning.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF TINO TRUJILLO

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life of Tino Trujillo. Tino was a well-known community leader in Plano and Dallas. My wife, Shirley, and I had the privilege of calling him and his late wife, Janie, friends.

Tino was a special person in our hometown. He immigrated to California in 1952 and became a proud American citizen, serving in the United States Army at Fort Hood. In 1975, he found his way to North Texas where he opened his first restaurant.

He loved to serve people, not only with good Mexican food, but giving back to the community that he loved. In fact, he was a founding trustee of Collin College, and he served for nearly 30 years.

Tino was soft-spoken, kindhearted, and he will be greatly missed in Plano and Texas.

America would be a better place with more folks like him.

SONS OF ITALY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of Forum Lodge 391 of the Order Sons of Italy, which later this month is celebrating its centennial anniversary as a civic organization in Newport, Rhode Island.

Originally known to members by the name La Loggia Progresso e Civiltà, Forum Lodge 391 has worked to promote and celebrate Italian heritage and culture on Aquidneck Island since it was founded on July 4, 1915. Over the years, it has established itself as a Rhode Island institution by hosting numerous community and cultural events for all to enjoy.

Most notably, Lodge 391's Anna M. Ripa Memorial Scholarship opens doorways to opportunity each year for Italian American high school seniors in Rhode Island who demonstrate success in the classroom and prepare a written essay on their cultural heritage.

I congratulate President Shirley Ripa and the men and women of Forum Lodge 391 of the Order Sons of Italy on this important milestone, and I extend my best wishes on their centennial celebration on July 23.

CRAFT BREWERS ARE CREATING AMERICAN JOBS

(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, over the past few years, we have seen small brewers in Minnesota and around the country continue to meet the needs of a public that is growing in its appreciation for craft beverages.

At the same time, these brewers are burdened by out-of-date regulations

and high taxes that make it difficult for them to grow their businesses and play an increasingly greater role in their local economy.

That is why I have introduced the Craft Beverage Modernization and Tax Reform Act with my colleague, RON KIND from Wisconsin, to modernize the Tax Code and streamline regulations for these small businesses.

These small breweries are a true example of the American dream. Many start out as hobbyists in the basement or in the garage, and they grow to be successful while, at the same time, creating jobs and creating a quality product.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure we embrace the potential this industry has, and that means modernizing our tax rules and our Tax Code to ensure that these small employers continue to grow.

SYMBOLS OF HATE IN OUR NATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have not spoken on the floor of the House on the horrific tragedy that occurred in Mother Emanuel Baptist church, our respect for our colleague from South Carolina; our respect for our assistant leader, JIM CLYBURN; and our respect for the families that have buried their dead over the last week. Many of us joined the President in Charleston, South Carolina, for the funeral of Reverend Dr. Pinckney.

Today, I rise to ask this body, reflecting on two amendments that were offered last night regarding the Confederate flag that were voted on by voice vote in the Interior bill, but I ask today the leadership to allow this House to look at three legislative initiatives that have been offered by Members based upon the Walker III v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans case.

I want my colleagues to know that the Supreme Court, including Justice Clarence Thomas, ruled that government speech did not warrant the utilization of the rebel flag.

Finally, let me read to you the words about senator Pinckney. This is warranted. The President said:

My liberty depends on you being free, too. History must be a manual for how to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past, how to break the cycle, a roadway toward a better world. He knew that the path of grace involves an open mind but, more importantly, an open heart.

We need to debate on the floor of the House the symbols of hate in this Nation, and we need to do it now. I ask my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to join us in the legislative initiatives we have for this to be placed on the floor of the House for all of us to stand and debate what is positive about America.

FAMILY, CAREER AND COMMUNITY LEADERS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a bipartisan resolution with my friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Mr. JIM LANGEVIN, to recognize the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America on their 70th anniversary.

Family, Career and Community Leaders of America is a national career and technical student organization that promotes personal growth, leadership development, and career preparation opportunities for students in family and consumer science education.

Since the program was launched 70 years ago to this day, more than 10 million students have participated and gained the knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to secure careers in growing, high-demand fields. I was pleased to welcome FCCL students from Forest County, Pennsylvania, today.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, I ask my friends to get behind this bipartisan resolution to support the goals and ideals of Family, Career and Community Leaders of America.

Now, more than ever, our young people need assurances that the skills they attain will lead to good-paying, family-sustaining jobs, and career and technical education programming can make those assurances.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Republicans in Congress have kept our Nation stuck in neutral, while our highways, bridges, and transit systems crumble around us. They keep riding the clutch with these short-term patches to keep the highway trust fund solvent for another couple of months.

You could say that we are in a big race and the road ahead is long. We can't keep stopping for gas every 5 minutes, and we have got to stop scrounging under the seats and the floor mats for enough change to buy a gallon here and a gallon there.

America's been in the lead, but now, we are just inching along. If we don't get back on track soon, we are going to be left in the dust by our foreign competitors. In the next few months alone, more than 600,000 American jobs are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, congressional Republicans are in the driver's seat, so they need to start driving like pros. It is time for Congress to do their job and pass a long-term plan to pay for much-

needed investments in our roads, rails, and bridges.

I say: "Fill her up with hi-test."

OUTRAGEOUS IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's nuclear negotiations with Iran pose significant threats to American families. Already, the President has conceded too much. An agreement that does not clearly prohibit the development of nuclear weapons threatens American families and our closest allies, such as Israel.

Now, as the negotiation deadline has been further extended, it is clear that President Obama is willing to grant more concessions to this murderous regime whose program of developing intercontinental ballistic missiles puts America as a target.

I am grateful that Congress passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, giving Congress a voice in the final deal. I urge the President to change course with this oppressive regime that promotes death to America, death to Israel.

It is not too late to prevent a legacy of appeasement and avoid being remembered as a new Neville Chamberlain, establishing nuclear weapons across the Middle East.

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

OPPOSING STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5, a misguided bill which denies America's children access to high-quality education.

Today, greater numbers of economically disadvantaged children are entering our public schools. For example, in my State of Texas, of the 5 million students enrolled in public schools in 2014 statewide, more than 3 million would be adversely impacted if we vote to pass H.R. 5.

This Republican bill abandons the Federal Government's historic commitment to educating disadvantaged populations. H.R. 5 block grants vital Federal programs, such as title I of the education code targeted for English language learners, migrant children, neglected and delinquent youth, and Native American education.

The bill allows States and districts to siphon away these Federal funds and use them for other purposes because of the proposed changes in the intent of the many education programs passed many years ago—50 years ago to be

exact—under the leadership of President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

H.R. 5 would provide inadequate funding and move backward on equity and accountability, harming the education of our Nation's children.

I respectfully urge Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on final passage today.

□ 1215

A NAVY MAN

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate one of my own. As of today, my son, Joe, is officially a member of the United States Navy.

My wife, Jacquie, and I are the proud parents of seven children. Last month, Joe, our fifth child, graduated high school and now is off to serve his country.

Today, as Joe leaves for basic, he knows that hard days lie ahead. He understands that he will have to listen and learn and, when the time comes, lead.

Like millions of brave and selfless Americans before him, Joe has taken an oath to serve his Nation and to protect the freedoms we hold dear.

My wife and I are so proud of Joe, and we are humbled by his chosen path.

So to Joe and his fellow recruits, we honor and thank you for your service, and we wish you fair winds and safe seas.

Joe, we will pray for you, and we look forward to seeing your transformation from citizen to sailor. We love you.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAYS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today we wear red to bring back our girls.

Boko Haram has heeded ISIS' call for increased violence and a so-called Month of Disaster in a rapid string of egregious acts of violence. A brutal spate of bombings and shootings has ripped through the country, killing at least 300 people in the past week alone.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram's unyielding thirst for violence and unflinching disregard for human life cannot go unchecked.

Later this month, when Nigerian President Buhari visits the White House to discuss the fight against Boko Haram with President Barack Obama, he must know that we here in Congress are committed to giving the Government of Nigeria the support it needs to defeat Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H. Res. 147, as amended, to help the Nigerian Government bring back our girls and defeat Boko Haram for good.

Mr. Speaker, don't forget to tweet, tweet, tweet bring back our girls, #bringbackourgirls, #joinrepwilson, #bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

LET'S FIX OUR PARKS, NOT ADD MORE

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express concern about continued acquisition of private lands by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government currently owns about 30 percent of the land in our country but is unable to properly maintain this land, as evidenced by the Park Service's staggering \$11.5 billion backlog of maintenance projects, yet the Federal Government continues to spend limited taxpayer dollars and resources on more land. For example, many of my constituents are facing a push by the government to take over historically private land.

A June 30 New York Times article, entitled, "Let's Fix Our Parks, Not Add More," further illustrates the scope of this problem, criticizing the administration's decision to add seven new parks to the system.

I urge my colleagues to oppose future land purchases and instead focus the Interior Department's attention on properly maintaining existing Federal lands to ensure access for generations to come.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue that deserves our immediate attention: the Republican leadership's failure to bring the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank to the House floor for a vote.

The Ex-Im Bank plays a critical role in our economy, opening international markets to U.S. businesses by facilitating the sale of American goods and services overseas. The Bank even the playing field for American companies, enabling them to compete based on the quality of their products, not on the financing term they can offer.

Allowing the Bank's authorization to expire will have real-world consequences, Mr. Speaker. If we don't act, American businesses that employ tens of thousands of our workers will struggle to survive in this competitive global marketplace.

There is no question that there are enough votes in both the House and the Senate to pass the Ex-Im Bank reauthorization at this point on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of American businesses and workers, the Republican leadership needs to stop playing to their out-of-touch base and start

acting in the best interests of the American people by reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank immediately.

HIGHLIGHTING THE VITAL ROLE OF FORT POLK, LOUISIANA

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the vital role Fort Polk, Louisiana, plays in our Nation's strategic defense and to urge the U.S. Army to spare it from any cuts.

Fort Polk houses the Army's primary Joint Readiness Training Center, the Nation's premier combat training center.

Fort Polk is also home to the 3rd Battalion, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Polk's lone brigade combat team, a highly mobile, lethal, and flexible combat unit. This team was recognized as a superior brigade combat team, awarding it the Meritorious Unit Citation for its efforts in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Any cuts to this award-winning unit would deal a devastating blow to the post, its surrounding communities, and Louisiana as a whole. The local community and State have invested money and donated land, demonstrating their commitment to this imperative post.

As the Army announces its troop realignment, Louisiana stands together to support the 3rd Battalion, 10th Mountain Division brigade combat team, the Fort Polk community, and the military excellence they represent.

PASS HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, the highway and transit trust fund will expire.

So what does the expiration of the trust fund mean to America, to American families?

It means the potential loss of over 600,000 jobs. It means the cancelation of major infrastructure projects. In fact, I heard this morning that five States have already canceled or delayed major projects because of Congress' lack of ability to do its work.

My home State of Michigan, we know more than anyplace that if we invest in our roads and bridges and rails, we grow our economy.

Other nations, instead of planning months ahead, are planning years ahead and building infrastructure. China, for example, is spending 10 times what we are as a percentage of their GDP on infrastructure.

Meanwhile, back in May, instead of thinking about the decades to come and hundreds of thousands of jobs, this Congress passed a 2-month extension, a self-imposed, manmade crisis, governing crisis to crisis on every big issue that we deal with.

We can't let this happen. This Congress needs to do its job. We need to come together in a bipartisan way—we can do it—and pass an extension of the highway trust fund that invests in America and puts American workers back to work rebuilding this country.

If we don't do this, we cannot expect our economy to grow. Congress has to act.

JOE'S BBQ IN FANNIN COUNTY, GEORGIA

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the Ninth District of Georgia, there is something we like, and that is barbecue. Especially our office, our staff, and our interns know this well, and especially my ag intern, Casey, from Georgia, because we now can ascribe to Trip Advisory's latest pick of the Nation's best barbecue. And I am proud to announce Joe's BBQ was named number one barbecue in the country.

Joe's is located 90 miles north of Atlanta in Blue Ridge and was founded just 3 years ago by a former mortgage salesman, Joe Ray. Mr. Ray moved to Blue Ridge, Georgia, 10 years ago to pursue his career in mortgage banking, but he ended up doing barbecue. He calls it beginner's luck, but I think it is turning into a legacy and a tradition in north Georgia. You see, customers travel from hundreds of miles to experience the secret recipe at Joe's BBQ, and it has been named number one as proof of the fruits of their labor.

So now we have many coming to northeast Georgia to experience what we in the Ninth District always knew: the best barbecue is in north Georgia, the greatest place in world. And I just want to invite everybody to Joe's BBQ in Blue Ridge.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN YEMEN

(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, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a humanitarian crisis in Yemen. My district is home to many Yemenis who are deeply concerned, and many families have been in my office in total desperation and tears. This week, 45 civilians were killed after an airstrike hit a marketplace north of Aden.

Of real concern is the current outbreak of dengue fever. The World Health Organization estimates there are at least 3,000 cases of dengue fever in Yemen right now, and other groups are estimating it is twice that.

My constituents have family members who are suffering and have no access to medications, doctors, hospitals or, in many cases, even clean water. We must show U.S. leadership to help contain this outbreak.

Today I sent a letter to Secretary Kerry asking about plans the State Department is undertaking to combat this problem. I hope my colleagues will join me in a bipartisan manner to support real concrete action that is needed to help the Yemenis who are sick, desperate, and in critical need of assistance and leadership.

HONORING GRANITE STATE COMMUNITY LEADER DON MOORE

(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 a selfless Granite Stater who is paving the way for our mental health community and was recently awarded the Portsmouth Rotary Club's Humanitarian Award.

In 2014, Don Moore founded Seacoast Pathways in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, with the goals of providing those with mental illness resources to find a stable place to live, find a job, and opportunities for members to develop talents and interests to stay engaged in our community.

For far too long, the topic of mental health has been regarded as taboo and carries with it an undeserved stigma. People like Don Moore are changing this negative perception and bringing about positive change for our communities.

In fact, the successes of the clubhouse model used by Seacoast Pathways are borrowed from another successful clubhouse in Manchester, New Hampshire, called Granite Pathways. This spring, I had the privilege of visiting both, meeting with their staffs and clubhouse members.

Seacoast Pathways' commitment to creating a community where members can reach their goals of work, education, and stable housing are absolutely commendable, and it is because of the selfless and dedicated folks like Don that our State remains a shining example of best practices in this area.

On behalf of the entire Granite State, congratulations to Don on receiving a well-deserved honor, and for working tirelessly on behalf of the mental health community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KEVIN JOSEPH SUTHERLAND

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, 4 days ago, on July 4, a young man was murdered just a mile from here in broad daylight on a crowded subway. That young man was Kevin Joseph Sutherland, 24 years old. He was my campaign volunteer, my intern, and my friend.

Maybe that is unremarkable. Violence seems to be a part of who we are and all too present with us.

But I want to tell this House that Kevin was in Washington because he

believed in the best of us, each one of us. He believed that we could come together. He believed that we could set aside our petty prejudices. He believed that we could bring our voices together in this Chamber and make a better world.

I think there is a chance that 20 years from now Kevin might have served in this Chamber. Now, that is not going to happen. But Kevin's spirit of openness, of optimism, of possibility, that spirit must live on in this Chamber and in our hearts.

Thank you, Kevin.

HONORING PRIVATE WILLIAM LONG AND PRIVATE QUINTON EZEAGWULA

(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, I rise today to pay tribute to two courageous young men, Army Private William "Andy" Long and Private Quinton "EZ" Ezeagwula.

On June 1, 2009, these soldiers were the target of a terrorist attack at a military recruiting station in my hometown of Little Rock, Arkansas, which, tragically, Andy Long did not survive.

Last Wednesday, in an emotional ceremony at the Arkansas State Capitol and after a wait of 6 years, these two soldiers were finally awarded the Purple Heart Medals they deserved.

I was privileged to be present as EZ and the family of Andy Long received the recognition they deserve for their sacrifice to our Nation.

Andy's father, Daris Long, put it best at the ceremony when he stated that this was never just about Purple Hearts. "It was about accurately identifying what really happened in Little Rock and at Fort Hood. These acts were not simply a drive-by shooting or workplace violence. They were terrorist attacks on our servicemembers in our own land."

I am truly appreciative of the work of our entire congressional delegation, both past and present, whose tireless efforts over the past 6 years ensured the sacrifice of these young men has been fully recognized and honored.

□ 1230

HONORING CHRISTINE RATH UPON HER RETIREMENT

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor one of New Hampshire's best and brightest educators upon her retirement.

Christine Rath has served as superintendent of the Concord School District for 15 years, helping to maintain the high standards of public education

in Concord, New Hampshire. I am a proud product of Concord's public schools; so, they hold a special place in my heart.

Chris started her teaching career right here in Washington, D.C., in the 1960s as a member of President Johnson's Teacher Corps, designed to help educate low-income students in cities all across this country. That is where she met her husband Tom Rath, another community leader who has made many positive contributions to the Granite State over the years.

After they moved to New Hampshire, she taught in Goffstown, worked in Concord's Second Start alternative education program, and eventually became the principal of Rundlett Middle School in Concord. Chris has spent decades working to provide excellent education and support to students of all ages across the Granite State.

Our young people are our Nation's greatest resource, and it is absolutely essential that they have the tools they need to follow their dreams and meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Chris sets an extraordinary example for young educators who hope to change the lives of their students through commitment and creativity. I applaud her impressive service to the students, the city of Concord, and to the Granite State.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, just last week an American woman was shot and killed by an illegal immigrant while walking through a tourist-friendly area of San Francisco with her father.

She was killed for no reason by an illegal immigrant convicted of seven felonies who had been previously deported five times and was released by the San Francisco Police Department again over the objections of Federal immigration authorities.

This is sadly not the first time this has happened. Several years ago a father and his two sons were killed by an illegal immigrant felon who, again, San Francisco refused to detain for Federal immigration authorities.

The evidence is clear. Sanctuary city laws make our cities less safe and endanger Americans. Despite liberal claims to the contrary, this refusal to enforce immigration laws means that dangerous criminals with no regard for our laws are walking our streets.

In California alone, over 10,000 immigration detainee requests were declined; 10,000 known criminals were released in violation of Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the House to act to ensure that the Federal Government does not aid cities who refuse to enforce our Nation's laws. That would be comprehensive immigration reform we can all understand.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, even though many in Congress still refuse to admit that climate change is a very real problem, the administration has been leading action on what has become one of the most important issues of our generation.

This week the White House announced a new initiative to increase access to solar energy, especially in low- and moderate-income communities. This is a critical step to reducing our carbon footprint and showing the world that we are, indeed, ready to lead by example when it comes to clean energy innovation.

The initiative expands training and education for jobs in the solar industry and is a partnership with the private sector to increase diversity in a new "green collar" workforce. Access to clean, reliable energy results in good-paying jobs, cleaner air, and an opportunity for our innovators and entrepreneurs to grow our economy.

As a member of the Safe Climate Caucus and a co-chair of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I applaud and support the administration's announcement this week and will continue to press for broader climate action in this Congress.

IN MEMORY OF RAPHAEL "RAFE" SAGARIN

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Raphael "Rafe" Sagarin, a world-renowned scientist and University of Arizona professor who died tragically a few weeks ago.

Rafe was passionate about the world's oceans and applying the lessons of our natural world to solving modern challenges. He earned widespread recognition for theorizing that governments could learn national defense techniques by studying how animals adapt to threats they face in the wild.

During his lifetime, Rafe authored three books and nearly two dozen scholarly articles and book chapters. At the time of his death, he was leading a University of Arizona project called Biosphere 2 that involved creating a functional model of the Gulf of California in the Sonoran Desert.

I was fortunate enough to meet Rafe earlier this year and hear him describe with trademark enthusiasm his work studying adaptable security systems in southern Arizona. I am also currently reading his insightful book on the subject.

Rafe will be missed by so many around the world, but his contagious spirit and groundbreaking contributions over many years will have lasting impacts.

Rest in peace, Rafe.

CLEAN WATER AND SAFE DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, during a severe drought crisis, such as the one now in California, we must focus on solutions that create water and maintain a clean water supply. That is why I am stressing how crucial the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds are.

Clean and safe water is essential for our homes, farms, and businesses. These funds help finance projects that treat domestic sewage, capture stormwater run-off, and deliver drinking water to homes and businesses. SFR programs are the only low-cost loans available for many small- and medium-sized communities to finance clean water infrastructure.

Every dollar that we invest in water infrastructure comes back to our economy six times over. Cutting the SFR programs will have a crippling effect on our communities' abilities to meet water needs.

Republicans say they support drought relief. But, in reality, they have cut desperately needed funds for both these programs, a 23 percent cut in the House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill being debated today.

Congress must provide necessary funding to maintain our Nation's aging water infrastructure. Our communities depend upon it.

OPPOSING THE STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 5, also known as the Student Success Act. The Federal Government has played a key role in funding our education for 40 years; 40 years, Mr. Speaker.

We know how effective title I is when it is properly funded. We know low-income children and English language learners are negatively impacted when education funding is block-granted or made portable.

H.R. 5 does all these things: It locks in cuts to title I funding, block-grants many of the funding streams dedicated to specific at-risk populations, and it allows these funds to be diverted away from the districts and schools that need them most.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is meant to promote opportunity, Mr. Speaker, not take it away. I urge all my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5.

And while Ranking Member SCOTT's substitute amendment is an improve-

ment over the current law and I will be supporting it, I still have serious concerns about our Nation's emphasis on standardized testing. We cannot continue to use standardized test scores to punish teachers and schools.

OPPOSING THE STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as well in strong opposition to H.R. 5, the so-called Student Success Act.

There should be no question that education in this country is a right, not a privilege. Every student deserves the opportunity to succeed, and that opportunity begins with equal access to high-quality education.

But this bill severely undercuts our public schools. It slashes funding and takes away critical resources from students with the greatest needs. It eliminates key protections for students with disabilities. It guts support for vital afterschool programs.

And on the Central Coast of California, where I am from, our high school graduation rates have continuously improved over the past 5 years, exceeding statewide averages.

We must build upon these successes, not turn the clock backwards by dismantling equity and accountability standards. We must instead continue to move forward, deliver the promise of a great education and the opportunity for a bright future. Sadly, this bill only takes away that promise.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 5.

PASTOR BERNYCE CLAUSEL

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the late Bernyce Clausel, who passed away at the age of 98 last week. She was a civil rights leader in Tallahassee who participated in the bus boycotts of 1956. She was a devout Christian who, with her husband, founded Calvary Baptist Church in 1958. And later she became the church's pastor, one of the first women to do so in Tallahassee.

She was a fixture at town hall meetings and charity drives, and she was always there to help those in need. We lost a true north Florida hero, but I am so thankful that we had her for so long.

May God bless Pastor Bernyce Clausel, and may He bless each of us with the strength and dedication to serve our communities as well as she did.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2647, RESILIENT FEDERAL FORESTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 125, it shall be in order to consider the further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution as though they were the last further amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-29.

SEC. 2. 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. 2647) to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act and improve forest management activities in units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, 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 amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources 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 114-21 modified by the amendment printed in part B 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 C 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 recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a House rule, House Resolution 347, providing for consideration of two important pieces of legislation for which I am honored to be able to bring forward for consideration by this legislative body: H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, and H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2647 under a structured rule with four amendments made in order, a majority of which were offered by our Democratic colleague Members of the House. The rule also provides for further consideration of H.R. 5 under a structured rule with four additional amendments that were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, a bill that is critically important to my district in central Washington State which is, unfortunately, once again facing another devastating wildfire season.

This bipartisan, comprehensive legislation is aimed at expediting and improving forest management activities in Federal forests. It builds upon many legislative concepts introduced in this and in previous Congresses to address disastrous consequences of catastrophic wildfire, insect and disease infestations, and other threats to our Nation's forests.

H.R. 2647 would return resilience to the overgrown, fire-prone forests that encompass a great deal of land in the Western United States. It would dramatically improve the health and resiliency of our Federal forests and rangelands by simplifying environmental process requirements, curtailing project planning times, and reducing the cost of implementing forest man-

agement projects, all while still ensuring robust protection of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, just last year, my district in central Washington endured the Carlton Complex fire, the largest wildfire in our State's history, which was responsible for the destruction of over 300 homes and businesses. This devastating, catastrophic wildfire crippled many parts of my district, and many of my constituents are still trying to recover; yet it seems, as soon as we start to move past one major wildfire, another is immediately on our doorstep, literally.

Almost 10 days ago, new fires broke out in Washington State in cities like Wenatchee and Quincy and counties, including Benton, Chelan, Grant, Adams and Douglas, immediately spreading and some requiring Washington State fire mobilization resources to keep them from escalating. As the West continues to face severe drought conditions, the threat of wildfire will only continue to worsen.

In order to begin to prevent and address these fires, we need to reform the way we prepare for, respond to, and fund wildfire response and mitigation efforts. We cannot continue to limp from one devastating fire season to the next, leaving little to no time, and even less funding, available for reforestation, rehabilitation, and overall forest management.

This bill addresses those shortcomings by providing new methods of funding, which will tackle the problem of fire borrowing. It also includes tools the Forest Service can implement immediately to treat thousands of acres of forest land at a lower cost.

Earlier this year, the House Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on Federal Lands, of which I am a member, held a hearing on this bill. One of the witnesses testifying was U.S. Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell.

In his opening comments, Chief Tidwell remarked that "the Forest Service is encouraged by many of the goals outlined within" the bill and "welcomes legislation that incentivizes collaboration and expands the toolset that we can use to complete critical work on our Nation's forests without over-riding environmental laws."

I believe these comments reflect the bipartisan nature in which the legislation was drafted and highlights the necessity of the reforms we are considering here today.

Mr. Speaker, it should also be noted that, because of the reforms and streamlined authorities in this bill, there will be an increase in acres of treated land, all at no additional costs to taxpayers. This legislation is essential and desperately needed to change the current path of forest management on public lands, which is outdated, unsustainable, and dangerous.

This rule also provides for further consideration of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, an education reform bill that reduces the Federal Government's

footprint and restores local control over education by eliminating wasteful and duplicative Federal programs and replacing them with guidelines that maintain both high-performance expectations and appropriate levels of funding.

This legislation provides local governments with the flexibility necessary to develop appropriate strategies with which to serve their students, parents, and communities.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as No Child Left Behind, has been due for reauthorization since 2007. Because it has not been reauthorized, the administration has been free to circumvent Congress and impose its own vision of education reform on the country, resulting in unprecedented intervention in local education issues.

The Student Success Act addresses this overreach by streamlining and eliminating more than 70 elementary and secondary education programs that have been deemed ineffective and instead promotes a more focused, efficient, and appropriate Federal law in the Nation's education system.

H.R. 5 will eliminate the current one-size-fits-all Federal accountability requirement and replace it with State-determined accountability systems designed to maintain high expectation for our Nation's schools. Additionally, the bill supports and encourages parental engagement in their children's education by helping parents to enroll their children in charter schools and allowing title I funds to follow low-income children to the school of their parents' choice.

Mr. Speaker, a well-educated workforce is imperative to the health and vitality of both our Nation's children and our economy. The Student Success Act will benefit students, parents, teachers, and school administrators by returning responsibility for student achievement to the States and local communities while maintaining high standards and expectations for our Nation's students, teachers, and schools.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for consideration of two critical pieces of legislation that will help protect our rural communities, provide much-needed reforms to our education system, and ensure that we are prepared to respond to devastating and catastrophic wildfires that have plagued many areas of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule's adoption; I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this morning, I got to meet with one of the superintendents from my district, Bruce Messinger, superintendent of the Boulder Valley

School District. Bruce told me, as so many others have over the previous years, how the outdated policies under No Child Left Behind stifle innovation and burden teachers and principals with a culture of overtesting.

I remember a lot of these concerns well because I served on our State Board of Education in Colorado from 2000 to 2006, when we were originally implementing No Child Left Behind; and just as we are now frustrated, we were then frustrated with the lack of flexibility, the fact that solutions were coming out of Washington rather than honoring our local accountability system in how we were able to make things work locally, and a formula, adequate yearly progress, that we knew wouldn't work.

We knew that we wouldn't have 100 percent proficiency in all subgroups within a decade. We knew we needed reasonable goals to look at student achievement growth rather than the 1-year picture. Since that time, there has been additional discretion given through a policy of waivers that have been given in many States, including my home State of Colorado, but I think we can all agree that it is past time to reauthorize and replace No Child Left Behind with a Federal education policy that makes sense.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is not that policy that makes sense. One need go no further than the very beginning of the bill in the sense of Congress section on page 7, just to see some of the Tea Party paranoia that underpins a lot of this bill.

It starts out on page 7 as a finding of Congress saying that the Secretary of Education, through three separate initiatives, has created a system of waivers and grants that influence, incentivize, and coerce State educational agencies into implementing common national curriculum programs of instruction and assessments for elementary and secondary education, which is just patently false.

First of all, I believe this is a reference—incorrect of course—to the Common Core standards. Now, first of all, standards are different from curriculum. Standards are certainly different from programs of instruction which stem from curriculum, and standards are different from assessments.

Common Core was an effort of the States to create college- and career-ready standards. What the Federal Government and Secretary Duncan have attempted to do is say States need to have college- and career-ready standards.

We can't define success downwards and say that kids are passing the test because it is a low test, it is an insufficient test. Whether States want to do it through Common Core or other mechanisms and other types of standards, they are welcome to do it.

Now, none of that—and the most factually erroneous part—none of that has to do with curriculum or program of

instruction. Those are entirely developed at the local level. Standards and the grade level expectations are one thing, as anybody involved with education knows; curriculum is another.

This bill starts with a false premise. It starts with a premise that somehow Washington is trying to run local school districts. That has never been the case, nor should it be the case. If that is the beginning of the essence of our cooperation, I think we can work together on a bill that empowers teachers, empowers local school districts, and empowers States with an accountability system that makes sense and the resources they need to meet the learning needs of all students.

Now, more than a decade has passed since Congress has authorized No Child Left Behind. While again, there are some good intentions in this bill, and there is some good language—which is also reflected in our Democratic substitute—it is far outweighed by some of the unintended consequences of the harmful language which will hurt students that is in this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me give a little refresher on how we got here. In early February, Chairman KLINE introduced this bill. The bill was introduced without input or buy-in from Democrats, and it was drafted with zero committee hearings on ESEA.

The bill immediately went to markup and was passed along partisan lines. The bill resembles a bill last session that passed this Chamber with zero Democratic votes. This bill is actually worse from my perspective and the perspective of Democrats, for a number of reasons that I will get into, than the bill that attracted zero Democratic support last session.

This bill was brought before the House in February. It was then pulled. Look, everybody can agree that this is a bad bill. Teachers say it is a bad bill; principals say it is a bad bill; parents say it is a bad bill; the civil rights community says it is a bad bill; disabilities advocates say it is a bad bill, and the business community and the chamber do not support this bill.

I think—and I am sure they will mention it—the only group that we can even find that supports this bill are superintendents. I am sure they will find a few more. We will have an enormous record of disability groups, civil rights groups, teachers groups, and many others that oppose this bill for a number of reasons, and those reasons are correct.

If it looks bad, if it looks like a duck, it walks like a duck, and it quacks like a duck, it really is a duck. It is hard to bring together the business community, the civil rights community, and teachers unions around anything; and to bring them around saying that this bill will result in less educational opportunities for American kids really is a crowning achievement.

We need a bill that prepares the next generation of our workforce with the skills they need to succeed.

□ 1300

We need an ESEA reauthorization that helps improve American competitiveness in the global economy. We need a bill that expects the best of teachers and gives teachers the respect that they deserve as a profession. We need a bill that cares about students with special needs and gives them the support they need. We need a bill that allows for innovation in our schools. We need a bill that protects lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students from discrimination and bullying; and yet both times that I offered an amendment to include the Student Non-Discrimination Act, it was not allowed in the Rules Committee. And we need a bill that ensures that every child in America has access to a world-class education, regardless of their ZIP Code, their race, their background, their socioeconomic class, or their sexual orientation.

The Democratic substitute that Mr. SCOTT has offered and will be debated and voted on is a strong step forward and reflects many of these priorities. It would have been wise for Chairman KLINE and the sponsors of the bill to take a closer look at Mr. SCOTT's Democratic substitute and to have considered many of those provisions in the underlying bill.

Now, I do want to point out a few of the good provisions in the bill, all of which are also reflected in the Democratic substitute and are generally reflected in some of the language being debated in the Senate as well.

As the founder of a public charter school network called the New America School, I understand how the freedom to innovate and flexibility to pursue a unique mission can help public charter schools achieve the highest levels of success.

The New America School has campuses in two States—Colorado and New Mexico—serving over 2,000 students from 40 countries. Just a few years ago, I was honored to speak at its Colorado graduation, and it was moving to hear the tales of some of the immigrant students who were served by this school.

There is excellent language around the charter school title V programs in both the Democratic substitute and nearly identical language in the underlying bill that ups the bar on charter schools and makes sure that the districts and States have best policies surrounding accountability for charter schools and makes sure that successful charter school models can replicate and expand to serve more students.

I am also pleased that two of my amendments to H.R. 5 were made in order and have already passed the House in the previous debate in February. One of my amendments encouraged collaboration among charter schools and traditional public schools, and another amendment allowed funds to be used for open educational resources to help save districts and students money on textbooks and other programs. These resources that are

open source, which are licensed but free to use, can reduce the burden of overtesting and can help reduce costs in education.

Now, there is not a lot more to say with regard to the positive provisions of this bill, but I want to talk about one of its biggest shortcomings and, namely, getting accountability right.

We can all agree that No Child Left Behind did not get accountability right, but the answer is to move forward and improve upon and make accountability work, not to take a step backward, which is what this bill does, by having a misguided set of principles defining performance targets and accountability.

In fact, if this bill were to become law, States would not be required to set performance targets based on student growth, proficiency, or graduation rates. The bill doesn't define low-performing schools, nor does it establish any parameters for intervention when we know a school isn't working.

One of the most compelling things that we can do here in Washington is equip local superintendents with the toolbox they need to help turn around persistently failing schools, and this bill fails to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we should provide schools with more flexibility to design school improvement programs that No Child Left Behind does, but we should not provide schools with the option to do nothing and allow dropout factories to continue to exist, elementary schools where we know that kids are falling further and further behind every year.

No child should be trapped in a failing school with no recourse. We need to fix accountability, not step away from it. This bill constitutes the Federal Government throwing up its arms and letting States define success downward to make themselves look good while leaving more students behind.

This problem is compounded by another amendment that was not even previously discussed that has now been allowed under this rule, namely, the Salmon amendment, 129, which is universally opposed by civil rights groups from the NAACP to La Raza to the Urban League to LULAC to the Education Trust.

The Salmon amendment assumes that disadvantaged students aren't capable of high achievement, perpetuating low expectations that are projected on students of color, poor students, immigrant students, students with disabilities, and others.

This amendment effectively gives in to those political pressures which we all feel that work against disadvantaged students, that work against them at the district level because often their parents are not enfranchised members of the community or voting in school board races or serving on the board that work against them at the State level because they are up against the special interests and, yes, work against them here even in Washington.

This body needs to stand up for disadvantaged communities, needs to stand up for African Americans, Latinos, immigrant communities, those students with disabilities and ensure that any deficiency in the quality of instruction for disadvantaged communities is not swept under the rug as the Salmon amendment would do.

I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the Salmon amendment.

While No Child Left Behind certainly had its flaws, it did move us forward in continuing to serve low-income and minority students, English language learners and students with disabilities.

H.R. 5 is a step backwards. Even without the Salmon amendment, it excludes students with disabilities from school accountability systems. The bill eliminates the 1 percent cap on alternate assessments based on alternative achievement standards.

Now, again, there is a real-world problem to be solved. There are some kids with learning disabilities so severe that they can't be given a test for accountability purposes. And that 1 percent number is an arbitrary number. You can argue it should be half a percent, you can argue it should be 1½ percent. That is a very legitimate discussion to have. And I would be fully open, as many of my colleagues were, to figuring out what that number is.

The answer is not to eliminate that number and effectively allow a State that might serve 12 percent of a population with students with disabilities to say none of those students will be tested; none of those students with individual education plans, none of those students who might be dyslexic will be looked at in terms of how they are learning.

Do you know what? My father was dyslexic, and it took him until fifth grade to learn to read. But under provisions of this bill, he might never have learned to read because he and millions of other Americans with disabilities would be completely swept under the rug with the elimination of the cap.

This bill also fails to invest in our Nation's teachers. In February, I introduced the Great Teaching and Leading for Great Schools Act, which would advance a new definition of professional development based on research and best practices.

Professional development doesn't have to simply be hiring someone to lecture teachers for a few hours while they are all bored. In fact, there is better proven, data-proven ways that can help advance teaching and learning in schools, including collaborative peer networks, feedback from teachers and principals, tying data in to ensure that our professional development opportunities work. Unfortunately, H.R. 5 eliminates any requirement that ensures quality professional development for teachers.

Now, let me talk about one of the most concerning provisions in this bill to Democrats, including myself, and it

has an innocuous name. It is called title I portability. It sounds like a good concept. It says that Federal aid for students of poverty would follow the student.

Now, that sounds good, again, just as that finding that somehow the Federal Government should never do these programs of destruction in national curriculum sounds good. But again, it is devoid of facts.

Let me tell you what the effect of this provision would do. What this provision would do is it would shift millions of dollars from schools that serve our most at-risk kids to schools that serve wealthier children.

The Center for American Progress recently released a report that broke down exactly what the language would mean for high-need schools in each State. In Colorado alone, schools that serve students of poverty would lose over \$8 million of funding.

So again, let's talk about how this works.

There is a threshold in each school district for schools that receive title I free and reduced lunch services. They are focused on the schools that serve the largest pockets of poverty.

In a school district like Boulder Valley School District whose superintendent was in to meet with me earlier today, they offer title I services in their schools that have about 40 percent or more free and reduced lunch kids. That allows them to focus on the eight or nine schools that have the highest need in what is overall a fairly prosperous school district.

If this provision were passed, resources would be diverted out of those schools that are in our neediest communities to the schools that are in our wealthiest communities.

As our ranking member has said and probably will say again, what problem is it you are trying to solve by shifting resources from poor schools to wealthy schools? While, again, it is a noble concept, and if there were a way to hold harmless or provide additional support for schools that serve at-risk kids, there might be some basis of discussion with myself and Members on my side of the aisle; but to simply say that we are going to shift tens or hundreds of millions of dollars from schools that serve kids in communities of poverty to wealthier schools, under any possible accountability metric, I guarantee you, will only increase the already persistent learning gap that exists between communities of poverty and prosperous communities, and is exactly the wrong way to go with regard to how we target our Federal resources to make the biggest difference in the lives of Americans who deserve access to quality public education.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate my colleague on the other side of the aisle's enthusiasm on this issue. This is an important topic, something that we have been discussing and debating for many, many

years and will continue to, because all of us want to do right by the children in our school districts. They are our future. We have an equal amount of enthusiasm on our side of the aisle.

At this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support not only of the rule, but of the underlying legislation with reforms that are included not only in the bill, but in the amendments that are coming forward in this rule.

I first want to commend Chairman KLINE and his staff for working over the last few months with many members of our Conference that had some real issues they wanted to see addressed in the bill. I want to talk about a few of those, specifically, the Salmon amendment that this rule makes in order that brings forward the ability for parents to opt out of testing in a way that doesn't impact the local school system.

This comes down to a question of whether or not you trust parents to make the right decisions for their children in making real reforms that give parents more control, getting Washington out of those decisions and allowing local innovation to move forward, and allowing parents to make those decisions about what is best for their children. So the Salmon amendment does that. I strongly support it, and I know Chairman KLINE supports it as well.

I want to also point out the Rokita-Grothman amendment. This is an amendment, again, that Chairman KLINE worked very closely with a number of our members on to bring forward to reduce the timeframe of the authorization. Instead of a 6-year authorization, it would be a 4-year authorization to give an opportunity to let the next administration put their own prints on what they want to see in terms of education reform while allowing these other reforms to move forward. That is an amendment that Chairman KLINE supports, as I do, and, hopefully, gets added to the bill.

The third amendment I want to talk about is the Zeldin amendment. This is an amendment that gets the Federal Government out of Common Core, not only financially, but also taking the ability away from the Secretary of the Department to use things like Common Core as a bludgeon when they are determining whether or not to approve waivers. So I think it is very important to get the Federal Government out of those decisions of Common Core, and that is what the Zeldin amendment does.

And then, finally, the Walker amendment, allowing a vote on A-PLUS, is something that I support, and I am glad that that is in the rule as well.

So many good reforms, not only with the amendments, but with the underlying bill, to give parents more control

and get the Federal Government out of those decisions, really good legislation to advance conservative causes in letting innovation happen at the local level.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, elementary school principal, and school board member, I know firsthand that No Child Left Behind is in need of serious improvement. Improvements must take substantial steps towards fulfilling the promises made by ESEA, those simple, yet powerful, promises that are at the heart of this civil rights law, promises made to all American children.

H.R. 5 ignores these promises and endangers the educational gains made in the 50 years since ESEA was passed. H.R. 5 threatens to thrust us back to a time when the right to quality education was merely an intangible promise for disadvantaged children. It ignores the promises at the heart of this civil rights law.

We must take substantial steps towards fulfilling the promises made by ESEA. H.R. 5 ignores the promise to value every child by allowing States and school districts to redirect funds away from the schools and the children most in need. They call it portability. H.R. 5 ignores the promise that every child counts by using vague and undefined accountability measures and failing to provide Federal guardrails for student achievement.

□ 1315

H.R. 5 ignores the promise that every child deserves a quality education, and it does so by failing to address our excessive dependence on deeply problematic standardized tests. We need to move toward more balanced forms of assessment that effectively measure diverse kinds of success in teaching and learning.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent decades working to understand how children learn, and I can tell you this—that this bill fails to meet the very promises that are essential for educating our children and that are at the heart of the ESEA. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote against this bill of unfulfilled promises.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), someone who really embodies something that I have seen in this Congress on both sides of the aisle since my becoming a Member, people who dedicate their lives to different fields. Congresswoman FOXX is a colleague and a member of the Rules Committee who has dedicated her life to education.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Washington for yielding and for his kind comments.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate on education and the Student Success Act is a crucial one for our future.

Over the last five decades, the Federal Government's role in education has increased dramatically. The Department of Education currently runs more than 80 K–12 education programs, many of which are duplicative or ineffective.

As a school board member in North Carolina, I saw how the vast reporting requirements for these Federal programs tie the hands of State and local school education leaders.

My colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working on the Student Success Act to make common-sense changes to update Federal law, addressing the concerns raised following No Child Left Behind.

Our legislation is centered on four principles: reducing the Federal footprint in education, empowering parents, supporting effective teachers, and restoring local control.

H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, will also streamline the Department of Education's bureaucracy by eliminating more than 65 duplicative and ineffective Federal education programs, cutting through the bureaucratic red tape that is stifling innovation in the classroom, granting States and school districts the authority to use Federal education funds as they believe will best meet the unique needs of their students.

Additionally, this legislation will take definitive steps to limit the Secretary's authority by prohibiting him or her from coercing States into adopting academic standards like the Common Core.

If we would like to reduce the Federal Government's role in education, we must act. In the absence of congressional action, President Obama and his Education Department have taken unprecedented steps to regulate education.

Beginning in 2011, the Obama administration began offering States temporary waivers from No Child Left Behind's onerous burden in exchange for granting the Secretary of Education complete discretion to coerce States into enacting the President's preferred education reforms.

The Student Success Act provides an important opportunity to stop President Obama's overreach into State and local education debates through his waiver scheme.

Mr. Speaker, our children deserve better. It is time to acknowledge more Federal intrusion cannot address the challenges facing schools. That is the promise of the Student Success Act: a reduced Federal role, focused on restoring authority and control to parents, teachers, States, and communities on how our children are educated.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, now more than ever we must ensure that every kid has access to a great school. It shouldn't matter who your parents are, what ZIP code you live in, or how many zeros are at the end of your bank account.

H.R. 5 breaks the promise made 50 years ago to help all kids get a good public education and to recognize the challenges faced by kids living in poverty.

Republicans will have the opportunity to make their bad bill even worse by allowing an amendment to come to the floor today which essentially turns all of ESEA into a block grant, allowing States to use Federal resources for any educational purpose, meaning States can redirect Federal funds towards taxpayer-funded vouchers for private and religious schools.

That has been a failed experiment in Wisconsin, and that strips money away from public schools and hurts kids everywhere. I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 5, a bad bill that could likely get even worse today.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a fellow freshman.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the debate before this floor today is who knows best how to educate our children.

I rise today to speak about H.R. 5, the Student Success Act. This is legislation that I believe goes a long way in getting the Federal Government out of the way of our schools and teachers and putting education back in the right hands by restoring local control.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I have spent several hours debating and marking up this legislation. I have also visited several schools in my district and have spoken with parents, teachers, and administrators about the challenges they are facing.

What I heard across the board was that top-down regulations from Washington are burdening our teachers with seemingly endless compliance requirements.

Our educators should have the ability to focus on the individual needs of their students and their classes. Instead, our current system is forcing them to spend time filling out paperwork and meeting this one-size-fits-all requirement.

That is exactly why H.R. 5 is important legislation that I urge my colleagues to support today. This bill replaces the current accountability system that says Washington knows what is best for our students, and it replaces it with a system that gives States and school districts the responsibility for measuring the success of their schools. Through bottom-up reforms, it restores local control and gives our educators more freedom to innovate.

I have personally seen in my district how students and communities benefit

from local innovation in schools. We have one such example in my district that does not get \$1 of Federal funding, and it takes children who are discarded by the public school system and makes successful students from this group. I am very proud of what this school has accomplished.

H.R. 5 empowers parents, just like at this school, with more information to hold schools accountable for effective teaching, and it expands opportunities to send their children to a school that best meets their needs. It also gets rid of almost 70 unnecessary Federal programs and, instead, creates a block grant that provides money to the States.

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

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

Mr. ALLEN. Under H.R. 5, States are protected from being coerced into adopting Common Core by the Department of Education, and they have the right to opt out of any program under the law.

Mr. Speaker, all of these are significant and needed steps to put the responsibility of education back where it belongs, and that is with the States, local school districts, parents, and the educators, as they know what is best. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, more than 60 years ago, in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court talked about the value of education when it said that, these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity where the State has undertaken to provide it is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

The fact is that equal educational opportunities were not and still are not always available in low-income areas, basically, for two reasons. First, we fund education through the real estate tax, virtually guaranteeing that wealthy areas will have more resources; and just with the give and take in politics, you know that low-income areas will generally get the short end of the stick.

In 1965, we enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to recognize the disparities in funding. It addresses "the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs."

While public education would remain fundamentally a local issue through ESEA, the government recognized that, without Federal oversight and support, districts would not address these inequities.

In the last reauthorization, better known as No Child Left Behind, in addition to money, Congress required States to identify and address achievement gaps.

Because of that work, the education of our children has been much improved, as high school dropout rates are at historic lows, as the long-term scores on the national tests have gone up, and as the achievement gaps for racial and ethnic minorities have actually been closing, but the gap between rich and poor has actually been going up.

Mr. Speaker, with that background, the House has put forth its vision of the reauthorization of the ESEA, the Student Success Act. It violates the original purpose of ESEA, first, by reducing the funding, but also by changing the funding formula to take money from low-income areas and to give it to wealthy areas.

For example, Los Angeles, with 70 percent poverty, would lose about a quarter of its funding while Beverly Hills, with virtually no poverty, would pick up about 30 percent in additional funding under that new formula.

This rule enables amendments that, if adopted in the bill, will significantly reduce the ability of States to determine academic achievement gaps.

Now, I recognize that everybody is mad at having to take tests, and we address that in the bill by auditing the number of tests, making sure that there are as few as possible and that they are used for purposes which are validated.

The bill significantly scales back the ability of States to identify achievement gaps and then scales back their requirement to do anything about it.

These are the major flaws in H.R. 5: less funding, less ability to determine the achievement gaps, and then no requirement to do anything about it.

There are other problems with the bill, for example, block granting programs that will end up underfunding bilingual education, afterschool programs, STEM, arts education, and others. These vital programs will certainly do worse.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, we should both defeat the rule. And if the rule passes, we should defeat the bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), another freshman colleague.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of the underlying bill.

We have a chance today to help put our K-12 education system back on track, helping students all across this country.

Over the past 6 months, I have traveled in my district to listen to the concerns of teachers, administrators, parents, and students.

One of the most common themes I hear is that there is too much confusion coming from Washington and that

those who know what is best—our educators and parents—are not getting a say in our children's futures.

Local school districts understand the unique needs of their students far better than any bureaucrat in Washington ever will.

From No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, and waivers, the Department of Education has sent so many mixed signals that it is impossible for teachers and administrators to focus on what is needed most, flexibility to help students learn and succeed. This is why I am a strong supporter of H.R. 5.

I commend Chairman JOHN KLINE and Subcommittee Chairman TODD ROKITA for putting forward legislation that ensures that students and schools are put first. Accountability will now be placed where it should have been all along, with States and local school districts.

Labeling half of all schools in the United States as failing has caused the Department of Education to become far too overreaching in defining accountability as they continue to shift the metrics on what is considered satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5 empowers parents and students by giving them access to information about local schools in order to hold them accountable.

In addition, this bill eliminates 65 duplicative and underperforming programs and consolidates the money into a new grant program for local school districts. This money can be spent by districts to meet their unique needs.

Funding for title I remains robust in the bill, and students and parents retain the ability to make the best educational decisions for them by providing access to charter schools and magnet schools.

□ 1330

Particularly important for my constituents in New York is language in H.R. 5 that prevents the Secretary of Education from forcing States to implement Common Core.

I urge all Members to vote "aye" on the rule and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, back to the same bill we debated earlier this year that continues to embrace the idea that less Federal oversight over Federal dollars is what we need to transform K–12 education.

The opposition seems to believe that removing Federal standards would help local leaders make tough decisions. That is absolutely wrong. It actually makes it harder.

For 9 years, I served on a school board in a large urban school district, and I remember agonizing over the decision to move money from one high-needs school to another. In the end, it was the law and safeguards around

title I that helped direct us to make sure the money went to the students that required the greatest assistance. This changes that.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is a Federal law that gives guidance to local school board members that must deal with thousands of competing interests every single day and which enables local leaders ultimately to make the right decision.

Mr. Speaker, today represents a missed opportunity. We need a 21st century education system that makes investment in all our Nation's children. That and only that will help our Nation compete in the global economy. Today's reauthorization of ESEA not only misses the mark, but actually moves us in the wrong direction.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, a "no" vote on final passage and also on the Salmon amendment.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership, the gentleman from Washington, and the members of the Committee on Rules for bringing this rule to the floor. I think it is a good rule. I urge a "yes" vote on it and the underlying bill, which I am hopeful and pleased we are going to get to today.

In response to some of the last speakers, first of all, let me associate myself with the remarks of Ms. STEFANIK from New York. She is right on. This is exactly the kind of policy and law that we need in this country at this particular time because it puts the trust and the personal responsibility back in the hands of the people where it belongs; and that is our parents, our teachers, our school principals, and superintendents.

How arrogant for anyone to think that we here in Washington know better how to raise our children than those children's parents, working hand in hand, side by side, with that child's teacher and school leaders.

This bill is needed. It is right on point. It is needed for the 21st century, and I want to address some of the misinformation that might be out there.

First of all, I want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the civil rights protections, which I agree with my friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, are very, very important—critical. That is all kept here. That language remains because it is essential.

Secondly, we mandate disaggregated data so that we can see from a holistic, collective standpoint how our children of whatever ethnic background are doing. That is very important. That is kept. Title I is there. There is some more portability, but we think that is a good thing because choice in this subject is a good thing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this isn't about money. Federal spending in education has gone up 300

percent since the Federal Government got involved in this business, and test results are flat. It is not about money. It is about leadership.

The best way to empower leaders is to give them the tools that they need so that they can help our children grow and compete in the 21st century world and win. That is exactly what the Student Success Act does. It trusts teachers and parents over Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for full support from this House for the rule and for the underlying legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0).

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule which would allow for consideration of H.R. 5, a harmful bill that abandons our commitment to ensuring all children in my home State of Arizona and across the country are afforded quality education that prepares them for success.

We can all agree that every child deserves a fair shot by giving them and their teachers the tools they need; but the reality is millions of kids face additional barriers that require targeted resources. Unfortunately, this bill turns its back on these kids by block granting all funding for English language learners, migrant students, and at-risk students and lets the funding be spent elsewhere.

What is more, it eliminates requirements that schools improve the education of English language learners each year. By removing accountability for the achievement and learning gains of Latinos and English language learners, this bill ignores the real needs of kids and families across our communities.

Mr. Speaker, a Latino child in Phoenix deserves every resource he or she needs to succeed. That is why I strongly support the Democratic substitute amendment to H.R. 5 offered by my colleague Congressman SCOTT. This alternative recognizes the needs of Latino students and ensures proper oversight that we know is necessary.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5 and its dangerous provisions for Latino students.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, when he first signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, President Lyndon B. Johnson greatly advanced both education and civil rights.

Now, here, 50 years later, the need for Federal support for our schools remains very real, but Republicans celebrate the anniversary by effectively repealing the civil rights portion, Title I, of this act.

In February, Republicans began consideration of this bill and then suspended it because so many of their Members did not think it was extreme

enough in cutting aid to our schools. Since then, the Senate has come together in a bipartisan, though lacking, approach, but a better approach that recognizes the need for civil rights and public education.

Just as it did previously on immigration reform, the House has rejected that bipartisan approach and has jumped off the right end with a more extreme antieducation attitude.

In a few weeks, bright-faced young schoolchildren will put on their backpacks and head off to school. As their number increases, this bill actually cuts the purchasing power available to our schools to meet those growing needs.

Most importantly, Republicans would encourage the States to divert aid from the schools with the greatest need and to actually use Federal dollars to replace what the States are already spending on education.

Not only does the bill shortchange our schools and our students, it also eliminates dedicated funding for important programs like STEM—science, technology, engineering, and math education. These STEM skills are driving innovation.

It is silent on support for our youngest Americans, as schools across the country recognize that brain research supports having pre-K through 12 education. We need not only accountability but funding. This bill should be rejected. We cannot shut the door on these students.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, passage of this measure will restore responsible management to our forests after decades of Federal neglect. My district includes seven national forests which have suffered from increasingly devastating forest fires caused by overgrown, mismanaged forests and has been economically hobbled by restrictions on forest management.

Last year, in just one of my counties, just three forest fires burned 200,000 acres. Our rural communities, public lands, and environment are being destroyed by this neglect.

This measure will return active management to our forests by increasing flexibility; cutting red tape; and, most importantly, acting to manage forests before fires occur, not afterwards. Streamlining the review process means that forest management can occur when it is actually needed to address dangerous conditions, not after years of legal roadblocks.

Allowing categorical exclusions for postfire salvage and rehabilitation hastens forest recovery and prevents fuel buildup that can contribute to the next future fire. Expanding local involvement in forest management will improve the data available for planning and respect local priorities.

In light of Forest Service surveys finding that over 12 million Sierra Nevada trees have died in the last year, we cannot afford to wait another year.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we act today before our forests have passed beyond any point where they can be restored to good forest health.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). The gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Instead of engaging in partisan fights on so important an issue that, in essence, is about our future as a Nation and future generations, we should find common ground. Education is a civil right. All students deserve the opportunity of a world class, high-quality education.

This very week, the Senate is discussing their own version of ESEA reauthorization. Now, while nothing is perfect, their bill reflects the bipartisan spirit that would improve this bill if it was allowed in this body.

Members of the Tri-Caucus and leaders of the New Democrat Coalition have sent letters to the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions with a number of suggestions for their bill, but at least there is a bipartisan attempt to help prepare our Nation's kids for our future.

ESEA is one of the most significant pieces of legislation this body will consider. It is a bill about our future. Members of this body are eager to improve this bill and pass a reauthorized version to finally replace No Child Left Behind.

No child should have to attend a failing school, and ZIP Code and race should never determine the quality of an education that a child receives. I think that is something, hopefully, we can agree on as a core principle.

Unfortunately, the bill before us retreats from our promise to our Nation's students. H.R. 5 would bring us back to a time with no accountability standards, where students with disabilities are swept under the rug.

It would divert money from the schools and kids that need it the most; and with the Salmon amendment, it would sweep minority students, students with disabilities, new immigrant students, and low-income students under the rug, as they were in the past. Now that they have emerged, we must ensure that they meet all the learning needs for all students.

Mr. Speaker, we are shortchanging our Nation's kids by not being thoughtful and deliberate with this issue. It is rare that a bill would unite the business community, teachers, school boards, and many others in opposition, but H.R. 5 does this.

The bill's sponsors had 133 days to give students and our country a bill that they deserve.

□ 1345

It is a shame that they didn't take better advantage of that opportunity.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule; "no" on the bill; "no" on the Salmon amendment; and "yes" on the Democratic substitute, which was thoughtfully put together to ensure that America's next generation is prepared to carry on our legacy of global leadership and to put food on their tables as aspiring members of our great country.

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

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

As you can tell, due to the number of colleagues from both sides of the aisle speaking today, these are critically important issues we are considering, important to the economic well-being of our country, as well as to the health of our forest lands and the safety of rural communities.

Reforming our education system and the way we combat wildfires and manage our forests is of the highest priority, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as both of the underlying bills.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, a bipartisan, comprehensive bill aimed at expediting and improving forest management activities in Federal forests.

This critical piece of legislation would address the disastrous consequences of catastrophic wildfire and would return resilience to our overgrown, fire-prone forests by dramatically improving the health of our Federal forests and rangelands.

My district, as well as many other areas around the country, continue to face the threat of catastrophic wildfire, which is made worse by the continuing drought conditions and the poor management and maintenance of forests on our Federal lands.

We must begin to take steps to prevent and address these fires, which this bill does by reforming the way we prepare, respond to, and fund wildfire response and mitigation efforts.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue on this current path, where we limp from one devastating fire to the next, unable to break the cycle of destructive fire seasons due to ineffective funding mechanisms, insufficient forest maintenance, and a burdensome Federal permitting and review process.

This bill addresses these shortcomings by tackling the problem of fire borrowing, simplifying environmental process requirements, reducing project planning times, and lowering the cost of implementing forest management projects, all while ensuring robust environmental protections.

Mr. Speaker, because of the reforms and streamlined authorities in this bill, there will be an increase in acres of treated land, which will come at no additional cost to our taxpayers. This legislation is essential and desperately needed to change the outdated, unsustainable, and ultimately dangerous system of forest management on Federal lands.

This rule also provides for further consideration of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, a reform of our Nation's education system which reduces the Federal Government's footprint in State and local issues and restores control over education back to those on the ground who are best qualified to make the decisions affecting their students, parents, teachers, and communities.

Mr. Speaker, a well-educated workforce is imperative to the health and vitality of both our Nation's children and our economy. The Student Success Act empowers parents, local communities, and State governments to lead the way in fixing America's broken educational system.

H.R. 5 will benefit students, parents, teachers, and school administrators by returning responsibility for student achievement to the States and local communities, while maintaining high standards and expectations for our Nation's students, teachers, and schools.

This is a good, straightforward rule, Mr. Speaker, allowing for consideration of two critical pieces of legislation that will help protect our rural communities, provide much-needed reforms to our education system, and ensure that we are prepared to respond to the devastating and catastrophic wildfires that have plagued many areas of our country. I support the rule's adoption, and I urge my colleagues also to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 185, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

YEAS—242

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

Grothman	McCarthy	Rouzer
Guinta	McCaul	Royce
Guthrie	McClintock	Russell
Hanna	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Hardy	McKinley	Salmon
Harper	McMorris	Sanford
Harris	Rodgers	Scalise
Hartzler	McSally	Schweikert
Heck (NV)	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Hensarling	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Sessions
Hice, Jody B.	Mica	Shimkus
Hill	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Holding	Mooleenaar	Simpson
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)
Huelskamp	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Neugebauer	Stefanik
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Stewart
Hurt (VA)	Noem	Stivers
Issa	Nugent	Stutzman
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Thornberry
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Tiberi
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Tipton
Jolly	Paulsen	Trott
Jones	Pearce	Turner
Jordan	Perry	Upton
Joyce	Pittenger	Valadao
Katko	Pitts	Wagner
Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Kelly (PA)	Poliquin	Walden
King (IA)	Pompeo	Walker
King (NY)	Posey	Walorski
Kinzinger (IL)	Price, Tom	Walters, Mimi
Kline	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)
Knight	Reed	Webster (FL)
Labrador	Reichert	Wenstrup
LaMalfa	Renacci	Westerman
Lamborn	Ribble	Westmoreland
Lance	Rice (SC)	Whitfield
Latta	Rigell	Williams
LoBiondo	Roby	Wilson (SC)
Long	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Womack
Love	Rogers (KY)	Woodall
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Yoder
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Yoho
Lummis	Rooney (FL)	Young (AK)
MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IA)
Marchant	Roskam	Young (IN)
Marino	Ross	Zeldin
Massie	Rothfus	Zinke

NAYS—185

Adams	DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.
Ashford	DeGette	Kaptur
Bass	Delaney	Keating
Beatty	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Becerra	DelBene	Kennedy
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Beyer	Dingell	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kind
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	F.	Kuster
Boyle, Brendan	Duckworth	Langevin
F.	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Engel	Lawrence
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Lee
Bustos	Esty	Levin
Butterfield	Farr	Lewis
Capps	Fattah	Lieu, Ted
Capuano	Foster	Lipinski
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Loebach
Carney	Fudge	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lowey
Cartwright	Gallago	Lujan Grisham
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Graham	Luján, Ben Ray
Chu, Judy	Grayson	(NM)
Cicilline	Green, Al	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Carolyn
Clay	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean
Cleaver	Hahn	Matsui
Clyburn	Hastings	McCollum
Cohen	Heck (WA)	McDermott
Connolly	Higgins	McGovern
Conyers	Himes	McNerney
Cooper	Hinojosa	Meeks
Costa	Honda	Meng
Courtney	Hoyer	Moore
Crowley	Huffman	Moulton
Cuellar	Israel	Murphy (FL)
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Napolitano
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Neal

Nolan	Rush	Takano
Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
O'Rourke	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	T.	Titus
Pascarella	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Payne	Sarbanes	Torres
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Perlmutter	Schiff	Van Hollen
Peters	Schrader	Vargas
Peterson	Scott (VA)	Veasey
Pingree	Scott, David	Vela
Pocan	Serrano	Velázquez
Polis	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Sherman	Walz
Quigley	Sinema	Wasserman
Rangel	Sires	Schultz
Rice (NY)	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Richmond	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Roybal-Allard	Speier	Welch
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Ruppersberger	Takai	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Aguilar	Culberson	Lofgren
Black	Deutch	Miller (FL)

□ 1418

Messrs. DOYLE, SIRE, and HIMES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FITZPATRICK, FRELING-HUYSEN, DUFFY, STEFANIK, MULLIN, YOHO, BRIDENSTINE, TIBERI, YOUNG of Alaska, ROGERS of Alabama, and TIPTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONGRES- SIONAL WOMEN'S GAME SOFTBALL

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the congressional version of the Women's World Cup Soccer team, the softball version.

I am here with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, my teammates, my sisters who played valiantly in the 7th Annual Congressional Women's Softball Game.

Congratulations to the women Members of Congress who beat the press in a shutout game, defending our title in back-to-back victories as Congressional Women's Softball Game Champions.

I want to thank my teammates on both sides of the aisle. They have become my sisters and my friends throughout the whole season.

It is always so amazing to think about what we do over 3 months with the incredibly busy schedules that so many of us have, coming out to practice at 7:00 in the morning, two or three times a week. We did not have a smaller turnout for practice than 10 Members at each practice at 7:00 in the morning. And our hard work paid off.

This is a game that, I know, many of you know is near and dear to my heart.

I know that many of you know this. It bears repeating just because of the reason that we play this game. I was

diagnosed with breast cancer 7½ years ago, and today I am cancer free at 41 years old.

It is really timely for us to be able to focus some attention on breast cancer in young women, given the USPSTF recommendations and the discussions that we are having around making sure that we pay attention and help young women focus on their breast health. That is what this game is all about.

We are so proud to tell you that since we started this game 7 years ago, we have raised about \$700,000 for the Young Survival Coalition. \$200,000 of that was this game.

Without the leadership and dedication of our board of directors and our organizing committee, this game and the money we raise would not have been possible.

I want to specifically thank our board president, Kate Yglesias Houghton, and all the members of board: Atalie Ebersole, Natalie Buchanan, Tori Barnes, and Kristen Buckler. Also, a huge thank you to the members of the organizing committee: Jill Agostino, Sean Bartlett, Gary Caruso, Kayla Dunlap, Katharine Emerson, Ben Gerdes, Jenna Glazer, Kathryn Hamm, Erika Kelly, Jim Kiley, and Dana Paikowsky. A special shout-out to EDDIE PERLMUTTER, who was one of our assistant coaches, and to our cheerleaders.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), who for the second time this month and for the second time in the last couple of weeks is actually standing next to me.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentlewoman from Florida's remarks.

I also would like to thank all of our colleagues here in this Chamber today that have not only come out and supported us, but also supported the Young Survivors Coalition as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the survivors. Each member of this team played either in memory of or on behalf of someone who is currently struggling with the fight with cancer.

So I would just say to mine, Rhonda McCall Walker, Mr. Speaker, who came from Alabama and attended the game, along with so many others, that we support these individuals. This is a really incredible thing that the Members of Congress do.

Mr. Speaker, to the Bad News Babes, I would just say we are on it for next year, too. So keep your guard up.

I would like to also recognize the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who is the MVP. She played an incredible game. And "most improved" is the gentlewoman from Arizona, KYRSTEN SINEMA.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 333 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. 2822.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1426

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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 132, line 24.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment by Mr. SABLON of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Amendment by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

Amendment by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.

Amendment No. 13 by Mrs. LAWRENCE of Michigan.

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

Amendment by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

Amendment by Mr. HARDY of Nevada.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting 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 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 181, noes 244, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—181

Adams	Gabbard	Moulton
Aguilar	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Ashford	Garamendi	Nadler
Bass	Grayson	Napolitano
Beatty	Griffith	Neal
Becerra	Grijalva	Nolan
Benishek	Gutierrez	Norcross
Bera	Hahn	Pallone
Beyer	Hastings	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Blumenauer	Herrera Beutler	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Pingree
F.	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Honda	Poliquin
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bustos	Israel	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Capps	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jolly	Rush
Carson (IN)	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Katko	T.
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sanford
Ciциlline	Kelly (PA)	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kind	Scott, David
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Connolly	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Langevin	Sherman
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Courtney	Lawrence	Sires
Crowley	Lee	Slaughter
Cummings	Levin	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Takai
DeFazio	Lipinski	Takano
Delaney	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Loeback	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Titus
Denham	Lowey	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Torres
Dingell	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doggett	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
F.	Massie	Veasey
Duckworth	Matsui	Vela
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Walz
Eshoo	McKinley	Wasserman
Esty	McNerney	Schultz
Farr	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Meng	Watson Coleman
Foster	Miller (MI)	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moore	Zeldin

NOES—244

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Cooper
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)
Allen	Buchanan	Cramer
Amash	Buck	Crawford
Amodei	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Babin	Burgess	Cuellar
Barletta	Byrne	Curbelo (FL)
Barr	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Carter (GA)	DeGette
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	Dent
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	DesJarlais
Black	Clawson (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Blackburn	Coffman	Dold
Blum	Cole	Donovan
Bost	Collins (GA)	Duffy
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Duncan (SC)
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Duncan (TN)
Brat	Conaway	Elmiers (NC)
Bridenstine	Cook	Emmer (MN)

Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)

Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Moolenaar
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
LaMalfa
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver Engel Speier
Culberson Lofgren Yarmuth
Deutch Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1429

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) 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 184, noes 243, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck

Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar

Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas

Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
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
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen

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

NOT VOTING—6

Blackburn Deutch Miller (FL)
Culberson Lofgren Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1433

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) 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 183, noes 245, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—183

Adams Fattah Norcross
 Aguilar O'Rourke
 Ashford Frankel (FL)
 Bass Fudge
 Beatty Gabbard
 Becerra Gallego
 Bera Garamendi
 Bishop (GA) Gibson
 Bishop (UT) Grayson
 Blumenauer Green, Al
 Bonamici Green, Gene
 Boyle, Brendan Grijalva
 F. Gutiérrez
 Brady (PA) Hahn
 Brown (FL) Hastings
 Brownley (CA) Heck (WA)
 Bustos Higgins
 Butterfield Himes
 Capps Hinojosa
 Capuano Honda
 Cárdenas Hoyer
 Carney Huffman
 Carson (IN) Israel
 Cartwright Jackson Lee
 Castor (FL) Jeffries
 Castro (TX) Johnson (GA)
 Chu, Judy Johnson, E. B.
 Cicilline Jones
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy
 Clay Kildeer
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kind
 Cohen Kuster
 Connolly Langevin
 Conyers Larson (CT)
 Cooper Lawrence
 Costa Lee
 Courtney Levin
 Crowley Lewis
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted
 Cummings Lipinski
 Curbelo (FL) Loeb sack
 Davis (CA) Lowenthal
 Davis, Danny Lowey
 DeFazio Lynch
 DeGette Maloney,
 Delaney Carolyn
 DeLauro Maloney, Sean
 DelBene Matsui
 Denham McCollum
 DeSaulnier McDermott
 Dingell McGovern
 Doggett McNeerney
 Doyle, Michael Meeks
 F. Meng
 Duckworth Moore
 Edwards Moulton
 Ellison Murphy (FL)
 Engel Nadler
 Eshoo Napolitano
 Esty Neal
 Farr Nolan

NOES—245

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

Holding Hudson
 Huelskamp Huelkamp
 Huizenga (MI) Hultgren
 Hunter Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA) Issa
 Jenkins (KS) Mooney (WV)
 Jenkins (WV) Mullin
 Johnson (OH) Mulvaney
 Johnson, Sam Murphy (PA)
 Jolly Neugebauer
 Jordan Newhouse
 Joyce Noem
 Katko Nugent
 Keating Nunes
 Kelly (MS) Olson
 Kelly (PA) Palazzo
 King (IA) Palmer
 King (NY) Paulsen
 Kinzinger (IL) Pearce
 Kirkpatrick Perry
 Kline Peters
 Knight Pittenger
 Labrador Pitts
 LaMalfa Poe (TX)
 Lamborn Poliquin
 Lance Polis
 Larsen (WA) Pompeo
 Latta Posey
 LoBiondo Price, Tom
 Long Ratcliffe
 Loudermilk Reed
 Love Reichert
 Lucas Renacci
 Luetkemeyer Ribble
 Lujan Grisham Rice (SC)
 (NM) Rigell
 Lujan, Ben Ray Roby
 (NM) Roe (TN)
 Lummis Rogers (AL)
 MacArthur Rogers (KY)
 Marchant Rohrabacher
 Marino Rokita
 Massie Rooney (FL)
 McCarthy Roskam
 McCaul Ross
 McClintock Rothfus
 McHenry Rouzer
 McKinley Royce

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson Kaptur
 Deutch Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1436

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CAS-
 TOR) 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 188, noes 239,
 not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—188

Adams Ashford Bass
 Aguilar Barletta Beatty

Becerra Bera
 Beyer Beyer
 Bishop (GA) Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer Blumenauer
 Bonamici Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan Boyle, Brendan
 F. F.
 Brady (PA) Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA) Brownley (CA)
 Bustos Bustos
 Butterfield Butterfield
 Capps Capps
 Capuano Capuano
 Cárdenas Cárdenas
 Carney Carney
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN)
 Cartwright Cartwright
 Castor (FL) Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX) Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy Chu, Judy
 Cicilline Cicilline
 Clark (MA) Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY) Clarke (NY)
 Clay Clay
 Cleaver Cleaver
 Clyburn Clyburn
 Cohen Cohen
 Connolly Connolly
 Conyers Conyers
 Cooper Cooper
 Costa Costa
 Courtney Courtney
 Crowley Crowley
 Cuellar Cuellar
 Cummings Cummings
 Curbelo (FL) Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA) Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny Davis, Danny
 DeFazio DeFazio
 DeGette DeGette
 Delaney Delaney
 DeLauro DeLauro
 DelBene DelBene
 Denham Denham
 DeSaulnier DeSaulnier
 Dingell Dingell
 Doggett Doggett
 Doyle, Michael Doyle, Michael
 F. F.
 Duckworth Duckworth
 Edwards Edwards
 Ellison Ellison
 Engel Engel
 Eshoo Eshoo
 Esty Esty
 Farr Farr

NOES—239

Abraham Cole
 Aderholt Collins (GA)
 Allen Collins (NY)
 Amash Comstock
 Amodei Conaway
 Babin Cook
 Barr Costello (PA)
 Barton Cramer
 Benishek Crawford
 Bilirakis Crenshaw
 Bishop (MI) Davis, Rodney
 Bishop (UT) Denham
 Black Dent
 Blackburn DeSantis
 Blum DesJarlais
 Bost Diaz-Balart
 Boustany Donovan
 Brady (TX) Duffy
 Brat Duncan (SC)
 Bridenstine Duncan (TN)
 Brooks (AL) Ellmers (NC)
 Brooks (IN) Emmer (MN)
 Buchanan Esty
 Buck Farenthold
 Bucshon Fincher
 Burgess Fitzpatrick
 Byrne Fleischmann
 Calvert Flores
 Carter (GA) Forbes
 Carter (TX) Fortenberry
 Chabot Foss
 Chaffetz Franks (AZ)
 Clawson (FL) Frelinghuysen
 Coffman Garrett

Norcross O'Rourke
 Pallone Pallone
 Pascarelli Pascarelli
 Payne Payne
 Green, Gene Green, Gene
 Pelosi Pelosi
 Grijalva Grijalva
 Gutiérrez Gutiérrez
 Hahn Hahn
 Hastings Hastings
 Heck (WA) Heck (WA)
 Higgins Higgins
 Himes Himes
 Hinojosa Hinojosa
 Honda Honda
 Hoyer Hoyer
 Huffman Huffman
 Israel Israel
 Jackson Lee Jackson Lee
 Jeffries Jeffries
 Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B.
 Jones Jones
 Kaptur Kaptur
 Keating Keating
 Kelly (IL) Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy Kennedy
 Kildeer Kildeer
 Kilmer Kilmer
 Kind Kind
 Kirkpatrick Kirkpatrick
 Kuster Kuster
 Langevin Langevin
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
 Lawrence Lawrence
 Lee Lee
 Levin Levin
 Lewis Lewis
 Lieu, Ted Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski Lipinski
 Loeb sack Loeb sack
 Lowenthal Lowenthal
 Lowey Lowey
 Lynch Lynch
 Maloney, Maloney,
 Carolyn Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean Maloney, Sean
 Matsui Matsui
 McCollum McCollum
 McDermott McDermott
 McGovern McGovern
 McMorris McMorris
 Rodgers Rodgers
 McNeerney McNeerney
 Meeks Meeks
 Meng Meng
 Moore Moore
 Moulton Moulton
 Murphy (FL) Murphy (FL)
 Nadler Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Neal Neal
 Nolan Nolan

Gibbs Gohmert
 Goodlatte Goodlatte
 Gosar Gosar
 Gowdy Gowdy
 Granger Granger
 Graves (GA) Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA) Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO) Graves (MO)
 Griffith Griffith
 Grothman Grothman
 Guinta Guinta
 Guthrie Guthrie
 Hanna Hanna
 Hardy Hardy
 Harper Harper
 Harris Harris
 Hartzler Hartzler
 Heck (NV) Heck (NV)
 Hensarling Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B. Hice, Jody B.
 Hill Hill
 Holding Holding
 Hudson Hudson
 Huelskamp Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren Hultgren
 Hunter Hunter
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA) Hurt (VA)
 Issa Issa
 Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV) Jenkins (WV)

Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Schweikert	Carney	Himes	Pelosi	Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Kline	Palmer	Simpson
Jolly	Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Cartwright	Honda	Peters	Knight	Paulsen	Sinema
Jordan	Newhouse	Sessions	Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Pingree	Labrador	Pearce	Smith (MO)
Joyce	Noem	Shimkus	Castro (TX)	Huffman	Pocan	LaMalfa	Perry	Smith (NE)
Katko	Nugent	Shuster	Chu, Judy	Israel	Polis	Lamborn	Peterson	Smith (TX)
Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Simpson	Cioccilino	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)	Lance	Pittenger	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Smith (MO)	Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Quigley	Latta	Pitts	Stewart
King (IA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Rangel	Long	Poe (TX)	Stivers
King (NY)	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert	Loudermilk	Poliquin	Stutzman
Kinzinger (IL)	Paulsen	Stefanik	Cleaver	Kaptur	Rice (NY)	Love	Pompeo	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Pearce	Stewart	Clyburn	Keating	Richmond	Lucas	Posey	Thornberry
Knight	Perry	Stivers	Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard	Luetkemeyer	Price, Tom	Tiberi
Labrador	Peters	Stutzman	Connolly	Kennedy	Ruiz	Lummis	Ratcliffe	Tipton
LaMalfa	Peterson	Thompson (PA)	Conyers	Kildee	Ruppersberger	MacArthur	Reed	Trott
Lamborn	Pittenger	Thornberry	Cooper	Kilmer	Rush	Marchant	Renacci	Turner
Lance	Pitts	Tiberi	Courtney	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Marino	Ribble	Upton
Latta	Poe (TX)	Tipton	Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda T.	Massie	Rice (SC)	Valadao
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Trott	Cummings	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta	McCarthy	Rigell	Wagner
Long	Polis	Turner	Curbelo (FL)	Langevin	Sarbanes	McCaul	Roby	Walberg
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Upton	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky	McClintock	Roe (TN)	Walden
Love	Posey	Valadao	Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Schiff	McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walker
Lucas	Price, Tom	Wagner	DeFazio	Lawrence	Schrader	McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Walberg	DeGette	Lee	Scott (VA)	McMorris	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi
Lujan Grisham	Reed	Walden	Delaney	Levin	Scott, David	Rodgers	Rokita	Weber (TX)
(NM)	Renacci	Walker	DeLauro	Lewis	Serrano	McSally	Rooney (FL)	Webster (FL)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ribble	Walorski	DeBene	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)	Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
(NM)	Rice (SC)	Walters, Mimi	DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Sherman	Meehan	Roskam	Westerman
Lummis	Rigell	Weber (TX)	Dingell	LoBiondo	Sires	Messer	Ross	Westmoreland
MacArthur	Roby	Webster (FL)	Doggett	Loebach	Slaughter	Mica	Rothfus	Whitfield
Marchant	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup	Dold	Lowenthal	Smith (NJ)	Miller (MI)	Rouzer	Williams
Marino	Rogers (AL)	Westerman	Doyle, Michael F.	Lowey	Smith (WA)	Moolenaar	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Massie	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland	Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Speier	Mooney (WV)	Russell	Wittman
McCarthy	Rohrabacher	Whitfield	Edwards	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)	Mullin	Ryan (WI)	Womack
McCaul	Rokita	Williams	Ellison	Lujan, Ben Ray	Takai	Mulvaney	Salmon	Woodall
McClintock	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Engel	(NM)	Takano	Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Yoder
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman	Eshoo	Lynch	Thompson (CA)	Neugebauer	Scalise	Yoho
McKinley	Roskam	Womack	Esty	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)	Newhouse	Schweikert	Young (AK)
McSally	Ross	Woodall	Farr	Carolyn	Titus	Noem	Scott, Austin	Young (IA)
Meadows	Rothfus	Yoder	Fattah	Maloney, Sean	Tonko	Nugent	Sensenbrenner	Young (IN)
Meehan	Rouzer	Young (AK)	Foster	Matsui	Torres	Nunes	Sessions	Zeldin
Messer	Royce	Young (IA)	Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Tsongas	Olson	Shimkus	Zinke
Mica	Russell	Young (IN)	Fudge	McDermott	Van Hollen	NOT VOTING—5		
Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Zinke	Gabbard	McGovern	Vargas			
Moolenaar	Salmon		Gallego	McNerney	Veasey	Culberson	Duffy	Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)	Sanford		Garamendi	Meeks	Vela	Deutch	Lofgren	
Mullin	Scalise		Gibson	Meng	Velázquez	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR		
			Graham	Moore	Visclosky			
			Grayson	Moulton	Walz	The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).		
			Green, Al	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman			
			Green, Gene	Nadler	Schultz	There is 1 minute remaining.		
			Grijalva	Napolitano	Waters, Maxine			
			Gutiérrez	Neal	Watson Coleman	□ 1442		
			Hahn	Nolan	Welch			
			Hastings	Norcross	Wilson (FL)	So the amendment was rejected.		
			Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Yarmuth			
			Herrera Beutler	Pallone		The result of the vote was announced		
			Higgins	Pascrell				
				Payne		as above recorded.		
						AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS		
						The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished		
						business is the demand for a recorded		
						vote on the amendment offered by the		
						gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms.		
						TSONGAS) 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 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 189, noes 239,		
						not voting 5, as follows:		
						[Roll No. 397]		
						AYES—189		
Adams	Beyer	Brown (FL)	Abraham	Comstock	Graves (GA)			
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Aderholt	Conaway	Graves (LA)			
Ashford	Blumenauer	Bustos	Allen	Cook	Graves (MO)			
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield	Amash	Costa	Griffith			
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan	Capps	Amodei	Costello (PA)	Grothman			
Becerra	F.	Capuano	Babin	Cramer	Guinta			
Bera	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas	Barletta	Crawford	Guthrie			
			Barr	Crenshaw	Hanna			
			Barton	Cuellar	Hardy			
			Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Harper			
			Bilirakis	Denham	Harris			
			Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hartzler			
			Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Heck (NV)			
			Black	DesJarlais	Hensarling			
			Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hice, Jody B.			
			Blum	Donovan	Hill			
			Bost	Duncan (SC)	Holding			
			Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Hudson			
			Brady (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp			
			Brat	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)			
			Bridenstine	Farenthold	Hultgren			
			Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Hunter			
			Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)			
			Buchanan	Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)			
			Buck	Fleming	Issa			
			Bucshon	Flores	Jenkins (KS)			
			Burgess	Forbes	Jenkins (WV)			
			Byrne	Portenberry	Johnson (OH)			
			Calvert	Fox	Johnson, Sam			
			Carter (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Jolly			
			Carter (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Jones			
			Chabot	Garrett	Jordan			
			Chaffetz	Gibbs	Joyce			
			Clawson (FL)	Gohmert	Katko			
			Coffman	Goodlatte	Kelly (MS)			
			Cole	Gosar	Kelly (PA)			
			Collins (GA)	Gowdy	King (IA)			
			Collins (NY)	Granger	King (NY)			

NOT VOTING—6

Clay	Deutch	Lofgren
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1439

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRI-
JALVA) 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 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 189, noes 239,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—189

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

NOES—239

Comstock	Graves (GA)
Conaway	Graves (LA)
Cook	Graves (MO)
Costa	Griffith
Costello (PA)	Grothman
Cramer	Guinta
Crawford	Guthrie
Crenshaw	Hanna
Cuellar	Hardy
Davis, Rodney	Harper
Denham	Harris
Dent	Hartzler
DeSantis	Heck (NV)
DesJarlais	Hensarling
Diaz-Balart	Hice, Jody B.
Donovan	Hill
Duncan (SC)	Holding
Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp
Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Farenthold	Hultgren
Fincher	Hunter
Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)
Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)
Fleming	Issa
Flores	Jenkins (KS)
Forbes	Jenkins (WV)
Portenberry	Johnson (OH)
Fox	Johnson, Sam
Franks (AZ)	Jolly
Frelinghuysen	Jones
Garrett	Jordan
Gibbs	Joyce
Gohmert	Katko
Goodlatte	Kelly (MS)
Gosar	Kelly (PA)
Gowdy	King (IA)
Granger	King (NY)

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson	Duffy	Miller (FL)
Deutch	Lofgren	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1442

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms.
TSONGAS) 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 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 191, noes 238,
not voting 4, as follows:

Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Polis	Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)	Doggett	Kuster	Richmond
Cooper	Kaptur	Price (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Smith (NJ)	Doyle, Michael	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Keating	Quigley	Lummis	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	F.	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Rangel	MacArthur	Posey	Stewart	Duckworth	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kennedy	Rice (NY)	Marchant	Price, Tom	Stivers	Edwards	Lawrence	Rush
Cuellar	Kildee	Richmond	Marino	Ratcliffe	Stutzman	Ellison	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard	Massie	Reed	Thompson (PA)	Engel	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ruiz	McCarthy	Reichert	Thornberry	Eshoo	Lewis	T.
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger	McCaul	Renacci	Tiberi	Esty	Lieu, Ted	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Kuster	Rush	McClintock	Ribble	Tipton	Farr	Lipinski	Sarbanes
DeGette	Langevin	Ryan (OH)	McHenry	Rice (SC)	Trotter	Fattah	Loeb sack	Schakowsky
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda	McKinley	Rigell	Turner	Foster	Lowenthal	Schiff
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	T.	McMorris	Roby	Upton	Frankel (FL)	Lowe y	Schrader
DeBene	Lawrence	Sanchez, Loretta	Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Valadao	Fudge	Lynch	Scott (VA)
DeSaulnier	Lee	Sarbanes	McSally	Rogers (AL)	Wagner	Gabbard	Maloney,	Scott, David
Dingell	Levin	Schakowsky	Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Walberg	Gallego	Carolyn	Serrano
Doggett	Lewis	Schiff	Meehan	Rohrabacher	Walden	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Dold	Lieu, Ted	Schrader	Messer	Rokita	Walker	Graham	Matsui	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Scott (VA)	Mica	Rooney (FL)	Walorski	Grayson	McCollum	Sires
F.	Loeb sack	Scott, David	Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi	Green, Al	McDermott	Slaughter
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Serrano	Moolenaar	Roskam	Weber (TX)	Green, Gene	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)	Mooney (WV)	Ross	Webster (FL)	Grijalva	McNerney	Speier
Ellison	(NM)	Sherman	Mullin	Rothfus	Wenstrup	Gutiérrez	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema	Mulvaney	Rouzer	Westerman	Hahn	Meng	Takai
Eshoo	(NM)	Sires	Murphy (PA)	Royce	Westmoreland	Hastings	Moore	Takano
Esty	Lynch	Slaughter	Neugebauer	Russell	Whitfield	Heck (WA)	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Maloney,	Smith (WA)	Newhouse	Ryan (WI)	Williams	Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Carolyn	Speier	Noem	Salmon	Wilson (SC)	Himes	Nadler	Titus
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Stefanik	Nugent	Sanford	Wittman	Hinojosa	Napolitano	Tonko
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)	Nunes	Scalise	Womack	Honda	Neal	Torres
Fudge	McCollum	Takai	Olson	Schweikert	Woodall	Hoyer	Nolan	Tsongas
Gabbard	McDermott	Takano	Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Yoder	Huffman	Norcross	Van Hollen
Gallego	McGovern	Thompson (CA)	Palmer	Sensenbrenner	Yoho	Israel	O'Rourke	Vargas
Garamendi	McNerney	Thompson (MS)	Paulsen	Sessions	Young (AK)	Jackson Lee	Pallone	Veasey
Graham	Meeks	Titus	Pearce	Shimkus	Young (IA)	Jeffries	Pascrell	Vela
Grayson	Meng	Tonko	Perry	Shuster	Young (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Payne	Velázquez
Green, Al	Moore	Torres	Pittenger	Simpson	Zinke	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Visclosky
Green, Gene	Moulton	Tsongas	Pitts	Smith (MO)		Kaptur	Peters	Walz
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Van Hollen				Keating	Pingree	Wasserman
Guinta	Nadler	Vargas				Kelly (IL)	Pocan	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Veasey				Kennedy	Polis	Waters, Maxine
Hahn	Neal	Vela				Kildee	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman
Hanna	Nolan	Velázquez				Kilmer	Quigley	Welch
Hastings	Norcross	Visclosky				Kind	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Walz				Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)	Yarmuth
Higgins	Pallone	Wasserman						
Himes	Pascrell	Schultz						
Hinojosa	Payne	Waters, Maxine						
Honda	Pelosi	Watson Coleman						
Hoyer	Perlmutter	Welch						
Huffman	Peters	Wilson (FL)						
Israel	Peterson	Yarmuth						
Jackson Lee	Pingree	Zeldin						
Jeffries	Pocan							
Johnson (GA)								

NOES—238

Abraham	Cramer	Harper
Aderholt	Crawford	Harris
Allen	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Amash	Curbelo (FL)	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Babin	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Barletta	Dent	Hice, Jody B.
Barr	DeSantis	Hill
Barton	DesJarlais	Holding
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bilirakis	Donovan	Huelskamp
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Hurd (TX)
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Hurt (VA)
Bost	Farenthold	Issa
Boustany	Fincher	Jenkins (KS)
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Brat	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Jolly
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Jones
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Jordan
Buck	Foxx	Joyce
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Katko
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (MS)
Byrne	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Gibbs	King (IA)
Carter (GA)	Gibson	King (NY)
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	Kinzing er (IL)
Chabot	Goodlatte	Kline
Chaffetz	Gosar	Knight
Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Labrador
Coffman	Granger	LaMalfa
Cole	Graves (GA)	Lamborn
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Lance
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Latta
Comstock	Griffith	LoBiondo
Conaway	Grothman	Long
Cook	Guthrie	Loudermilk
Costello (PA)	Hardy	Love

Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Smith (NJ)
Lummis	Pompeo	Smith (TX)
MacArthur	Posey	Stewart
Marchant	Price, Tom	Stivers
Marino	Ratcliffe	Stutzman
Massie	Reed	Thompson (PA)
McCarthy	Reichert	Thornberry
McCaul	Renacci	Tiberi
McClintock	Ribble	Tipton
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Trotter
McKinley	Rigell	Turner
McMorris	Roby	Upton
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Valadao
McSally	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Walden
Messer	Rokita	Walker
Mica	Rooney (FL)	Walorski
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi
Moolenaar	Roskam	Weber (TX)
Mooney (WV)	Ross	Webster (FL)
Mullin	Rothfus	Wenstrup
Sherman	Rouzer	Westerman
Sinema	Royce	Westmoreland
Sires	Russell	Whitfield
Slaughter	Ryan (WI)	Williams
Smith (WA)	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Speier	Sanford	Wittman
Stefanik	Scalise	Womack
Swalwell (CA)	Schweikert	Woodall
Takai	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Takano	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Thompson (CA)	Sessions	Young (AK)
Thompson (MS)	Shimkus	Young (IA)
Titus	Shuster	Young (IN)
Tonko	Simpson	Zinke
Torres	Smith (MO)	
Tsongas		
Van Hollen		
Vargas		
Veasey		
Vela		
Velázquez		
Visclosky		
Walz		
Wasserman		
Schultz		
Waters, Maxine		
Watson Coleman		
Welch		
Wilson (FL)		
Yarmuth		
Zeldin		

NOT VOTING—4

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1446

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRI-
JALVA) 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 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 178, noes 251,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

AYES—178

Adams	Butterfield	Cohen
Agullar	Capps	Connolly
Bass	Capuano	Conyers
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cooper
Becerra	Carney	Courtney
Bera	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Beyer	Cartwright	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Boyle, Brendan	Ciilline	DeGette
F.	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Brown (FL)	Clay	DeBene
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Bustos	Clyburn	Dingell

Doggett	Kuster	Richmond
Doyle, Michael	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
F.	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Duckworth	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Edwards	Lawrence	Rush
Ellison	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
Eshoo	Lewis	T.
Esty	Lieu, Ted	Sanchez, Loretta
Farr	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Fattah	Loeb sack	Schakowsky
Foster	Lowenthal	Schiff
Frankel (FL)	Lowe y	Schrader
Fudge	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	Maloney,	Scott, David
Gallego	Carolyn	Serrano
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Graham	Matsui	Sherman
Grayson	McCollum	Sires
Green, Al	McDermott	Slaughter
Green, Gene	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McNerney	Speier
Guinta	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Gutiérrez	Meng	Takai
Hahn	Moore	Takano
Hanna	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Nadler	Titus
Higgins	Napolitano	Tonko
Himes	Neal	Torres
Hinojosa	Nolan	Tsongas
Honda	Norcross	Van Hollen
Hoyer	O'Rourke	Vargas
Huffman	Pallone	Veasey
Israel	Pascrell	Vela
Jackson Lee	Payne	Velázquez
Jeffries	Pelosi	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Peters	Walz
	Pingree	Wasserman
	Pocan	Schultz
	Polis	Waters, Maxine
	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman
	Quigley	Welch
	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
	Rice (NY)	Yarmuth

NOES—251

Abraham	DeSantis	Hurd (TX)
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Hurt (VA)
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Amash	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Amodei	Donovan	Jenkins (WV)
Ashford	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Babin	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Jones
Barton	Emmer (MN)	Jordan
Benishek	Farenthold	Joyce
Bilirakis	Fincher	Katko
Bishop (MI)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Black	Fleming	King (IA)
Blackburn	Flores	King (NY)
Blum	Forbes	Kinzing er (IL)
Bost	Fortenberry	Kline
Boustany	Foxx	Knight
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Brat	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Bridenstine	Garrett	Lamborn
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Lance
Brooks (IN)	Gibson	Latta
Buchanan	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Buck	Goodlatte	Long
Bucshon	Gosar	Loudermilk
Burgess	Gowdy	Love
Byrne	Granger	Lucas
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	Lujan Grisham
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	(NM)
Chabot	Griffith	Luján, Ben Ray
Chaffetz	Grothman	(NM)
Clawson (FL)	Guinta	Lummis
Coffman	Guthrie	MacArthur
Cole	Hanna	Marchant
Collins (GA)	Hardy	Marino
Collins (NY)	Harper	Massie
Comstock	Harris	McCarthy
Conaway	Hartzler	McCaul
Cook	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Costa	Hensarling	McHenry
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
Crawford	Hill	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Holding	McSally
Cuellar	Hudson	Meadows
Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp	Meehan
DeLauro	Huizenga (MI)	Messer
DeBene	Hultgren	Mica
DeSaulnier	Hunter	Miller (MI)
Dingell		

Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
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

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Deutch

Lofgren
Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1449

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes 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 243,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—186

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
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
Crawley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)

Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
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
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan

Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)

Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Gibbs
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
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
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam

Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Deutch

Lofgren
Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1453

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms.
EDWARDS) 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 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 180, noes 249,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—180

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

Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)

Higgins	Maloney, Sean	Sanchez, Loretta	Reed	Scott, Austin	Walberg	Kelly (IL)	Moore	Schiff
Himes	Matsui	Sarbanes	Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Walden	Kennedy	Moulton	Schrader
Hinojosa	McCollum	Schakowsky	Renacci	Sessions	Walker	Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Honda	McDermott	Schiff	Ribble	Sewell (AL)	Walorski	Kilmer	Nadler	Scott, David
Hoyer	McGovern	Schrader	Rice (SC)	Shimkus	Walters, Mimi	Kind	Napolitano	Serrano
Huffman	McNerney	Scott (VA)	Rigell	Shuster	Weber (TX)	Kuster	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Israel	Meeks	Scott, David	Roby	Simpson	Webster (FL)	Langevin	Nolan	Sherman
Jackson Lee	Meng	Serrano	Roe (TN)	Sinema	Wenstrup	Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Sires
Jeffries	Moore	Sherman	Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Westerman	Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Johnson (GA)	Moulton	Sires	Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland	Lawrence	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter	Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield	Lee	Pascarella	Speier
Kaptur	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Rokita	Smith (TX)	Williams	Levin	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Keating	Napolitano	Speier	Rooney (FL)	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)	Lewis	Pelosi	Takai
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Swalwell (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Wittman	Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Takano
Kennedy	Nolan	Takai	Roskam	Stivers	Woodall	Lipinski	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Norcross	Takano	Ross	Stutzman	Womack	Loeb sack	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)	Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	Woodall	Lowenthal	Pocan	Titus
Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)	Rouzer	Thornberry	Yoder	Lowe	Polis	Tonko
Kuster	Pascarella	Titus	Royce	Tiberi	Yoho	Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)	Torres
Langevin	Payne	Tonko	Russell	Tipton	Young (AK)	(NM)	Quigley	Tsongas
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Torres	Ryan (WI)	Trott	Young (IA)	Lujan, Ben Ray	Rangel	Van Hollen
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Tsongas	Salmon	Turner	Young (IN)	(NM)	Rice (NY)	Vargas
Lawrence	Peters	Van Hollen	Sanford	Upton	Zeldin	Lynch	Richmond	Veasey
Lee	Pingree	Vargas	Scalise	Valadao	Zinke	Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Levin	Pocan	Veasey	Schweikert	Wagner		Carolyn	Ruiz	Visclosky
Lewis	Polis	Vela				Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Walz
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Velázquez				Matsui	Rush	Wasserman
Lipinski	Quigley	Visclosky	Culberson	Lofgren		McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Loeb sack	Rangel	Walz	Deutch	Miller (FL)		McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Waters, Maxine
Lowenthal	Rice (NY)	Wasserman				McGovern	T.	Watson Coleman
Lowe	Richmond	Schultz				McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine				Meeks	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
(NM)	Ruiz	Watson Coleman				Meng	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger							
(NM)	Rush							
Lynch	Ryan (OH)							
Maloney,	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)						
Carolyn	T.	Yarmuth						

NOES—249

Abraham	Ellmers (NC)	King (NY)
Aderholt	Emmer (MN)	Kinzing (IL)
Allen	Farenthold	Kirkpatrick
Amash	Fincher	Kline
Amodei	Fitzpatrick	Knight
Ashford	Fleischmann	Labrador
Babin	Fleming	LaMalfa
Barletta	Flores	Lamborn
Barr	Forbes	Lance
Barton	Fortenberry	Latta
Benishek	Fox	LoBiondo
Billirakis	Franks (AZ)	Long
Bishop (MI)	Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Love
Black	Gibbs	Lucas
Blackburn	Gibson	Luetkemeyer
Blum	Gohmert	Lummis
Bost	Goodlatte	MacArthur
Boustany	Gosar	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	Marino
Brat	Granger	Massie
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	McCarthy
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Buchanan	Griffith	McHenry
Buck	Grothman	McKinley
Bucshon	Guinta	McMorris
Burgess	Guthrie	Rodgers
Byrne	Hanna	McSally
Calvert	Hardy	Meadows
Carter (GA)	Harper	Meehan
Carter (TX)	Harris	Messer
Chabot	Hartzler	Mica
Chaffetz	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)
Clawson (FL)	Hensarling	Moolenaar
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)
Cole	Hice, Jody B.	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Hill	Mulvaney
Collins (NY)	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Comstock	Hudson	Neugebauer
Conaway	Huelskamp	Newhouse
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Noem
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Nugent
Cramer	Hunter	Nunes
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Olson
Crenshaw	Hurt (VA)	Palazzo
Cuellar	Issa	Palmer
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (WV)	Pearce
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Perry
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Peterson
DeSantis	Jolly	Pittenger
DesJarlais	Jones	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Poe (TX)
Dold	Joyce	Poliquin
Donovan	Katko	Pompeo
Duffy	Kelly (MS)	Posey
Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom
Duncan (TN)	King (IA)	Ratcliffe

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Deutch

Lofgren
Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1456

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs.
LAWRENCE) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed 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 179, noes 250,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—179

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

NOES—250

Abraham	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Aderholt	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Allen	Fleming	Long
Amash	Flores	Loudermilk
Amodei	Forbes	Love
Ashford	Fortenberry	Lucas
Babin	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Barr	Frelinghuysen	MacArthur
Barton	Garrett	Marchant
Benishek	Gibbs	Marino
Billirakis	Gohmert	Massie
Bishop (GA)	Goodlatte	McCarthy
Bishop (MI)	Gosar	McCaul
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	McClintock
Black	Granger	McHenry
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Blum	Graves (LA)	McMorris
Bost	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Boustany	Green, Gene	McSally
Brady (TX)	Griffith	Meadows
Brat	Grothman	Meehan
Bridenstine	Guinta	Messer
Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Mica
Brooks (IN)	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Buchanan	Hardy	Moolenaar
Buck	Harper	Mooney (WV)
Bucshon	Harris	Mullin
Burgess	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Byrne	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Noem
Chabot	Hill	Nugent
Chaffetz	Holding	Nunes
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Olson
Coffman	Huelskamp	Palazzo
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Palmer
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pearce
Comstock	Hurd (TX)	Perry
Conaway	Hurt (VA)	Peterson
Cook	Issa	Pittenger
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Pitts
Cramer	Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Poliquin
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Pompeo
Cuellar	Jolly	Posey
Curbelo (FL)	Jones	Price, Tom
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Ratcliffe
Denham	Joyce	Reed
Dent	Katko	Reichert
DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Renacci
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Ribble
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Rice (SC)
Dold	King (NY)	Rigell
Donovan	Kinzing (IL)	Roby
Duffy	Kirkpatrick	Roe (TN)
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Rogers (KY)
Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa	Rokita
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)
Fincher	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen

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

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson Lofgren
 Deutch Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1459

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes 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 192, noes 237,
 not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—192

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

Larsen (WA) Nolan
 Larson (CT) Norcross
 Lawrence O'Rourke
 Lee Pallone
 Levin Pascarell
 Lewis Payne
 Lieu, Ted Pelosi
 Lipinski Perlmutter
 Loeb sack Peters
 Lowenthal Pingree
 Lowey Pocan
 Lujan Grisham Polis
 (NM) Price (NC)
 Luján, Ben Ray Quigley
 (NM) Rangel
 Lynch Ribble
 Maloney, Rice (NY)
 Carolyn Richmond
 Maloney, Sean Roybal-Allard
 Matsui Ruiz
 McCollum Ruppertsberger
 McDermott Rush
 McGovern Ryan (OH)
 McNerney Sánchez, Linda
 Meehan T.
 Meeks Sanchez, Loretta
 Meng Sarbanes
 Moore Schakowsky
 Moulton Schiff
 Murphy (FL) Scott (VA)
 Nadler Scott, David
 Napolitano Serrano
 Neal Sewell (AL)

NOES—237

Abraham Foxx MacArthur
 Aderholt Franks (AZ) Marchant
 Allen Frelinghuysen Marino
 Amash Garrett Massie
 Amodei Gibbs McCarthy
 Babin Gohmert McCaul
 Barletta Goodlatte McClintock
 Barr Gosar McHenry
 Barton Gowdy McKinley
 Benishek Granger McMorris
 Bilirakis Graves (GA) Rodgers
 Bishop (MI) Graves (LA) McSally
 Bishop (UT) Graves (MO) Meadows
 Black Griffith Messer
 Blackburn Grothman Mica
 Blum Guinta Miller (MI)
 Bost Guthrie Moolenaar
 Boustany Hanna Mooney (WV)
 Brady (TX) Hardy Mullin
 Brat Harper Mulvaney
 Bridenstine Harris Murphy (PA)
 Brooks (AL) Hartzler Neugebauer
 Brooks (IN) Heck (NV) Newhouse
 Buchanan Hensarling Noem
 Buck Herrera Beutler Nugent
 Bucshon Hice, Jody B. Nunes
 Burgess Hill Olson
 Byrne Holding Palazzo
 Calvert Hudson Palmer
 Carter (GA) Huelskamp Paulsen
 Carter (TX) Huizenga (MI) Pearce
 Chabot Hultgren Perry
 Chaffetz Hunter Peterson
 Clawson (FL) Hurd (TX) Pittenger
 Coffman Hurt (VA) Pitts
 Cole Issa Poe (TX)
 Collins (GA) Jenkins (KS) Poliquin
 Collins (NY) Jenkins (WV) Pompeo
 Comstock Johnson (OH) Posey
 Conaway Johnson, Sam Price, Tom
 Cook Jolly Ratcliffe
 Cramer Jones Reed
 Crawford Jordan Reichert
 Crenshaw Joyce Renacci
 Curbelo (FL) Katko Rice (SC)
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (MS) Rigell
 Denham Kelly (PA) Roby
 Dent King (IA) Roe (TN)
 DeSantis King (NY) Rogers (AL)
 DesJarlais Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (KY)
 Diaz-Balart Kline Rohrabacher
 Dold Knight Rokita
 Donovan Labrador Rooney (FL)
 Duffy LaMalfa Ros-Lehtinen
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn Roskam
 Duncan (TN) Lance Ross
 Elmers (NC) Latta Rothfus
 Emmer (MN) LoBiondo Rouzer
 Farenthold Long Royce
 Fincher Loudermilk Russell
 Fleischmann Love Ryan (WI)
 Fleming Lucas Salmon
 Flores Luetkemeyer Sanford
 Forbes Lummis Scalise

Schrader Thompson (PA)
 Schweikert Thornberry
 Scott, Austin Tiberi
 Sensenbrenner Tipton
 Sessions Trott
 Shimkus Turner
 Shuster Upton
 Simpson Valadao
 Smith (MO) Wagner
 Smith (NE) Walberg
 Smith (NJ) Walden
 Smith (TX) Walker
 Stefanik Walorski
 Stewart Walters, Mimi
 Stivers Weber (TX)
 Stutzman Webster (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson Lofgren
 Deutch Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1503

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms.
 TSONGAS) 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 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 243,
 not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—186

Adams Costello (PA) Gutiérrez
 Aguilar Courtney Hahn
 Bass Crowley Hanna
 Beatty Cummings Hastings
 Becerra Curbelo (FL) Heck (WA)
 Bera Davis (CA) Higgins
 Beyer Davis, Danny Himes
 Bishop (GA) DeFazio Hinojosa
 Blumenauer DeGette Honda
 Bonamici Delaney Hoyer
 Boyle, Brendan DeLauro Huffman
 F. DelBene Israel
 Brady (PA) DeSaulnier Jackson Lee
 Brown (FL) Dingell Jeffries
 Brownley (CA) Doggett Johnson (GA)
 Buchanan Dold Johnson, E. B.
 Bustos Doyle, Michael Kaptur
 Butterfield F. Katko
 Capps Duckworth Keating
 Capuano Edwards Kelly (IL)
 Cárdenas Ellison Kennedy
 Carney Engel Kildee
 Carson (IN) Eshoo Kilmer
 Cartwright Esty Kuster
 Castor (FL) Farr Langevin
 Castro (TX) Fattah Larsen (WA)
 Chu, Judy Fitzpatrick Larson (CT)
 Cicilline Foster Lawrence
 Clark (MA) Frankel (FL) Lee
 Clarke (NY) Fudge Levin
 Clay Gabbard Lewis
 Cleaver Gallego Lieu, Ted
 Clyburn Garamendi Lipinski
 Cohen Graham Loeb sack
 Connolly Grayson Lowenthal
 Conyers Green, Al Lowey
 Cooper Green, Gene Lujan Grisham
 Costa Grijalva (NM)

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Peters	Sires	Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Wittman	Loebsack	Payne	Sinema
Lynch	Pingree	Slaughter	Thornberry	Walters, Mimi	Womack	Lowenthal	Pelosi	Sires
Maloney, Carolyn	Pocan	Smith (WA)	Tiberi	Walz	Woodall	Lowey	Perlmutter	Slaughter
Maloney, Sean	Polis	Speier	Tipton	Weber (TX)	Yoder	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Peters	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)	Trott	Webster (FL)	Yoho	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pingree	Speier
McCollum	Quigley	Takai	Turner	Welch	Young (AK)	Maloney, Carolyn	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
McDermott	Rangel	Takano	Upton	Wenstrup	Young (IA)	Maloney, Sean	Polis	Takai
McGovern	Rice (NY)	Thompson (CA)	Valadao	Westerman	Young (IN)	Matsui	Price (NC)	Takano
McNerney	Richmond	Thompson (MS)	Wagner	Westmoreland	Zeldin	McCollum	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus	Walberg	Whitfield	Zinke	McDermott	Rangel	Titus
Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Tonko	Walden	Williams		McGovern	Rice (NY)	Tonko
Meng	Ruiz	Torres	Walker	Wilson (SC)		McNerney	Richmond	Torres
Moore	Ruppersberger	Tsongas				Meeks	Roskam	Tsongas
Moulton	Rush	Van Hollen	Culberson	Lofgren		Meng	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vargas	Deutch	Miller (FL)		Moore	Ruiz	Vargas
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda T.	Veasey				Moulton	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela				Murphy (FL)	Rush	Vela
Neal	Sarbanes	Velázquez				Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Norcross	Schakowsky	Visclosky				Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda T.	Visclosky
O'Rourke	Schiff	Wasserman				Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Schultz				Nolan	Sarbanes	Schultz
Pascarell	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine				Norcross	Schakowsky	Waters, Maxine
Payne	Serrano	Watson Coleman				O'Rourke	Schiff	Watson Coleman
Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)				Pallone	Scott (VA)	Welch
Perlmutter	Sherman	Yarmuth				Pascarell	Scott, David	Whitfield
	Sinema						Serrano	Wilson (FL)
							Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
							Sherman	

NOT VOTING—4

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1506

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I would like to include an extension of the record indicating that I inadvertently voted “no” on rollcall 404. I intended to vote “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) 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 183, noes 244, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—183

Abraham	Gohmert	McSally	Adams	Conyers	Grijalva	Abraham	Garrett	McCaul
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Meadows	Agular	Courtney	Gutiérrez	Aderholt	Gibbs	McClintock
Allen	Gosar	Messer	Bass	Crowley	Hahn	Allen	Gibson	McHenry
Amash	Gowdy	Mica	Beatty	Cuellar	Hastings	Amash	Gohmert	McKinley
Amodei	Granger	Miller (MI)	Becerra	Cummings	Heck (WA)	Amodei	Goodlatte	McMorris
Ashford	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar	Bera	Davis (CA)	Higgins	Ashford	Gosar	Rodgers
Babin	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Beyer	Davis, Danny	Himes	Babin	Gowdy	McSally
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Mullin	Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hinojosa	Barletta	Graham	Meadows
Barr	Griffith	Mulvaney	Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Hoyer	Barr	Graham	Meehan
Barton	Grothman	Murphy (PA)	Black	Delaney	Huffman	Barton	Granger	Messer
Benishek	Guinta	Neugebauer	Blackburn	DeLauro	Israel	Benishek	Graves (GA)	Mica
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Newhouse	Blum	DelBene	Jackson Lee	Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)
Bishop (MI)	Hardy	Noem	Bost	DeSaulnier	Jeffries	Bishop (MI)	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Nolan	Boustany	Dingell	Kennedy	Bishop (UT)	Green, Gene	Mooney (WV)
Black	Harris	Nugent	Brady (TX)	Doggett	Kildee	Black	Griffith	Mullin
Blackburn	Hartzler	Nunes	Brady (TX)	Dold	Kilmer	Blackburn	Grothman	Mulvaney
Blum	Heck (NV)	Olson	Brat	Donovan	Kind	Blum	Guinta	Murphy (PA)
Bost	Hensarling	Palazzo	Bridenstine	Doyle, Michael F.	Kelly (IL)	Bost	Hanna	Neugebauer
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Brooks (AL)	Brady (PA)	Keating	Boustany	Hardy	Newhouse
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen	Brooks (IN)	Brown (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Brady (TX)	Harper	Noem
Brat	Hill	Pearce	Buck	Brownley (CA)	Kennedy	Brat	Harris	Nugent
Bridenstine	Holding	Perry	Bucshon	Buchanan	Kilmer	Bridenstine	Hartzer	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Peterson	Burgess	Bustos	Kind	Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Pittenger	Byrne	Bustos	King (IA)	Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Buck	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts	Calvert	Butterfield	King (NY)	Buck	Hensarling	Palazzo
Bucshon	Hultgren	Poe (TX)	Carter (GA)	Capps	Kinzing (IL)	Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Burgess	Hunter	Poliquin	Carter (TX)	Carpenter	Kirkpatrick	Burgess	Hice, Jody B.	Pearce
Byrne	Hurd (TX)	Pompeo	Chabot	Cassidy	Kirkpatrick	Byrne	Hill	Perry
Calvert	Hurt (VA)	Posney	Chaffetz	Castro (TX)	Kuster	Calvert	Holding	Pittenger
Carter (GA)	Issa	Price, Tom	Chaffetz	Castro (TX)	Kuster	Carter (TX)	Hudson	Pitts
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Ratcliffe	Chabot	Chen	Kyle	Chabot	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Reed	Chaffetz	Chen	Kyle	Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Poliquin
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Reichert	Clawson (FL)	Chen	Kyle	Chaffetz	Hultgren	Pompeo
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Renacci	Coffman	Chen	Kyle	Coffman	Hunter	Posney
Coffman	Jolly	Ribble	Cole	Chen	Kyle	Cole	Hurt (TX)	Price, Tom
Cole	Jones	Rice (SC)	Collins (GA)	Chen	Kyle	Collins (GA)	Hurt (VA)	Ratcliffe
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rigell	Collins (NY)	Chen	Kyle	Collins (NY)	Issa	Reed
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Roby	Comstock	Chen	Kyle	Comstock	Jenkins (KS)	Reichert
Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Roe (TN)	Conaway	Chen	Kyle	Conaway	Jenkins (WV)	Renacci
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Cook	Chen	Kyle	Cook	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Cook	Kind	Rogers (KY)	Cramer	Chen	Kyle	Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Cramer	King (IA)	Rohrabacher	Crawford	Chen	Kyle	Crawford	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Crawford	King (NY)	Rokita	Crenshaw	Chen	Kyle	Crenshaw	Jones	Rigell
Crenshaw	Kinzing (IL)	Rooney (FL)	Cuellar	Chen	Kyle	Costa	Jordan	Roby
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Roskam	Davis, Rodney	Chen	Kyle	Costello (PA)	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Ross	Denham	Chen	Kyle	Cramer	Katko	Rogers (AL)
Denham	Knight	Rothfus	Dent	Chen	Kyle	Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Dent	Labrador	Rouzer	DeSantis	Chen	Kyle	Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Royce	DesJarlais	Chen	Kyle	Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rokita
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Russell	Diaz-Balart	Chen	Kyle	Duffy	Kinzing (IL)	Rooney (FL)
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Ryan (WI)	Donovan	Chen	Kyle	Duffy	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Donovan	Latta	Salmon	Duffy	Chen	Kyle	Ellmers (NC)	Knight	Ross
Duffy	LoBiondo	Sanford	Duncan (SC)	Chen	Kyle	Ellmers (MN)	Labrador	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Long	Scalise	Duncan (TN)	Chen	Kyle	Farenthold	LaMalfa	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Schrader	Ellmers (NC)	Chen	Kyle	Fleming	Lamborn	Royce
Ellmers (NC)	Love	Schweikert	Emmer (MN)	Chen	Kyle	Flores	Lance	Russell
Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Scott, Austin	Farenthold	Chen	Kyle	Forbes	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner	Fincher	Chen	Kyle	Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Salmon
Fincher	Lummis	Sessions	Fleischmann	Chen	Kyle	Fox	Long	Sanford
Fleischmann	MacArthur	Shimkus	Fleming	Chen	Kyle	Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Scalise
Fleming	Marchant	Shuster	Flores	Chen	Kyle	Fox	Love	Schrader
Flores	Marino	Stefanik	Forbes	Chen	Kyle	Fortenberry	Lucas	Schweikert
Forbes	Massie	Stewart	Fortenberry	Chen	Kyle	Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	McCarthy	Stutzman	Fox	Chen	Kyle	Fortenberry	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Fox	McCaul		Frelinghuysen	Chen	Kyle	Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McClintock		Garrett	Chen	Kyle	Garrett	Marchant	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McHenry		Gibbs	Chen	Kyle	Gibbs	Marino	Shuster
Garrett	McKinley		Gibson	Chen	Kyle	Gibson	Massie	Simpson
Gibbs	McMorris			Chen	Kyle		McCarthy	
Gibson	Rodgers			Chen	Kyle			

NOES—244

Abraham	Garrett	McCaul
Aderholt	Gibbs	McClintock
Allen	Gibson	McHenry
Amash	Gohmert	McKinley
Amodei	Goodlatte	McMorris
Ashford	Gosar	Rodgers
Babin	Gowdy	McSally
Barletta	Graham	Meadows
Barr	Granger	Meehan
Barton	Graves (GA)	Messer
Benishek	Graves (LA)	Mica
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)
Bishop (MI)	Green, Gene	Moolenaar
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Black	Grothman	Mullin
Blackburn	Guinta	Mulvaney
Blum	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Bost	Hanna	Neugebauer
Boustany	Hardy	Newhouse
Brady (TX)	Harper	Noem
Brat	Harris	Nugent
Bridenstine	Hartzer	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Palazzo
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Palmer
Bucshon	Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen
Burgess	Hill	Pearce
Byrne	Holding	Perry
Calvert	Hudson	Peterson
Carter (GA)	Huelskamp	Pittenger
Carter (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Chabot	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hunter	Poliquin
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (TX)	Pompeo
Coffman	Hurt (VA)	Posney
Cole	Issa	Price, Tom
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Ratcliffe
Collins (NY)	Jenkins (WV)	Reed
Comstock	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Cook	Jolly	Ribble
Cooper	Jones	Rice (SC)
Costa	Jordan	Rigell
Costello (PA)	Joyce	Roby
Cramer	Katko	Roe (TN)
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Davis, Rodney	Kinzing (IL)	Rokita
Dent	Kline	Rooney (FL)
DeSantis	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
DesJarlais	Labrador	Ross
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Duffy	Lamborn	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Royce
Ellmers (NC)	Latta	Russell
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Fincher	Long	Salmon
Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Sanford
Fleming	Love	Scalise
Flores	Lucas	Schrader
Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Fox	MacArthur	Sensenbrenner
Fortenberry	Marchant	Sessions
Frelinghuysen	Marino	Shimkus
Garrett	Massie	Shuster
Gibbs	McCarthy	Simpson

Smith (MO)	Turner	Westmoreland
Smith (NE)	Upton	Williams
Smith (NJ)	Valadao	Wilson (SC)
Smith (TX)	Wagner	Wittman
Stefanik	Walberg	Womack
Stewart	Walden	Woodall
Stivers	Walker	Yoder
Stutzman	Walorski	Yoho
Thompson (CA)	Walters, Mimi	Young (AK)
Thompson (PA)	Walz	Young (IA)
Thornberry	Weber (TX)	Young (IN)
Tiberi	Webster (FL)	Zeldin
Tipton	Wenstrup	Zinke
Trott	Westerman	

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson	Deutch	Lofgren
Denham	Duncan (SC)	Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1509

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 405, I mistakenly voted “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 405 on H.R. 2822, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “nay.”

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 405 on H.R. 2822, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “nay.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) 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 189, noes 237, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—189

Adams	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Aguilar	Chu, Judy	Dingell
Ashford	Cicilline	Doggett
Bass	Clark (MA)	Dold
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael
Becerra	Clay	F.
Bera	Cleaver	Duckworth
Beyer	Clyburn	Edwards
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Ellison
Blumenauer	Connolly	Engel
Bonamici	Conyers	Eshoo
Boyle, Brendan	Cooper	Esty
F.	Costa	Farr
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Fattah
Brown (FL)	Crowley	Foster
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Bustos	Curbelo (FL)	Fudge
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Capps	Davis, Danny	Galleo
Capuano	DeFazio	Garamendi
Cardenas	DeGette	Gibson
Carney	Delaney	Graham
Cartwright	DeLauro	Grayson
Castor (FL)	DelBene	Green, Al

Green, Gene	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Grijalva	Maloney,	T.
Gutiérrez	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta
Hahn	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Hastings	Matsui	Schakowsky
Heck (WA)	McCollum	Schiff
Higgins	McDermott	Schrader
Himes	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Hinojosa	McNerney	Scott, David
Honda	Meehan	Serrano
Hoyer	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Huffman	Meng	Sherman
Israel	Moore	Sires
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Slaughter
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Speier
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Stefanik
Kaptur	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Katko	Nolan	Takai
Keating	Norcross	Takano
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Pascrell	Titus
Kilmer	Payne	Tonko
Kind	Pelosi	Torres
Kuster	Perlmutter	Peters
Langevin	Pingree	Van Hollen
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Vargas
Larsen (CT)	Polis	Veasey
Lawrence	Price (NC)	Vela
Lee	Quigley	Velázquez
Levin	Rangel	Visclosky
Lewis	Reichert	Walz
Lieu, Ted	Rice (NY)	Wasserman
Lipinski	Richmond	Schultz
Loeback	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters, Maxine
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman
Lowe	Ruiz	Welch
Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
(NM)	Rush	Yarmuth
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	
(NM)		

NOES—237

Abraham	Ellmers (NC)	King (IA)
Aderholt	Emmer (MN)	King (NY)
Allen	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Amash	Fincher	Kirkpatrick
Amodei	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Babin	Fleischmann	Knight
Barietta	Fleming	Labrador
Barr	Flores	LaMalfa
Barton	Forbes	Lamborn
Benish	Fortenberry	Lance
Bilirakis	Fox	Latta
Bishop (MI)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Long
Black	Garrett	Loudermilk
Blackburn	Gibbs	Love
Blum	Gohmert	Lucas
Bost	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Boustany	Gosar	Lummis
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	MacArthur
Brat	Granger	Marchant
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	Massie
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Buchanan	Griffith	McCaul
Buck	Grothman	McClintock
Bucshon	Guinta	McHenry
Burgess	Guthrie	McKinley
Byrne	Hanna	McMorris
Calvert	Hardy	Rodgers
Carter (TX)	Harper	McSally
Chabot	Hartzler	Meadows
Chaffetz	Heck (NV)	Messer
Clawson (FL)	Hensarling	Mica
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Cole	Hice, Jody B.	Mooleenaar
Collins (GA)	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY)	Holding	Mullin
Comstock	Hudson	Mulvaney
Conaway	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Newhouse
Cramer	Hunter	Noem
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Nugent
Crenshaw	Hurt (VA)	Nunes
Cuellar	Issa	Olson
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
Denham	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
DesJarlais	Jolly	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Jones	Peterson
Donovan	Jordan	Pittenger
Duffy	Joyce	Pitts
Duncan (SC)	Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)	Poliquin

Pompeo	Scalise	Walberg
Posey	Schweikert	Walden
Price, Tom	Scott, Austin	Walker
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Reed	Sessions	Walters, Mimi
Renacci	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Ribble	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Rice (SC)	Simpson	Wenstrup
Rigell	Sinema	Westerman
Roby	Smith (MO)	Westmoreland
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Whitfield
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rohrabacher	Stewart	Wittman
Rokita	Stivers	Womack
Rooney (FL)	Stutzman	Woodall
Roskam	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Ross	Thornberry	Yoho
Rothfus	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Rouzer	Tipton	Young (IA)
Royce	Trott	Young (IN)
Russell	Turner	Zeldin
Ryan (WI)	Upton	Zinke
Salmon	Valadao	
Sanford	Wagner	

NOT VOTING—7

Carson (IN)	Deutch	Miller (FL)
Carter (GA)	Harris	
Culberson	Lofgren	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1512

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 406, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 406 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS.

BLACKBURN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 258, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—168

Allen	Buck	DeSantis
Amash	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Babin	Burgess	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Byrne	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Carter (GA)	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	Fincher
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	Fleischmann
Black	Chaffetz	Fleming
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Flores
Blum	Coffman	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Fox
Brat	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Conaway	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Cook	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Cooper	Gohmert
Buchanan	Crawford	Goodlatte

Gosar	Loudermilk	Rothfus	Moulton	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (CA)	Crawford	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Gowdy	Love	Rouzer	Murphy (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)	Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Granger	Lucas	Royce	Nadler	Roskam	Thompson (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Kline	Rokita
Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Russell	Napolitano	Ross	Titus	Davis, Rodney	Knight	Rooney (FL)
Graves (LA)	Lummis	Ryan (WI)	Neal	Roybal-Allard	Tonko	Dent	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Graves (MO)	Marchant	Salmon	Newhouse	Ruiz	Torres	DeSantis	LaMalfa	Roskam
Griffith	Massie	Sanford	Noem	Ruppersberger	Trott	DesJarlais	Lamborn	Ross
Grothman	McCarthy	Scalise	Nolan	Rush	Tsongas	Diaz-Balart	Lance	Rothfus
Guinta	McCaull	Schweikert	Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Turner	Dold	Latta	Rouzer
Guthrie	McClintock	Scott, Austin	Nugent	Sánchez, Linda T.	Valadao	Donovan	LoBiondo	Royce
Hardy	McHenry	Sensenbrenner	Nunes	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen	Duffy	Long	Russell
Harper	McMorris	Sessions	O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Vargas	Duncan (SC)	Loudermilk	Ryan (WI)
Harris	Rodgers	Shuster	Pallone	Schakowsky	Veasey	Duncan (TN)	Love	Salmon
Hartzer	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Payne	Schiff	Vela	Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Scalise
Hensarling	Messer	Smith (NE)	Pearce	Schrader	Velázquez	Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Hice, Jody B.	Mica	Smith (TX)	Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Visclosky	Fincher	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Hill	Miller (MI)	Stewart	Perlmutter	Scott, David	Walden	Fleischmann	MacArthur	Sensenbrenner
Holding	Moolenaar	Stutzman	Peters	Serrano	Walz	Fleming	Marchant	Sessions
Hudson	Mullin	Thornberry	Peterson	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman	Flores	Marino	Shimkus
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Tiberi	Pingree	Sherman	Schultz	Forbes	Massie	Shuster
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Tipton	Pocan	Shimkus	Waters, Maxine	Fox	McCarthy	Simpson
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Upton	Polis	Sinema	Watson Coleman	Frank (AZ)	McCaull	Sinema
Hunter	Olson	Wagner	Price (NC)	Sires	Garrett	Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Hurd (TX)	Palazzo	Walberg	Quigley	Slaughter	Webster (FL)	Gibbs	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Hurt (VA)	Palmer	Walker	Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Welch	Gohmert	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Issa	Paulsen	Walorski	Reed	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland	Goodlatte	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (KS)	Perry	Walters, Mimi	Reichert	Speier	Whitfield	Rodgers	McSally	Stefanik
Johnson (OH)	Pittenger	Weber (TX)	Renacci	Stefanik	Womack	Meadows	Gowdy	Stewart
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Wenstrup	Rice (NY)	Stivers	Yarmuth	Meehan	Granger	Stivers
Jones	Poe (TX)	Westerman	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)	Young (AK)	Messer	Graves (GA)	Stutzman
Jordan	Poliquin	Williams	Rigell	Takai	Zeldin	Mica	Graves (LA)	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (MS)	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)	Roby	Takano		Miller (MI)	Graves (MO)	Thornberry
King (IA)	Posey	Wittman	Williams			Mooney (WV)	Grothman	Tiberi
Kline	Price, Tom	Woodall	Yoder			Mullin	Guinta	Tipton
Knight	Ratcliffe	Yoho	Young (IA)			Mulvaney	Guthrie	Trott
Labrador	Ribble	Young (IN)	Zinke			Murphy (PA)	Hardy	Turner
LaMalfa	Rice (SC)					Harris	Harper	Upton
Lamborn	Roe (TN)					Hartzer	Harris	Valadao
Lance	Rogers (AL)					Heck (NV)	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Latta	Rohrabacher					Hice, Jody B.	Hill	Newhouse
Long	Rokita					Holding	Hudson	Noem
						Hultgren	Huelskamp	Nugent
						Huizenga (MI)	Issa	Nunes
						Hunter	Jenkins (KS)	Olson
						Hurd (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
						Hurt (VA)	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
						Issa	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
						Jenkins (KS)	Jolly	Perrin
						Jenkins (WV)	Jordan	Pittenger
						Johnson (OH)	Joyce	Pitts
						Johnson, Sam	Katko	Poe (TX)
						Jolly	Katko	Poliquin
						Jordan	Kelly (MS)	Pompeo
						Joyce	Kelly (PA)	Posey
						Katko	Roe (TN)	Price, Tom
						Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)	Ratcliffe
						Kelly (PA)		Reichert
						King (IA)		Renacci
								Ribble
								Rice (SC)
								Rigell
								Roby
								Roe (TN)
								Young (IN)
								Zeldin
								Zinke

NOES—258

Abraham	Davis, Danny	Israel
Adams	Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee
Aderholt	DeFazio	Jeffries
Aguilar	DeGette	Jenkins (WV)
Amodei	Delaney	Johnson (GA)
Ashford	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Barletta	DelBene	Jolly
Bass	Denham	Joyce
Beatty	Dent	Kaptur
Becerra	DeSaulnier	Katko
Benishkek	Diaz-Balart	Keating
Bera	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Beyer	Doggett	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Kennedy
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Kildee
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael F.	Kilmer
Bonamici	F.	Kind
Bost	Duckworth	King (NY)
Boustany	Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)
Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
F.	Ellison	Kuster
Brady (PA)	Ellmers (NC)	Langevin
Brown (FL)	Emmer (MN)	Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Bustos	Eshoo	Lawrence
Butterfield	Esty	Lee
Calvert	Farr	Levin
Capps	Fattah	Lewis
Capuano	Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted
Cárdenas	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Carney	Foster	LoBiondo
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Loebisack
Cartwright	Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lowe
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham
Chu, Judy	Galleo	(NM)
Ciçilline	Garamendi	Lujan, Ben Ray
Clark (MA)	Gibson	(NM)
Clarke (NY)	Graham	Lynch
Clay	Grayson	MacArthur
Cleaver	Green, Al	Maloney,
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Carolyn
Cohen	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cole	Gutiérrez	Marino
Comstock	Hahn	Matsui
Connolly	Hanna	McCollum
Conyers	Hastings	McDermott
Costa	Heck (NV)	McGovern
Costello (PA)	Heck (WA)	McKinley
Courtney	Herrera Beutler	McNerney
Crenshaw	Higgins	McSally
Crowley	Himes	Meehan
Cuellar	Hinojosa	Meeks
Cummings	Honda	Meng
Curbelo (FL)	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)
Davis (CA)	Huffman	Moore

NOT VOTING—7

Cramer
Culberson
Deutch
Lofgren
Miller (FL)
Pascrell
Simpson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1515

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
Stated against:
Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 407, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New Mexico (Mr.
PEARCE) 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 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 231, noes 198,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—231

Abraham	Blackburn	Carter (GA)	Clyburn	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Blum	Carter (TX)	Cohen	Foster
Allen	Boustany	Chabot	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Amash	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	Conyers	Fudge
Amodei	Brat	Clawson (FL)	Cooper	Gabbard
Babin	Bridenstine	Coffman	Costa	Galleo
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Cole	Courtney	Garamendi
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Crowley	Gibson
Barton	Buck	Collins (NY)	Cuellar	Graham
Benishkek	Bucshon	Comstock	Cummings	Grayson
Bilirakis	Burgess	Conaway	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Bishop (MI)	Byrne	Cook	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Costello (PA)	DeFazio	Griffith
Black		Cramer	DeGette	Grijalva
			Delaney	Gutiérrez
			DeLauro	Hahn
			DelBene	Hanna
			Denham	Hastings
			DeSaulnier	Heck (WA)
			Dingell	Herrera Beutler
			Doggett	Higgins
			Doyle, Michael F.	Himes
			Duckworth	Hinojosa
			Edwards	Honda
			Ellison	Hoyer
			Ellmers (NC)	Huffman
			Engel	Israel
			Eshoo	Jackson Lee
			Esty	Jeffries
			Farr	Johnson (GA)
			Fattah	Johnson, E. B.
			Fitzpatrick	Jones
				Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lowe y
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
Palmer
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
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
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long

Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
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)
Zinke

Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone

Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman

Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson
Deutch

Lofgren
Miller (FL)

Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1522

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chair, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 392—No. 409 on July 8, 2015 (today).

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 392—On Agreeing to the Resolution, Providing for further consideration of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act and H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, “aye;” rollcall vote No. 393—On Agreeing to the Amendment, First Garamendi of California Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 394—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Capps of California Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 395—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Sablan of Northern Mariana Islands Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 396—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Castor of Florida Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 397—On Agreeing to the Amendment, First Grijalva of Arizona Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 398—On agreeing to the Amendment, First Tsongas of Massachusetts Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 399—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Second Grijalva of Arizona Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 400—On Agreeing to the Amendment, First Polis of Colorado Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 401—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Edwards of Maryland Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall No. 402—On agreeing to the Amendment, Lawrence of Michigan Amendment No. 13 to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 403—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Second Polis of Colorado Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 404—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Second Tsongas of Massachusetts Amendment to H.R. 2822, “nay;” rollcall vote No. 405—On Agreeing to

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Deutch

Lofgren
Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1518

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARDY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) 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 222, noes 206, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

AYES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)

Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)

Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson

NOES—206

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted

the Amendment, Third Grijalva of Arizona Amendment to H.R. 2822, "nay;" rollcall vote No. 406—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Beyer of Virginia Amendment to H.R. 2822, "nay;" rollcall vote No. 407—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Blackburn of Tennessee Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 2822, "aye;" rollcall vote No. 408—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Pearce of New Mexico Amendment No. 13 to H.R. 2822, "aye;" rollcall vote No. 409—On Agreeing to the Amendment, Hardy of Nevada Amendment to H.R. 2822, "aye."

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 286. An act to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CALLING FOR SUBSTANTIVE DIALOGUE TO ADDRESS TIBETAN GRIEVANCES AND SECURE NEGOTIATED AGREEMENT FOR TIBETAN PEOPLE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 337) calling for substantive dialogue, without preconditions, in order to address Tibetan grievances and secure a negotiated agreement for the Tibetan people, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 337

Whereas Tibet is the center of Tibetan Buddhism, and His Holiness the Dalai Lama is the most revered figure in Tibetan Buddhism worldwide;

Whereas the Chinese response to the Tibetan Uprising in 1959 led to the exile of Tenzin Gyatso, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama, Tibet's spiritual and temporal leader;

Whereas His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama, who on July 6, 2015, celebrates his 80th birthday, has for over 50 years in exile significantly advanced greater understanding, tolerance, harmony and respect among the religious faiths of the world;

Whereas His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama has led the effort to preserve the rich cultural, religious, historical and linguistic heritage of the Tibetan people while at the same time promoting the safeguarding of other endangered cultures throughout the world;

Whereas His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama has personally promoted democratic self-government for Tibetans in exile and in 2011 turned over political authority to the democratically elected leadership of the Central Tibetan Administration;

Whereas His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama has been greatly concerned by the state of the Tibetan environment and the exploitation of its natural resources, including fresh water—as rivers originating in the Tibetan plateau support one-third of the world's population—and has promoted environmental awareness in the region;

Whereas His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989 in recognition of his efforts to seek a peaceful resolution to the situation in Tibet, and to promote non-violent methods for resolving conflict;

Whereas His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2007 in recognition of his promotion of democracy, freedom, and peace for the Tibetan people; his efforts to preserve the cultural, religious, and linguistic heritage of the Tibetan people; his promotion of non-violence; and his contributions to global religious understanding, human rights, and ecology;

Whereas His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama, as the spiritual leader of Tibetan Buddhism, publicly presented in 2011 the religious process which Tibetan Buddhists should follow regarding his reincarnation;

Whereas the Chinese central government has attempted to interfere with the reincarnation process and the practice of Tibetan Buddhist religious traditions; and Chinese officials assert that the failure to secure Beijing's approval on the Dalai Lama's reincarnation would make the process "illegal";

Whereas in the words of Party official Zhu Weiqun, "Decision-making power over the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama and over the end or survival of his lineage, resides with the central government of China.";

Whereas the Department of State's International Religious Freedom Report for 2013 noted that in Tibetan areas of China "[r]epression was severe and increased around politically sensitive events and religious anniversaries," and "[o]fficial interference in the practice of Tibetan Buddhist religious traditions continued to generate profound grievances";

Whereas the Department of State has designated China as a "country of particular concern" (CPC) for religious freedom since 1999, and in its 2013 human rights report details that "under the banner of maintaining social stability and combating separatism, the [Chinese] government has engaged in the severe repression of Tibet's unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage by, among other means, strictly curtailing the civil rights of China's ethnic Tibetan population, including the freedoms of speech, religion, association, assembly, and movement";

Whereas access to Tibetan areas of China for United States officials, journalists, and other United States citizens, is restricted by the Government of the People's Republic of

China, obscuring the full impact of the Chinese Government's policies, including the disappearance of Tibetans who sought to share information about human rights abuses on the Tibetan Plateau;

Whereas the Department of State's 2014 Report on Tibet Negotiations noted that "The Dalai Lama's representatives and Chinese officials have not met directly since the ninth round of dialogue in January 2010.";

Whereas, on March 10, 2015, the elected Tibetan leader Sikyong Dr. Lobsang Sangay publicly stated "The Envoys of His Holiness the Dalai Lama are ready to engage in dialogue with their Chinese counterpart any time and any place.";

Whereas it is the objective of the United States Government, consistent across administrations of different political parties and as articulated in the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (subtitle B of title VI of Public Law 107-228; 22 U.S.C. 6901 note) to promote dialogue between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama or his representatives to reach a negotiated agreement on Tibet;

Whereas China may be considering convening a Sixth Tibet Work Forum to set policy on Tibet for the next five years or so, with the last such work forum having been held in 2010; and

Whereas the American people have a long-held concern for and interest in the plight of the Tibetan people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on the United States Government to fully implement sections 613(a) and 621(c) of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 by strongly encouraging representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China and His Holiness the Dalai Lama to hold substantive dialogue, in keeping with the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 and without preconditions, in order to address Tibetan grievances and secure a negotiated agreement for the Tibetan people;

(2) calls on the United States Government to fully implement section 618 of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 in regard to the establishment of an office in Lhasa, Tibet, to monitor political, economic and cultural developments in Tibet, and to provide consular protection and citizen services;

(3) urges the United States Government—
(A) to consistently raise Tibetan human rights and political and religious freedom concerns at the United States-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue and other high-level bilateral meetings;

(B) and the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues to offer their assistance to China in its preparations for a potential future Sixth Tibet Work Forum; and

(C) to call for the immediate and unconditional release of Tibetan political prisoners, including Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, the 11th Panchen Lama, who was taken into custody by the Chinese authorities and has been missing since 1995, Tenzin Delek Rinpoche, and Khenpo Kartse (Khenpo Karma Tsewang);

(4) calls on the United States Government to underscore that government interference in the Tibetan reincarnation process is a violation of the internationally recognized right to religious freedom and to highlight the fact that other countries besides China have long Tibetan Buddhist traditions, and that matters related to reincarnations in Tibetan Buddhism are of keen interest to Tibetan Buddhist populations worldwide;

(5) calls on the United States Government to recognize and increase global public awareness and monitoring of the upcoming electoral process through which the Tibetan

people in exile will choose the next democratically elected leader of the Central Tibetan Administration, the Sikyong;

(6) calls on the United States Government to fully implement section 616(b) of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 by using its voice and vote to encourage development organizations and agencies to design and implement development projects that fully comply with the Tibet Project Principles;

(7) calls on United States and international governments, organizations, and civil society to renew and reinforce initiatives to promote the preservation of the distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and national identity of the Tibetan people;

(8) calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to allow unrestricted access to the Tibetan areas of China to United States officials, journalists, and other United States citizens;

(9) affirms the Dalai Lama's desire for a negotiated agreement for the Tibetan people, and urges the Chinese government to enter into negotiations with the Dalai Lama and his representatives; and

(10) reaffirms the unwavering friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Tibet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit statements or extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 337, calling for substantive dialogue without preconditions to help secure a negotiated agreement for the Tibetan people. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), my friend and colleague, for his leadership in introducing this bipartisan resolution.

This week, Madam Speaker, when so many voices around the world are joined in wishing his holiness the Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday, it is a fitting time to recommit ourselves to Congress' longstanding support for the fundamental rights of the people of Tibet, because the situation in Tibet has never been more bleak. Those basic rights involve fundamental and foundational rights of freedom of religion.

The recent State Department Human Rights Report offered a withering criticism of the Chinese Government's oversight of Tibet and Tibetan areas in China. It said:

The government engaged in severe repression of Tibet's religious, cultural, and religious heritage by, among other means, strictly curtailing the civil rights of China's Tibetan population, including the rights of the freedom of speech, religion, association, assembly, and movement.

Unfortunately, the regime's interference extends even to the most elemental aspects of Tibetan Buddhist practice. This year marks the 20th anniversary of the disappearance of the Panchen Lama, who was detained by Chinese Government officials back in 1995 when he was a young child. Zhu Wei-qun, a top Communist official dealing with ethnic and religious affairs, has claimed, "decisionmaking power over the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama and over the end or survival of his lineage resides with the central Government of China."

Sadly, we know that Tibetans have used self-immolations as a protest against religious and political oversight by the Chinese Government. There have been 134 self-immolations since 2009. The numbers are decreasing because of heavy security and punishments that target family members and entire villages. It is difficult to fathom the despair and the desperation felt by Tibetans who take this last act of defiance. The Chinese Government has blamed the Dalai Lama and "foreign forces" for self-immolations instead of looking at how their own despicable policies created such deep grievances.

Madam Speaker, the Tibetan people want to be free to practice their unique faith and to live by the dictates of their faith. This freedom is denied to them. The Chinese Government expanded its efforts last year to transform Tibetan Buddhism into a state-managed institution. They sought to undermine the devotion of the Tibetan people to the Dalai Lama and control the process of selecting Buddhist leaders. The Chinese Government wants a Tibetan Buddhism that is attractive to tourists and which allows the Communist Party to manage its affairs.

□ 1530

The U.N. Special Rapporteur on religion recently criticized China's efforts to control Tibetan Buddhism and the process of selecting leaders. He said:

The Chinese Government is destroying the autonomy of religious communities . . . creating schisms and pitting people against each other in order to exercise control.

This is exactly what the Chinese Government has done to other religious groups, including Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, and the Falun Gong. When the faithful don't fall in line, they are jailed.

Madam Speaker, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, of which I serve as chairman, has a prisoner database that contains records on 617 Tibetan political and religious prisoners. Forty-four percent of those detained are monks, nuns, and religious teachers. Almost all were imprisoned since 2008.

Unfortunately, our ability to get accurate information in real time about this situation in Tibet is complicated by restrictions on access to Tibetan areas by United States officials, journalists, and other U.S. citizens. This has frustrated U.S. consular officers'

ability to provide services to American citizens.

In October 2013, the Chinese Government delayed access for over 48 hours during an emergency situation involving a bus accident that ultimately resulted in the deaths of three U.S. citizens and injuries to others.

As the Chinese Government pushes for new consulates and official facilities in the United States, our government must insist on an official presence in Lhasa, which is called for in section 618 of the Tibetan Policy Act, which became law in the year 2002.

The Dalai Lama is recognized internationally for his commitment to peaceful and nonviolent conflict resolution. The recipient of the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize and a Congressional Gold Medal winner in 2007, he has made clear his willingness to engage in dialogue with Chinese counterparts at any time, at any place, and without any preconditions.

Unfortunately, this commitment to peaceful dialogue is not reciprocal, and Chinese officials have not met directly with his representatives in over 5 years. This is the longest break since the dialogue—or so-called dialogue—started in 2002.

Indeed, a Chinese Government white paper on Tibet published this April states that China will "only talk with private representatives of the Dalai Lama" to discuss "the future of the Dalai Lama" and how he can "gain the forgiveness of the central government and the Chinese people."

That is outrageous. Instead of asking for the Dalai Lama's forgiveness for the decades of brutal repression, the Chinese Government demands that he ask the government of China for forgiveness.

This is unfortunate and highly counterproductive. If China's goal is to build a "harmonious society" in Tibet, which they love to tout, it cannot be done without the Dalai Lama. He is the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people. His views are widely shared throughout Tibetan society, and he can be a constructive partner with China in addressing continuing tensions and deep-seated grievances.

In light of this, the resolution before us calls for fuller implementation of existing U.S. law in support of direct dialogue between Chinese officials and the Dalai Lama; it calls for an official U.S. presence in Lhasa and urges our government to ensure that religious rights and religious freedom issues are consistently raised in the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue and other high-level meetings.

It has many, many other provisions which I know the prime sponsor will elaborate.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 337, and I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California

(Ms. PELOSI), our leader and one of the greatest champions of Tibet's struggle for freedom.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for being a champion on human rights throughout the world.

I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks of Chairman SMITH, and I thank him for his courageous, long-term dedication to human rights throughout the world and the recognition that what is happening in Tibet is a challenge to the conscience of our country and to the world.

I thank him for enumerating some of the concerns that we have, and I know that our distinguished ranking member will talk about some of what is contained in the resolution. I thank them both for their leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and in celebration of the 80th birthday of His Holiness the Dalai Lama, whose spiritual wisdom and friendship have been inspiring and uplifting to many Tibetans, Americans, and people throughout the world.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama is a transcendent presence on the international stage. As a compassionate religious leader, astute diplomat, and an undaunted believer in the power of nonviolence, the Dalai Lama has earned the respect of people from many nations, many backgrounds, and many faith traditions.

American Presidents and the American people have been inspired by His Holiness, who describes himself as a simple monk, "no more, no less." Those American Presidents began with Franklin Roosevelt, who sent His Holiness the Dalai Lama a watch with the phases of the Moon on it for his birthday when he was a little boy.

How prescient it was of President Roosevelt because His Holiness would not only be a religious figure, but one who related so positively to science and its mysteries.

To Tibetan Buddhists, His Holiness is the earthly manifestation of the living Buddha. To them and the international community, he is the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people. To millions of believers and admirers, he is a source of wisdom and compassion. To young people, His Holiness is a positive example of how to make the world a better place.

As our colleague mentioned, the Chinese Government has refused to meet with him. They are afraid to meet with him; they consider him a threat, and that is so unnecessary. They accuse him of being for independence when he has said for decades now that he is for autonomy for Tibet.

The Chinese Government has brutally repressed Tibet's unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage. The Chinese Government's oppression of the Tibetan people and the Chinese Communist Party's vitriolic campaign against the Dalai Lama continues, which, again, challenges us all to speak out.

Again, the situation in Tibet is a challenge to the conscience of the world. If freedom-loving people do not speak out against oppression in Tibet, then we have lost all moral authority to speak out on behalf of human rights anywhere in the world.

If it is a big country with whom we have big commercial interests, like China, it deters us from using our voices in support of human rights. How then can we turn to smaller, less economically significant countries and say, "But for you, the standard is different"?

The Congress must continue to stand with the Tibetan people and stand with His Holiness the Dalai Lama to ensure that Tibetan children are free to learn their language, practice their faith, and honor their culture as they live in peace.

Perhaps one of the most remarkable achievements of His Holiness is his profound and unbreakable connection with the people of Tibet. He has won the Nobel Peace Prize, as was indicated; and we honored him with a Congressional Gold Medal in 2007. At that time, it was an honor for all of us that President George W. Bush and Mrs. Bush attended that gold medal ceremony.

An 80th birthday is a significant milestone in any culture, none more so than in Tibet. This is a moment to celebrate; yet on his birthday, July 6, Tibetans were still not even allowed to utter the Dalai Lama's name.

In the Dalai Lama's homeland, more than 140 Tibetans have self-immolated to protest oppression by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communist Party's vitriolic campaign against the exiled Tibetan religious; yet the people of Tibet persevere. They persevere in peace. The nonviolent nature of the Tibetan struggle should serve as an inspiration to a world riven by conflict and devastating acts of violence.

During his long life, the Dalai Lama has shown that harmony between peoples is based on freedom of expression, the freedom and courage to speak the truth and treat others with mutual respect and dignity.

I just recall one incident when I was visiting His Holiness in India at Dharamsala. He had lamas come from all over to visit with our bipartisan congressional delegation who were visiting him there.

After people got up and talked about all the oppression and the campaign against the Tibetans that was happening at that time, I got up to speak following that, and I said that we, in Congress, must act; we must act in terms of legislation to support the people of Tibet.

I said so in a very forceful way because it was so sad to hear the stories of what was happening in Tibet, and I was so strong in my reaction to it. His Holiness followed me in the program, and he said: "I pray that we can rid NANCY of her negative attitudes."

Anyway, there is no better way to honor the Dalai Lama on his 80th

birthday than by standing with him and the Tibetan people, vowing to keep their cause alive.

As we wish His Holiness a peaceful and joyous birthday, we must rededicate ourselves to the cause of peace in the world and peace in our lives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 337. I am proud to have offered this resolution that calls for the Chinese Government to sit down with Tibet's leaders without preconditions, listen to their grievances, and work toward an agreement that guarantees the rights and security of the Tibetan people.

It also marks, as the Democratic leader pointed out, the 80th birthday of the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people, His Holiness, the 14th Dalai Lama.

I have had the privilege to meet His Holiness, who is truly a remarkable man, such a gentle spirit driven from within by incredible strength and courage, a person of such humor and kindness whose life has been marked by struggle and setback.

I first met him here in Washington many years ago. When you meet him, no matter your faith or background, you cannot help but feel the bond of common humanity and be drawn into his cause and the cause of the Tibetan people; indeed, many in Congress have gotten behind this effort.

Let me, again, especially thank Leader PELOSI. There has been no greater champion in Congress for the Tibetan struggle for freedom. For years, she has held a light to the challenges the Tibetan people face in preserving their unique culture, language, and religion. I am honored that she is cosponsoring this resolution.

Let me also thank Asia Subcommittee Chairman MATT SALMON, and co-chairmen of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, Representative JIM MCGOVERN and Representative JOSEPH PITTS, for supporting this measure. I thank my friend Mr. SMITH of New Jersey as well.

Since 1951, the people of Tibet have lived under the shadow of the People's Republic of China, without guarantees of even the most basic rights and with no say in deciding Tibet's future. The Dalai Lama has described the cultural genocide the Tibetan people have endured, forced assimilation and loss of language and cultural identity.

Today, as human rights conditions for the Tibetan people deteriorate and continue to deteriorate, as more monasteries come under government control, as more people are arrested, the desperation of the Tibetan people grows.

Tragically, more than 140 Tibetans have burned themselves alive in protest of growing oppression; yet the Chinese authorities have not changed course. Despite talk of mutual respect and social harmony, the reality in Tibet tells a very, very different story.

Today, we look to the example set by the Dalai Lama and call for meaningful change for the Tibetan people. The Dalai Lama's life has been a peaceful journey toward a better future for his people. It is in that spirit that we call on the Chinese Government to negotiate without preconditions.

His Holiness has shown that democratic institutions can thrive alongside spiritual leadership. It is in that spirit that we urge the Chinese Government not to involve itself in the spiritual succession process for the next Dalai Lama, should there be one.

The Dalai Lama has championed freedom of expression and freedom of conscience to promote mutual understanding and harmony. It is in this spirit that this resolution calls on China to allow unrestricted access to officials, journalists, and other American citizens.

Let's not forget the United States has an obligation to hold up these freedoms as well. That is why this measure also calls on our own government to press the issues of human rights, political rights, and religious rights at the highest levels of the Chinese Government and to call for the immediate release of Tibetan political prisoners.

Throughout his life, the Dalai Lama has worked for a peaceful path forward for the Tibetan people. We are grateful for his example and his wisdom. With this resolution, we urge China's leaders to do the right thing for Tibet.

I enthusiastically support this resolution; I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the co-chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission and a longtime supporter of the Dalai Lama and of Tibet.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for yielding me the time and for his leadership on this issue and on so many other issues.

I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE; Subcommittee Chairman SALMON; my friend and fellow co-chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, Congressman JOE PITTS; as well as my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman SMITH, for working in such a bipartisan way to bring this resolution to the House floor during this week when we are all celebrating the 80th birthday of His Holiness, the Dalai Lama.

I especially want to thank Democratic Leader PELOSI for her many years of leadership and support of the Tibetan people. She is a true champion in the struggle to protect their basic human rights and autonomy.

We are all here because we care about the fundamental human rights of Ti-

betans, including the right to worship as they choose and to enjoy and protect their culture. But we may be running out of time to guarantee those rights.

As we celebrate the 80th birthday of Tenzin Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama, the Chinese Government has recently asserted its right to approve his successor. The very continuation of the ancient line of Tibetan spiritual leadership and reincarnation is in question.

Next Tuesday, on July 14, the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission will hold a hearing on the situation in Tibet with the aim of identifying new, creative ideas to advance the basic human rights of Tibetans and to ensure Tibetan autonomy.

I share the concerns of my colleagues that the situation in Tibet is dire.

Since 2009, more than 130 Tibetans inside China have taken the unimaginable step of setting themselves on fire. At least 112 are believed to have died. Some chose self-immolation to protest Chinese Government policies, others, to call for the return of the Dalai Lama. In response, Chinese authorities have intensified official reprisals.

Surely the people of Tibet must wonder whether anyone is hearing their desperate cries. With this resolution, we are attempting to send a clear message back to Tibet that, yes, we hear you. You are not alone.

Regrettably, the human rights abuses in Tibet are neither new nor unknown. On the contrary, Tibet is a very sensitive issue in U.S.-China relations. U.S. policy is supposed to be guided by the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, which encourages dialogue between the Chinese Government and representatives of the Dalai Lama, but Chinese intransigence has closed down dialogue since 2010.

China also severely restricts access to Tibet and Tibetan regions, especially for U.S. journalists, officials, and citizens, even though, I might add, Chinese citizens and officials enjoy unrestricted access here in the United States.

In April, the Chinese Government issued a new white paper on Tibet, with its own unbelievable version of history and an unprecedented demand that the Dalai Lama publicly state that Tibet has been an integral part of China since antiquity as a precondition for improving relations with China.

Madam Speaker, we need to be doing something different. We need to have the guts to take some action. Everyone in the world says how much they admire the Dalai Lama. Every head of state, every international organization all declare how much they care about Tibet and worry about Tibetan human rights abuses, but things have only gotten worse. We must all come together now to change the status quo, to change the game the Chinese Government has been playing for so many decades.

The situation is urgent. It can wait no longer. And shame on all of us if we

stand by with empty words and continue to watch the people of Tibet suffer and their culture, religion, and way of life be exterminated day by day, year by year, until nothing is left.

So I thank my colleagues for bringing this urgent matter to the attention of Congress, and I urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 337.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. What happens when the United States remains silent? What happens is repression and torture and the expansion of dictatorship, and, in the end, it makes the United States vulnerable.

We have sat back and permitted the Chinese to take whatever course they want to suppress the people of Tibet for over three decades now. And has it made Tibet any better, the people any freer that we haven't put any demands on the Communist Party in Beijing?

Has it made war less likely between the United States?

Has there been any more, because we have given them such elbow room, that the Chinese dictators in Beijing have decided to move on and treat their people a little bit better?

No. What has happened is there has been a growing repression and a growing chance of an altercation, an international altercation between China and its neighbors and, yes, the United States.

It is time we stand up for the people of the world who are fighting, struggling for their freedom, knowing that is what will make us secure, and nowhere is that more clear than in Tibet.

The people of Tibet are not Chinese people who are just reunited by the Communist Chinese with the motherland in China. It has been a distinct culture for centuries. And it wasn't until long after the Communist Chinese had taken over the rest of China that they invaded Tibet and subjugated its people.

The Dalai Lama is the spiritual leader, but also a symbolic force for freedom of religion and humanitarianism in this world.

We, as Americans, need to make sure that we are on the side of the Dalai Lama and the people of Tibet and in no way could our actions be interpreted, our silence be interpreted to be acquiescence to the repression that the people of Tibet have been experiencing these last three and four decades.

I rise in support of H. Res. 337, and I thank my colleagues for the leadership that they have provided on this issue. Let's make sure America stands tall, stands strong, and stands with the people of Tibet and other people seeking their freedom.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 337. I think everyone who spoke

made excellent points, and we are all of one mind. This is the right thing to do.

We should support this resolution to honor the deep humility, respect, and peace that the Dalai Lama represents to us and to people around the world. We should support this resolution to underscore our friendship and commitment to the Tibetan people and to all people who are oppressed and deprived of their basic rights.

Let me say that again, and to all people who are oppressed and deprived of their basic rights.

And we should support this resolution on behalf of the Chinese people themselves, the growing number of people inside China who understand China itself will be more prosperous and more successful when their government chooses to be genuinely open and respectful of all peoples and cultures.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 337, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I want to again thank my good friend and colleague ELIOT ENGEL for his excellent resolution. It is a bipartisan resolution.

I want to also thank Leader PELOSI for her eloquence on the floor today and for her love and respect that she has conveyed for decades to the Dalai Lama and the people of Tibet.

This is a bipartisan resolution. It shows, I think, that we are absolutely united, and I think that is an important message to send at this critical juncture.

I also want to point out to my colleagues that China really is a place where much is never as it seems to be. People who take trips there, go on tours there, even Members of Congress who travel there come away with a Potemkin village viewpoint of what is happening, especially when torture and other degrading acts and cruelty is routinely visited upon and imposed upon people that the Chinese Government deems to be of lesser value.

We see it with the Falun Gong. We see it with underground Christians. We see it with the Uighurs. And we see it in Tibet, where there has been a systematic effort to eradicate the culture of Tibet. It is genocide. They even used forced abortion as a way of genocide to kill the children of Tibetan mothers.

Years ago I held a hearing in the mid-1990s, and it was on torture in the People's Republic of China. And let us not forget, Chinese law proscribes torture. It prohibits torture. It is all a nice paper promise. It doesn't mean anything.

They have also signed the convention against torture, the U.N. convention, and they love to ballyhoo that when they are at international fora and when their people travel here to the United States.

But let's not forget, as well, that China took out a reservation to the U.N. Convention Against Torture, Article 20, that exempts it from accepting

any investigation about abuses. So the only one who will investigate China is the Chinese Government itself. They will not allow the International Committee of the Red Cross. They will not allow U.S. representatives and other bilateral or, I should say, multilateral organizations to come in and investigate allegations of torture.

Back in the early 1990s, again, I held this hearing, one of many. I have held 53 hearings on human rights abuses in China over the years. But this one we had six people, all of whom had been tortured with impunity by the Chinese Government.

Palden Gyatso, who is a Buddhist monk, came to the Rayburn Building, tried to go through the security there and was stopped. He was stopped because he brought with him some of the implements of torture that are used routinely by the Chinese Government—cattle prods and other hideous instruments that are put under the arms and elsewhere to cause horrific damage and pain to the victim—and he described in detail at the hearing what he personally went through.

Regrettably, that continues to this day. The State Department's report on human rights recently released reminds us that electric shocks, exposure to cold, and severe beatings, as well as extreme physical labor, are routinely used against Tibetans and Tibetan Buddhists, in particular, just like they were against Palden Gyatso years ago.

So it has not changed. It has actually gotten worse. And again, this resolution brings the light and scrutiny that is so necessary to these hideous practices.

So again, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 337, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING SREBRENICA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 310) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Srebrenica.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 310

Whereas July 2015 will mark 20 years since the genocide at Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Whereas beginning in April 1992, aggression and ethnic cleansing perpetrated by Bosnian

Serb forces resulted in a massive influx of Bosniaks seeking protection in Srebrenica and its environs, which the United Nations Security Council designated a "safe area" within the Srebrenica enclave in Resolution 819 on April 16, 1993, under the protection of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR);

Whereas the UNPROFOR presence in Srebrenica consisted of a Dutch peacekeeping battalion, with representatives of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the humanitarian medical aid agency Medecins Sans Frontieres (Doctors Without Borders) helping to provide humanitarian relief to the displaced population living in conditions of massive overcrowding, destitution, and disease;

Whereas early in 1995, an intensified blockade of the enclave by Bosnian Serb forces deprived the entire population of humanitarian aid and outside communication and contact, and effectively reduced the ability of the Dutch peacekeeping battalion to deter aggression or otherwise respond effectively to a deteriorating situation;

Whereas beginning on July 6, 1995, Bosnian Serb forces attacked UNPROFOR outposts, seized control of the isolated enclave, held captured Dutch soldiers hostage and, after skirmishes with local defenders, took control of the town of Srebrenica on July 11, 1995;

Whereas an estimated one-third of the population of Srebrenica at the time, including a relatively small number of soldiers, attempted to pass through the lines of Bosnian Serb forces to the relative safety of Bosnian-government controlled territory, but many were killed by patrols and ambushes;

Whereas the remaining population sought protection with the Dutch peacekeeping battalion at its headquarters in the village of Potocari north of Srebrenica, but many of these individuals were with seeming randomness seized by Bosnian Serb forces to be beaten, raped, or executed;

Whereas Bosnian Serb forces deported women, children, and the elderly in buses, but held over 8,000 primarily Bosniak men and boys at collection points and sites in northeastern Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control, and then summarily executed these captives and buried them in mass graves;

Whereas Bosnian Serb forces, hoping to conceal evidence of the massacre at Srebrenica, subsequently moved corpses from initial mass grave sites to many secondary sites scattered throughout parts of eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control;

Whereas the International Commission for Missing Persons (ICMP) deserves recognition for its assistance to the relevant institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina in accounting for close to 90 percent of those individuals reported missing from Srebrenica, despite active attempts to conceal evidence of the massacre, through the careful excavation of mass graves sites and subsequent DNA analysis which confirmed the true extent of the massacre;

Whereas the massacre at Srebrenica was among the worst of many atrocities to occur in the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina from April 1992 to November 1995, during which the policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing pursued by Bosnian Serb forces with the direct support of the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic and its followers ultimately led to the displacement of more than 2,000,000 people, more than 100,000 killed, tens of thousands raped or otherwise tortured and abused, including at concentration camps in the Prijedor area, with the innocent civilians of Sarajevo and other urban

centers repeatedly subjected to traumatic shelling and sniper attacks;

Whereas in addition to being the primary victims at Srebrenica, individuals with Bosniak heritage comprise the vast majority of the victims during the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a whole, especially among the civilian population;

Whereas Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide defines genocide as “any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group”;

Whereas, on May 25, 1993, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 827 establishing the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), based in The Hague, the Netherlands, and charging the ICTY with responsibility for investigating and prosecuting individuals suspected of committing war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity and grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions on the territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991;

Whereas the ICTY, along with courts in Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as in Serbia, have indicted and in most cases convicted approximately three dozen individuals at various levels of responsibility for grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, violations of the laws or customs of war, crimes against humanity, genocide, and complicity in genocide associated with the massacre at Srebrenica, most notably Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic whose trials are ongoing;

Whereas both the ICTY and the International Court of Justice (ICJ) have ruled that the actions of Bosnian Serb forces in Srebrenica in July 1995 constitute genocide;

Whereas House Resolution 199, passed on June 27, 2005, expressed the sense of the House of Representatives that the aggression and ethnic cleansing committed by Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina meets the terms defining genocide according to the 1949 Genocide Convention;

Whereas the United Nations has largely acknowledged its failure to fulfill its responsibility to take actions and make decisions that could have deterred the assault on Srebrenica and prevented the subsequent genocide from occurring;

Whereas some prominent Serbian and Bosnian Serb officials, among others, have denied or at least refused to acknowledge that the massacre at Srebrenica constituted a genocide, or have sought otherwise to trivialize the extent and importance of the massacre; and

Whereas the international community, including the United States, has continued to provide personnel and resources, including through direct military intervention, to prevent further aggression and ethnic cleansing, to negotiate the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (initialed in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995, and signed in Paris on December 14, 1995), and to help ensure its fullest implementation, including cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia as well as reconciliation among all of Bosnia and Herzegovina's citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms that the policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing as implemented by Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995 meet the terms defining the crime of genocide in Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide;

(2) condemns statements that deny or question that the massacre at Srebrenica constituted a genocide;

(3) urges the Atrocities Prevention Board, a United States interagency committee established by the Administration in 2012, to study the lessons of Srebrenica and issue informed guidance on how to prevent similar incidents from recurring in the future, paying particular regard to troubled countries including but not limited to Syria, the Central African Republic and Burundi;

(4) encourages the United States to maintain and reaffirm its policy of supporting the independence and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina, peace and stability in southeastern Europe as a whole, and the right of all people living in the region, regardless of national, racial, ethnic or religious background, to return to their homes and enjoy the benefits of democratic institutions, the rule of law, and economic opportunity, as well as to know the fate of missing relatives and friends;

(5) recognizes the achievement of the International Commission for Missing Persons (ICMP) in accounting for those missing in conflicts or natural disasters around the world and believes that the ICMP deserves justified recognition for its assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina and its relevant institutions in accounting for approximately ninety percent of those reported missing after the Srebrenica massacre and seventy percent of those reported missing during the whole of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(6) welcomes the arrest and transfer to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) of all persons indicted for war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide and grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, particularly those of Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, which has helped strengthen peace and encouraged reconciliation between the countries of the region and their citizens;

(7) asserts that it is in the national interest of the United States that those individuals who are responsible for these crimes and breaches should continue to be held accountable for their actions, and that the work of the ICTY therefore warrants continued support until all trials and appeals have been completed; and

(8) honors the thousands of innocent people killed or executed at Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina in July 1995, along with all individuals who were victimized during the conflict and genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995, as well as foreign nationals, including United States citizens, and those individuals in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and other countries of the region who risked and in some cases lost their lives during their brave defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and advocacy of respect for ethnic identity without discrimination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit statements and extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this week, the world pauses to remember and reflect on the Srebrenica genocide, horrific acts of brutality, wanton cruelty, and mass murder committed in Srebrenica beginning July 11, 20 years ago.

This week, we pause to honor those brave Bosniaks who suffered and died, victims of genocide. This week, the people in the United States and men and women of goodwill throughout the world again extend our deepest condolences and respect to the mothers and surviving family members who have endured unspeakable sorrow and loss that time will never abate. And this week, the international community must recommit itself to justice, once and for all, for those who perpetrated these heinous crimes.

Today, Ratko Mladic and Radovan Karadzic are incarcerated, awaiting final disposition of their cases before the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia for multiple counts of genocide, crimes against humanity, and violations of laws and customs of war.

Twenty years ago, Madam Speaker, an estimated 8,000 people were systematically slaughtered by Bosnian Serb soldiers in the United Nations-designated “safe haven” area of Srebrenica. They killed Muslim women and children, but especially sought out and murdered adult males in that area.

□ 1600

These brutal killings were not committed in battle. They were committed against people who were unarmed and helpless and who had been repeatedly assured by Dutch peacekeepers that they would not be harmed if they surrendered.

The evidence is overwhelming that the executions were committed with the specific intention of destroying the Bosnian Muslim population of that area. This intention is the central element in the crime of genocide.

The U.N. peacekeeping forces in Srebrenica were charged with enforcing Security Council Resolution 836, which had pledged to defend the safe areas with “all necessary means, including the use of force.”

But when the moment of truth came, the U.N. forces offered only token resistance to the Serb offensive. Their military and political commanders had redefined their primary mission not as the protection of the people of Srebrenica, but as the safety of the U.N. forces themselves.

When Bosnian Serb Commander Ratko Mladic threatened violence against the blue-helmeted soldiers,

here is the way one of those soldiers described the reaction. And I quote him: "Everybody got a fright. You could easily get killed in such an operation. As far as I knew, we had not been sent to Srebrenica to defend the enclave, but, rather, as some kind of spruced-up observers."

So that is what the peacekeepers became: observers to genocide. Soon they became something more than observers: enablers.

On July 13, the Dutch blue-helmet battalion handed Bosnian Muslims who had sought safety within the U.N. compound over to the Serbs. They watched as the men were separated from the women and children, a process which was already well known in Bosnia—it was at the time—as a sign that the men were in imminent danger of being executed. These men were never heard from again.

At one congressional hearing I chaired in March of 1998—and I had six of them—Hasan Nuhanovic, the indigenous translator working for the U.N. peacekeepers in Srebrenica, testified.

He was there in the room. Hasan lost his family in the genocide. He was there when Mladic and the commanders of the Dutch peacekeepers talked about the terms.

Here is what he told my panel, in part:

"On July 12, the day before the fall of Srebrenica, the Bosnian Serb Army commander, General Ratko Mladic, requested a meeting with the Dutchbat commander, Lieutenant Colonel Karemans, and local representatives of Srebrenica in the nearby town of Bratunac outside the enclave . . . During the meeting, Mladic assured the Dutch and local delegation that no harm would come to the refugees in Potocari . . .

"Upon returning to the camp, three local representatives are ordered by Dutchbat deputy commander, Major Franken, to prepare a list of all males, all men and boys between the ages of 16 and 65 among the refugees inside and outside the camp. The list of the males among the 6,000 inside the camp was completed the same day . . .

"On July 13, the Dutch ordered 6,000 refugees out of the Potocari camp. The Serbs were waiting at the gate, separating all males from the women and children. Major Franken stated that all the males whose names were on the list would be safe . . . I watched my parents and my brother being handed over to the Serbs at the gate. None of them have been seen since.

"I want to explain here that the people hoped that the Dutch were going to protect them, the U.N. peacekeeping troops and all other members of all other organization who were present in Srebrenica who were inside the camp, the people hoped that they would be protected, but the Dutch soldiers and officer gave no other option to the refugees but to leave. So the refugees inside were told to leave without any other choice. My family was told on

the evening of 13 July that they should leave. About 6 p.m., there were no more refugees inside the camp.

"I don't know if this is the topic of the meeting or hearing, but the same night the Dutch soldiers had a party inside the camp because they received two or three trucks full of beer and cigarettes. They played music while I was sitting, not knowing what happened to my family."

As he went on to say later, they had all been slaughtered.

In July of 2007, Madam Speaker, I visited Srebrenica, where, together with my good friends President Haris Silajdzic and the Grand Mufti of Bosnia, Reis Ceric, I spoke at a solemn memorial service and witnessed the internment of hundreds of wooden coffins of newly discovered victims of the genocide.

It was a deeply moving experience to see 12 years then after the genocide—now it is 20 years—families still grieving loved ones whose bodies were being identified, often miles from the killing sites, as Serb forces, trying to hide the evidence of their crimes, moved the bodies of their victims.

For the record, 10 years ago—in 2005—the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed H. Res. 199, which I authored, which clearly and unambiguously condemned the Srebrenica massacre for what it was: genocide.

That resolution was a landmark in the recognition of the Srebrenica massacre as a genocide. Two years later the verdict of the International Court of Justice found the same, in confirming the ruling of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

Today the international community is nearly unanimous when it proclaims that the Srebrenica massacre was a genocide. The resolution today, of course, supports that as well.

Astonishingly, Madam Speaker, there are some genocide deniers. That is why this resolution condemns statements that deny that the massacre at Srebrenica constituted genocide. Just last weekend Milorad Dodik, the president of Republika Srpska, asserted that the Srebrenica genocide is a lie.

Madam Speaker, just as it is doing in Ukraine, Russia is utilizing misinformation and historical revisionism in an attempt to destabilize Bosnia and the Balkan region. Today Russia vetoed a British U.N. Security Council resolution that reaffirms that Srebrenica was a genocide.

Russia has encouraged Serbia itself to protest the resolution and emboldened genocide denialism in the Republika Srpska, one of Bosnia's two constituent entities.

Madam Speaker, this resolution also encourages the administration to fulfill other neglected responsibilities. In particular, it urges the Atrocities Prevention Board to study the lessons of Srebrenica and issue informed guidance on how to prevent similar incidents from recurring in the future.

As you may know, the Atrocities Prevention Board is a U.S. interagency committee established by the administration in 2012 to flag potential atrocities. However, since its creation, the board has been marked by inaction and a complete lack of transparency.

This is unacceptable, especially as conflicts with disturbing parallels to Bosnia before the genocide continue to fester in Syria, the Central African Republic, Burma, and in Burundi.

Africa, in particular, would stand to benefit from a more active board. The conflict in Burundi is currently at a tipping point, and it absolutely needs attention.

Madam Speaker, despite the need for much greater atrocities prevention in U.S. policy, there have been many promising developments in the Balkan region, and this needs to be underscored.

In particular, I would note that Serbia today is not the Serbia of the Slobodan Milosevic era. That era was marked by nationalist aggression against neighboring countries and peoples, as well as considerable repression at home.

One of those who testified at one of my hearings on Serbia, Curuvija, a great young leader, was murdered on the second day after our bombing began by Serbian people. And the persons who did that have now been held to account. So what has happened there—thankfully, there have now been significant changes in Serbia.

I want to thank my colleagues. I do hope we will have a strong show of support for this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H. Res. 310.

I am the lead sponsor of this resolution. And I remember 20 years ago being in this Chamber when that massacre happened. It is hard to believe that it has been 20 years since the Srebrenica genocide, and it certainly was a genocide.

During the Bosnian war, the United Nations declared the area around this small town a safe zone. On the eve of the massacre, tens of thousands of displaced Bosniak civilians had gathered under the protection of the U.N. in what they thought was a safe zone.

They all rushed to that place, only to be slaughtered a little while later. But the 400 U.N. peacekeepers could put up scarce resistance to the army of the Republika Srpska, whose leaders were bent on wiping out the Bosniak population.

Over the next few days, men and boys were lined up and mowed down by machine guns. Children were murdered in front of their mothers. Women and girls were raped and beaten, as onlookers stood powerless to intervene. Bulldozers piled bodies into mass graves.

I remember that happened in our lifetime. It is hard to believe.

When the killing had ended, more than 8,000 Bosniaks—mostly men and

boys—had lost their lives in one of the bloodiest episodes on European soil since World War II.

This resolution tells their tragic story. It praises the efforts to hold the guilty accountable. It demands that those efforts continue. It underscores solidarity with the victims and calls for a reconciliation that will one day see the lies, hatred, and violence of the past replaced by true friendship and community.

This resolution tells the truth about what happened because telling the truth—however painful—is the starting point for healing to begin.

We remember the Srebrenica genocide to honor the victims and to remind ourselves of the costs of indifference, of what can happen when we say, well, that is somebody else's problem.

As this region of Europe heals—I have just come back from the Balkans—and charts a course toward a brighter future, I hope the lessons of this tragedy will be a guide for the United States and for countries around the world fighting against tyranny and oppression.

Today there was a disgrace that happened at the United Nations. Unfortunately, there are many disgraces that happen at the United Nations.

Two international courts have called the slaughter of Bosnian Serbs of some 8,000 Muslim men and boys who had sought refuge in what was supposed to be a U.N.-protected site genocide.

Now, what happened today at the U.N.? Russia vetoed a U.N. resolution calling Srebrenica a genocide. It passed the Security Council. Russia vetoed it.

You would think that a veto would be used for something of substance, not a resolution. This resolution has substance, but you would not think that Russia or any country would veto it.

Let me see what this defeated resolution stated. It stated that acceptance of “the tragic events at Srebrenica as genocide is a prerequisite for reconciliation” and “condemns denial of this genocide as hindering efforts towards reconciliation.”

The vote was ten countries in favor; Russia casting a veto; and four abstentions: China, Nigeria, Angola, and Venezuela.

The British Ambassador after the vote said that Britain was outraged by Russia's veto. And he said Russia's actions tarnish the memory of all those who died in the Srebrenica genocide. Russia will have to justify its behavior to the families of over 8,000 people murdered in the worst atrocity in Europe since the second World War.

“This is a defeat of justice,” said Camil Durakovic, the mayor of Srebrenica. He added that the veto means that the U.N. is not recognizing a decision by its own judicial branch, the International Court of Justice, which has declared the tragedy a genocide. “The world has lost. The world, and especially Serbia, will have to face the truth sooner or later.”

Our Ambassador Samantha Powell, who was a 24-year-old journalist in

Bosnia at the time of the Srebrenica massacre, told the Council that, “For all of the brutality of a horrific war, this was a singular horror. It was genocide, a fact now proven again and again by international tribunals.”

“Today's vote mattered,” Power said. “It mattered hugely to the families of the victims of the Srebrenica genocide. Russia's veto is heart-breaking for those families, and it is a further stain on this Council's record.”

I read that into the RECORD because I think it is important to notice the actions of Russia. We see their actions in Ukraine. We see their actions at the U.N. And we see the actions of the U.N., itself. And it really is a shame.

So, again, we remember this genocide to honor its victims. It is not somebody else's problem. It is all of our problems.

□ 1615

In order to prevent it from happening in the future, we have to accurately recall what happened in the past.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the full Foreign Affairs Committee and a great leader on human rights.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SMITH of New Jersey for bringing this bill up and keeping this atrocity and the lessons that it means for us today in front of this body, and as always, I appreciate Mr. ENGEL's cooperation in seeing this resolution move to the floor.

I appreciate the powerful stories that were shared by Mr. ENGEL and by Mr. SMITH today in terms of what happened on that day 20 years ago this month as Bosnian Serb forces transformed what was supposed to be a U.N. safe haven for refugees into what became an extermination camp.

On that July day, 8,000 men and boys were massacred. As they shared with you, Serb forces compiled detailed lists of those targeted for killing. They separated families, and they drove those young Muslim men to various fields where they were summarily executed.

The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia ruled that this act was an act of genocide—and rightly so. We do not know the names of many of these victims, as these killers took extensive measures to cover their crimes. As a result, families have never found their missing relatives, and experts continue to uncover and identify remains at the scenes of these mass killings.

Former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan has said that this tragedy will “haunt the United Nations forever.” Although it occurred 20 years ago, this massacre continues to hinder progress towards peace in this troubled region. For while Serbia's President

has apologized for crimes committed, he and other Serbian officials still refuse to admit the true extent of the brutality.

Mr. Speaker, today's resolution encourages Serbian authorities to publicly acknowledge the genocide that occurred, which would constitute a major step forward in restoring relations with its neighbor.

This resolution also reaffirms U.S. policy to oppose mass atrocities in the strongest terms whenever and wherever they occur; but of course, the Srebrenica genocide, along with others in Rwanda, Cambodia, and Darfur, are stark reminders that simply saying “never again” will never be enough. Action is needed, and it is demanded as, around the world, violent conflicts threaten to erupt once more into genocidal campaigns.

I will name some right now. Ongoing abuses against the Rohingya Muslim population in Burma have caused human rights advocates to sound the alarm over a “grave risk of additional mass atrocities and even genocide.” Unable to claim citizenship in Burma or elsewhere and under constant threat of violence, many have called the Rohingya Muslims “the most persecuted minority in the world,” leading thousands upon thousands to flee their homes in overloaded boats. That is why I helped lead the effort last Congress to pass H. Res. 418, calling for an end to the persecution of the Rohingya people.

In Sri Lanka, anti-Muslim riots broke out last June killing four and injuring dozens more. Acting with impunity under the Rajapaksa government, extremist forces destroyed mosques and Muslim businesses, displacing thousands.

Under the Sirisena government, however, we have an opportunity to press for positive change and inclusivity in the newly elected government there in Sri Lanka.

Extremist groups are similarly targeting minority communities in Syria, the Central African Republic, and Burundi. While we absolutely must remember past atrocities, we are charged with doing all we can to stop today's violence. I don't want future Congresses having to memorialize atrocities from our era now.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, for introducing this timely and important resolution; and, again, I thank Mr. ENGEL.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this.

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership on this important resolution, and I am gratified that we held this timely debate ahead of the solemn commemorations that will take place in Srebrenica and around the world this weekend.

I thank our chairman for his leadership, Chairman ROYCE, as usual. It

shows that we worked again together on the Foreign Affairs Committee in a very bipartisan manner. This transcends everything. This is genocide, and these resolutions are very, very important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's think about this. The chairman said something that really jostled my mind. I pointed out where a U.N. resolution was vetoed today by Russia. These men who were massacred in a genocide went to what they were told was a United Nations safe haven.

For this to happen under the auspices of the United Nations and then for Russia to veto a United Nations resolution commemorating solemn, solemn 20 years, it is just an absolute disgrace and irony; and it is one of the reasons that the United Nations has trouble because of the hypocrisy, once again, that we see in that body.

By passing this resolution, we put the House solidly on record honoring the thousands of innocent people killed at Srebrenica and all those who suffered during the Bosnian war. We stand alongside those who risked and continued to risk life and limb to defend the human rights of all people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution unanimously, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to finally say a very special thanks to Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for arranging for this bill to come to the floor and of course to the Speaker, to ED ROYCE, our distinguished chairman, and the ranking member for their strong support and cosponsorship of this resolution. It is bipartisan, and I think we are sending a clear and unambiguous message to the world, again, that Srebrenica was a genocide.

We must hold those to account who committed these atrocities. At least two of the major perpetrators, hopefully, will soon get justice, one at the end of this year and Mladic probably by 2017. The wheels of justice do turn slowly, but they are jailed right now. Above all, I think we need to pray for the victims.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pray for the loved ones who continue to suffer unspeakable agony. I do hope the American people and all of us in the House and in this town will—especially as this remembrance comes around beginning on July 11—keep these people who have suffered so much in our prayers.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 310, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Srebrenica. As a co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Bosnia, I believe it is crucial to distinguish the Srebrenica massacres as genocide while honoring the thousands of innocent people who were killed in July twenty years ago.

In the early 1990s, following Bosnia and Herzegovina's declaration of national sovereignty, Bosnian Serb forces attacked Eastern Bosnia in order to unify and secure Serb territory. During this struggle for control, those Bosnian Serb forces, also called the Army of Republika Srpska committed crimes of ethnic cleansing of the non-Serb population. Approximately 8,000 Bosnian men and boys were systematically executed in 1995.

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina during this time was a failure on behalf of the international community. In 1999, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan acknowledged that the global community needed to accept responsibility for the ethnic cleansing campaign in Bosnia and Herzegovina that killed thousands of unarmed civilians in a town designated as a "safe area."

For many years now, I have called on the United Nations to recognize Srebrenica as a genocide. Yesterday, I learned that Russia blocked the latest effort by the United Kingdom to recognize the Srebrenica massacres as a genocide, calling it "not constructive, confrontational, and politically-motivated." I am disappointed that the UN is unable to formally recognize Europe's worst atrocity since World War II.

Although the global community cannot and will not distinguish Srebrenica as genocide, I applaud my fellow Bosnia Caucus co-chair, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, for introducing this important resolution. While the UN's hands are tied, I am proud that the United States continues to be Bosnia and Herzegovina's greatest friend and ally. I urge my colleagues to support Bosnia and Herzegovina by voting in favor of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 310.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. 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 H.R. 5.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 125 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. 5.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1624

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. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, February 27, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 114-29 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been postponed.

Pursuant to House Resolution 347, it shall be in order to consider the further amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-29. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. ROKITA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part A of House Report 114-192.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, lines 4, 7, 16, 20, and 24, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

Page 6, lines 4, 10, 16, 21, and 25, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

Page 7, line 4, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

Page 94, line 18, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

Page 450, line 19 and 23, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

Page 461, line 17, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

Page 484, line 11, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

Page 619, line 7, strike "2021" and insert "2019".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It shortens authorization of the act from 6 years to 4 years. I am very thankful for the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for his work in leading this effort.

Mr. Chairman, it is the role of Congress to conduct oversight of Federal programs and regularly revisit the results of taxpayer investments. We began a process to replace No Child Left Behind 4 years ago, and our goal

from the beginning has always been to roll back the Federal Government's authority over K-12 schools and return to State and local education leaders the responsibility and opportunity to deliver a quality education to their students.

Now, the Student Success Act is a strong conservative proposal that reflects our shared principles for reducing the Federal role, restoring local control, and empowering individuals, not government bureaucrats. Reducing the authorization to 4 years will give Congress and the next administration a chance to ensure that these bold reforms are actually working as intended.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity to serve on our State Board of Education in Colorado from 2001 to 2007, so this was during the implementation phase of No Child Left Behind.

Now, we knew at the time many of the flaws we are hoping to address through ESEA reauthorization today, but it took several years just to get up to the point where we had the tests, we had the standards, and we complied with it.

Education is a major public enterprise. In fact, it is the largest public enterprise at the State and local level. One of the frustrations that I have heard a lot of in the last few years—and it has really amplified the frustration about testing—is the fact that the ball has been moving, the testing has been changed.

My State of Colorado, which is fairly typical, moved from one test, the CSAP, to a temporary test, the TCAP, and then finally a third test, all in a period of 4 years.

What we need to do—and this is something that we will hear from education stakeholders as varied as teachers, school boards, and principals—is stop moving the ball.

We know it is not going to be perfect. Let's give it a little bit of time to work. Now, this bill is far from perfect, which is why I oppose the underlying bill; but whatever set of rules you set in place, I feel it is important to allow the rulemaking, the State laws, to catch up, which takes a period of time, a period of years.

I think the longer reauthorization, through 2021, rather than reducing it to 4 years, is absolutely in the interests of ensuring that whatever law we come up with can be implemented more effectively at the State and local level.

Not only is it frustrating for districts and teachers to chase a constantly moving ball, it detracts from their most important effort, which is to educate the next generation of Americans.

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota, Chairman KLINE, the chairman of the full Education and Workforce Committee. He has been a leader in the area of working on these issues for a lot more than 4 years.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take literally a few seconds to say I understand the gentleman's purpose here. I think this improves the bill.

I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member.

□ 1630

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

As the gentleman from Colorado has indicated, if you have a good bill, you should have as long an authorization as possible. It allows for better planning and the other things he mentioned.

But this is a bad bill. The funding formula takes from the poor and gives to the rich. It eliminates the responsibility to actually do something about the achievement gaps. I just believe the quicker we can get back to it, the better. So if you want to shorten the authorization so that the pain inflicted on this bill is shorter, I am for it.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for supporting the amendment. The reasons he is supporting are completely wrong. We have increased Federal spending, as the gentleman knows, on education over 300 percent since the Federal Government has been involved. And guess what, Mr. Chairman, the results have been flatlined.

This bill does anything but take from the poor and give to the rich. In fact, it ensures that civil rights are protected and that children, whatever socioeconomic background, aren't left behind, but they have the opportunity to succeed in the 21st century and win.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROKITA. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), who is new to this Congress but is already making this mark. He has coauthored this amendment with me.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, well, one of the many reasons that this is a good bill is that it recognizes that the Federal Government is taking too much control over education in this country.

One of the reasons the Federal Government should not get involved in many, many things is they are not very nimble. When they make a mistake,

rather than turning something around—you know, if a school board makes a mistake, they may come back in a meeting 2 weeks later and undo the mistake they made. When the Federal Government makes a mistake, it can take 15 or 20 years, if ever, to admit they made a mistake.

Now, when the original No Child Left Behind bill passed, I used to meet with school superintendents a couple times a month. They knew within months that that bill was horribly flawed.

Chairman KLINE has worked very hard on this bill. It is a very good bill, but it is still a very big, complicated bill. And I am sure within months, years, a couple of years, local superintendents will report changes they want to have made.

I think this is a very good amendment because, even though it doesn't assure us that we are going to revisit this in 4 years any more than the original No Child Left Behind we were sure we were going to revisit in 7 years, I think it reminds Congress that at least in a 4-year period you ought to be looking at it, see what your local superintendents think, see what your local schoolteachers think, and see if it can be improved. And, of course, it is going to be able to be improved in 4 years. So that is the reason for the amendment.

I mean, if you told anybody back home we are passing a law and we don't anticipate even looking at it again for 4 years, I think they would think that is highly unusual. That defines one of the reasons why we shouldn't get the Federal Government involved in a wide variety of things.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, of course you can look at a bill during its period of initial authorization. There are routinely cleanup bills that move through this body.

And I wish—I wish—the No Child Left Behind had a cleanup bill in 2002 or in 2003 or in 2004, all during its initial period of authorization, but President Bush closed the doors on even the changes that I think that we could have had broad consensus that we needed to pass.

But of course whatever comes out of this ESEA process, if we can agree on cleanup things and unintended consequences 2 years, 3 years out, let's do them.

Look, the answer is not to move the ball. It leads to the spinning of the wheels for a period of years. And rather than working on educating kids, people are working on complying with an ever-changing matrix of Federal, State, and local law.

There is a lot that happens after we pass a law in this body. It goes to Federal rulemaking, input from various constituencies, final rules. It goes to States who might change their policies, State Boards of Education, State commissioners. It goes down to districts, busy superintendents who are worried about bus schedules, who are

worried about opening new schools, have to worry about recommending to their boards the new policies that will comply with our new Federal law.

It takes a lot of time. It might take 2 years, 3 years before it finally reaches those policy implementation levels on the ground at a local level. And guess what, if this amendment becomes law and the authorization period is only 4 years, they might finally—finally—start complying with this law only to find that there is a future Congress, a future President that moves the ball once again and starts the whole cycle of spinning wheels all over again.

We need to make sure that whatever we do in this body, that we give time for a thoughtful implementation of it at the State and local level that doesn't detract from the core mission that the men and women who teach in our classrooms, the men and women who volunteer on school boards, the professionals who serve as superintendents commit their lives to in terms of educating kids.

So we need to move forward with a longer reauthorization. If there are cleanup matters that we can agree on during that authorization period, we should by no means preclude them from the discussion until the end of this authorization. That was one of the problems with No Child Left Behind, that this body never had a follow-up discussion.

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 Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part A of House Report 114-192.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 580, line 24, strike the closing quotation mark and second period.

Page 580, after line 24, insert the following:

“PART G—A PLUS ACT

“SECTION 6701. SHORT TITLE; PURPOSE; DEFINITIONS.

“(a) SHORT TITLE.—This part may be cited as the “Academic Partnerships Lead Us to Success Act” or the ‘A PLUS Act’.

“(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this part are as follows:

“(1) To give States and local communities added flexibility to determine how to improve academic achievement and implement education reforms.

“(2) To reduce the administrative costs and compliance burden of Federal education programs in order to focus Federal resources on improving academic achievement.

“(3) To ensure that States and communities are accountable to the public for advancing the academic achievement of all students, especially disadvantaged children.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this part:

“(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The term ‘accountability’ means that public schools are an-

swerable to parents and other taxpayers for the use of public funds and shall report student progress to parents and taxpayers regularly.

“(2) DECLARATION OF INTENT.—The term ‘declaration of intent’ means a decision by a State, as determined by State Authorizing Officials or by referendum, to assume full management responsibility for the expenditure of Federal funds for certain eligible programs for the purpose of advancing, on a more comprehensive and effective basis, the educational policy of such State.

“(3) STATE.—The term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term in section 1122(e).

“(4) STATE AUTHORIZING OFFICIALS.—The term ‘State Authorizing Officials’ means the State officials who shall authorize the submission of a declaration of intent, and any amendments thereto, on behalf of the State. Such officials shall include not less than 2 of the following:

“(A) The governor of the State.

“(B) The highest elected education official of the State, if any.

“(C) The legislature of the State.

“(5) STATE DESIGNATED OFFICER.—The term ‘State Designated Officer’ means the person designated by the State Authorizing Officials to submit to the Secretary, on behalf of the State, a declaration of intent, and any amendments thereto, and to function as the point-of-contact for the State for the Secretary and others relating to any responsibilities arising under this part.

“SEC. 6702. DECLARATION OF INTENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State is authorized to submit to the Secretary a declaration of intent permitting the State to receive Federal funds on a consolidated basis to manage the expenditure of such funds to advance the educational policy of the State.

“(b) PROGRAMS ELIGIBLE FOR CONSOLIDATION AND PERMISSIBLE USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) SCOPE.—A State may choose to include within the scope of the State’s declaration of intent any program for which Congress makes funds available to the State if the program is for a purpose described in this Act. A State may not include any program funded pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

“(2) USES OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to a State pursuant to a declaration of intent under this part shall be used for any educational purpose permitted by State law of the State submitting a declaration of intent.

“(3) REMOVAL OF FISCAL AND ACCOUNTING BARRIERS.—Each State educational agency that operates under a declaration of intent under this part shall modify or eliminate State fiscal and accounting barriers that prevent local educational agencies and schools from easily consolidating funds from other Federal, State, and local sources in order to improve educational opportunities and reduce unnecessary fiscal and accounting requirements.

“(c) CONTENTS OF DECLARATION.—Each declaration of intent shall contain—

“(1) a list of eligible programs that are subject to the declaration of intent;

“(2) an assurance that the submission of the declaration of intent has been authorized by the State Authorizing Officials, specifying the identity of the State Designated Officer;

“(3) the duration of the declaration of intent;

“(4) an assurance that the State will use fiscal control and fund accounting procedures;

“(5) an assurance that the State will meet the requirements of applicable Federal civil rights laws in carrying out the declaration of

intent and in consolidating and using the funds under the declaration of intent;

“(6) an assurance that in implementing the declaration of intent the State will seek to advance educational opportunities for the disadvantaged;

“(7) a description of the plan for maintaining direct accountability to parents and other citizens of the State; and

“(8) an assurance that in implementing the declaration of intent, the State will seek to use Federal funds to supplement, rather than supplant, State education funding.

“(d) DURATION.—The duration of the declaration of intent shall not exceed 5 years.

“(e) REVIEW AND RECOGNITION BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review the declaration of intent received from the State Designated Officer not more than 60 days after the date of receipt of such declaration, and shall recognize such declaration of intent unless the declaration of intent fails to meet the requirements under subsection (c).

“(2) RECOGNITION BY OPERATION OF LAW.—If the Secretary fails to take action within the time specified in paragraph (1), the declaration of intent, as submitted, shall be deemed to be approved.

“(f) AMENDMENT TO DECLARATION OF INTENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The State Authorizing Officials may direct the State Designated Officer to submit amendments to a declaration of intent that is in effect. Such amendments shall be submitted to the Secretary and considered by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (e).

“(2) AMENDMENTS AUTHORIZED.—A declaration of intent that is in effect may be amended to—

“(A) expand the scope of such declaration of intent to encompass additional eligible programs;

“(B) reduce the scope of such declaration of intent by excluding coverage of a Federal program included in the original declaration of intent;

“(C) modify the duration of such declaration of intent; or

“(D) achieve such other modifications as the State Authorizing Officials deem appropriate.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment shall specify an effective date. Such effective date shall provide adequate time to assure full compliance with Federal program requirements relating to an eligible program that has been removed from the coverage of the declaration of intent by the proposed amendment.

“(4) TREATMENT OF PROGRAM FUNDS WITHDRAWN FROM DECLARATION OF INTENT.—Beginning on the effective date of an amendment executed under paragraph (2)(B), each program requirement of each program removed from the declaration of intent shall apply to the State’s use of funds made available under the program.

“SEC. 6703. TRANSPARENCY FOR RESULTS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State operating under a declaration of intent under this part shall inform parents and the general public regarding the student achievement assessment system, demonstrating student progress relative to the State’s determination of student proficiency, as described in paragraph (2), for the purpose of public accountability to parents and taxpayers.

“(b) ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.—The State shall determine and establish an accountability system to ensure accountability under this part.

“(c) REPORT ON STUDENT PROGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date of the declaration of intent, and annually

thereafter, a State shall disseminate widely to parents and the general public a report that describes student progress. The report shall include—

“(1) student performance data disaggregated in the same manner as data are disaggregated under section 1111(b)(3)(A); and

“(2) a description of how the State has used Federal funds to improve academic achievement, reduce achievement disparities between various student groups, and improve educational opportunities for the disadvantaged.

“SEC. 6704. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amount that a State with a declaration of intent may expend for administrative expenses shall be limited to 1 percent of the aggregate amount of Federal funds made available to the State through the eligible programs included within the scope of such declaration of intent.

“(b) STATES NOT CONSOLIDATING FUNDS UNDER PART A OF TITLE I.—If the declaration of intent does not include within its scope part A of title I, the amount spent by the State on administrative expenses shall be limited to 3 percent of the aggregate amount of Federal funds made available to the State pursuant to such declaration of intent.

“SEC. 6705. EQUITABLE PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

“Each State consolidating and using funds pursuant to a declaration of intent under this part shall provide for the participation of private school children and teachers in the activities assisted under the declaration of intent in the same manner as participation is provided to private school children and teachers under section 9501.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am introducing the Academic Partnerships Lead Us to Success, or the A-PLUS, Act.

When most of us come to Washington, one of the promises or one of the things that we try and do best is to return as much power or, should I say, decisionmaking back to the States and back to the people.

I believe the A-PLUS Act does that. It allows the States to opt out of as many as 80 different Federal programs, returning that opportunity. Some may say that No Child Left Behind, that it allows the opt out, and it does; but what it doesn't do, it doesn't allow the States to opt out of the mandates and still keep their Federal funding. That is why we believe this is a crucial amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), my distinguished friend.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from North Carolina.

I am happy to cosponsor this amendment. I think of this amendment in terms of Common Core because we have had a lot of controversy over Common Core. A lot of parents are upset about it, and they say: Look, this was the Federal Government getting involved in education, and people support it.

Congress said: Wait a minute. The Federal Government never mandated Common Core. That never happened.

And, you know, that is true.

But what did happen was the Federal Government had a huge amount of money under President Obama's race to the top, and they said: Hey, States—and this is during the recession and States needed the money—here is some money, but you have got to do what we want you to do.

And so they conditioned that funding and really coerced a lot of States into adopting something like Common Core.

And so I think what the A-PLUS does is it says: Okay. The Federal Government has gotten involved in K-12 education. I don't think it has been very successful from the very beginning, but if you are going to be providing money, at least give the State the ability to take that money and use it as they see fit to try and innovate and to try to do things that will improve the academic performance of their kids. But don't condition the funding on following specific formulas that Washington knows best.

I think this really empowers States. I think this is something that will empower local communities and, I think, ultimately will be better off as a matter of K-12 education. So I thank my friend from North Carolina for offering it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment would literally let States just take the money and run with no assurance that the billions of Federal dollars actually benefit the populations of students that ESEA was intended to serve: low-income, minority students who do not speak English, students with disabilities.

The original purpose of ESEA was to address the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs.

Subsequently, we added a requirement that you identify and address achievement gaps. That is the purpose of the law. If you just opt out and take it as a block grant, you don't have to address the problems that the money is designed to cure.

The underlying bill violates the original purpose of the original ESEA, and this amendment just makes it worse.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I request how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, who better to address these problems than

parents, States, and local school boards.

Let's talk about specifically what the A-PLUS Act does.

One, it restores education decision-making to State and local leaders who are better positioned to make informed decisions about the needs of their local school communities. It allows States to consolidate funding for any and all programs that are authorized under the ESEA, and it also reduces bureaucracy and increases transparency of student outcomes by redirecting accountability to parents and taxpayers, not Washington.

Fundamentally, I believe that government is more accountable, almost always, the more local, and it becomes more effective.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, there is a great potential for cooperation between Democrats and Republicans, as has historically been, with regard to education; and that lies in, of course, enhancing flexibility in freeing teachers and principals and districts from some of the bureaucratic constraints that they have that distract from their ability to maximize education.

But along with that increased flexibility needs to come accountability; otherwise, we wind up with the worst of both worlds. And just like No Child Left Behind erred too far in the direction of not enough flexibility with too much in the wrong kind of accountability, so, too, must we be careful not to err in the direction of too much flexibility without accountability.

It is important to make sure that as we increase the ways and the manner that States and districts have to free up local innovation at the classroom level, at the school level, at the district level, we need to make sure and reiterate what our goals are here.

How do we make sure that all students are learning? How do we make sure that schools are serving students with disabilities under IDEA? How do we make sure that districts and States are committed to closing the achievement gap between students of color and White students, even in local jurisdictions that might not have that political will intrinsically? That is the Federal promise. That is the promise and the reason behind ESEA and our efforts to improve education across these United States.

To turn it over to the States effectively makes the referee a player on the field. We need to have an objective look. The same people who are concerned with deciding exactly how monies are spent cannot objectively weigh whether it is working or whether it is not. That is just human nature.

We need to make sure that if States have additional flexibility in grants—something I think that we can certainly work together on—if they have

that flexibility, we need to make sure there is an objective standard under which what they are doing with that flexibility is determined to work or not to work. And if it doesn't work, we need to encourage those States to move in a different direction. If it does work, we can increase our efforts to support them.

So again, there is a general premise here that can be worked on, but the underlying amendment would be extremely detrimental to public education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina yielded back the balance of his time. Did the gentleman intend to reserve?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman ask for unanimous consent to reclaim his 2 minutes of time?

Mr. WALKER. He yielded back 2 minutes to me. Is that correct?

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman ask for unanimous consent?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina may reclaim his 2 minutes of time.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, to be clear, the gentleman was not yielded time from the gentleman from Virginia.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman was granted his own time, which erroneously he had yielded back to the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is correct.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, a lot of this is talk. And with due respect to my friend from Colorado, I hear the point. But I would say a lot of that is we are hearing "we, we this, we this, we the Federal, we this." It really should be "we the people at the State," "we the people at the local level."

It is important that we get some of the power that we like to monger up here among us in this House to return it back to the States, to return it back to the individual school boards.

□ 1645

Who best knows to make these decisions other than these parents and

these school boards? We talk about accountability. As Dr. Phil would say, "How has that been working for us the last 40 years?"

We need to get the accountability back to where it goes, where it should have been from the very beginning, and that is to the State level and to the local people, to the parents and the school boards.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the ESEA passed in 1965 because States and localities were not equitably funding the schools. The ESEA required the money to be spent primarily in the areas with a concentration of low-income families. If this amendment passes, we can reasonably assume that they will go back to the way they were doing it.

This makes a bad bill even worse. So I would hope that we would defeat the amendment and keep the requirement that the States, in using the money, address the fiscal inequalities and achievement gaps.

With this amendment, there are no requirements that they do anything, and we can reasonably assume that they would go back to doing the things they were doing to begin with before the ESEA passed. I would hope we would defeat this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part A of House Report 114-192.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 3, strike "(3)(B)(ii)(II)" and insert "(3)(B)(ii)(II), except that States shall allow the parent of a student to opt such student out of the assessments required under this paragraph for any reason and shall not include such students in calculating the participation rate under this clause".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank Chairman KLINE and Representative ROKITA of the House

Committee on Education and the Workforce for working with me on this important amendment, which is to ensure that parents have more authority and power over their children's educations.

My amendment is very, very simple. It would allow any parent to opt his child out of high-stakes testing, and it would protect schools from being punished by the Federal Department of Education if parents opted to take their children out of these tests.

Since the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, called No Child Left Behind, the Federal Government has placed increasing importance on academic assessments in K-12 education.

Assessments are important and even necessary to understand and measure a child's academic progress. However, academic assessments have become an overutilized metric to evaluate everything from the quality of a teacher to the strength of a particular program.

Because of this frenzied obsession with high-stakes testing, more and more time is being usurped from actual classroom learning. It was reported that the testing for a student in the 11th grade could take up to 27 days, a total of 15 percent of the entire school year, and a lot of the teachers complain about having to teach to the test. In fact, I think that is why the NEA has come out in support of this amendment.

Parents are becoming increasingly fed up with such constant and onerous testing requirements, and so are the teachers. While some States currently allow parents to opt their students out of assessments, there exists a simultaneous obligation on schools of a 95 percent participation rate in school assessments.

If schools don't meet these requirements, they risk enforcement measures from the Department of Education, which, at worst, could include losing access to Federal funding. These factors create a strange environment of conflicting interests for students, parents, and schools.

My amendment would ease a school's fear of penalties by directing that opted-out students not be counted among the 95 percent participation requirement while giving parents due power over their children's educations.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment, which returns the power back to where it should be, with the parents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to keep a light on problems like achievement gaps, as the underlying bill does, but it kind of sweeps everything under the rug.

Before the participation threshold of 95 percent, only one State actually assessed 95 percent of students with disabilities, and it was not unusual for

low-achieving students to suddenly have field trips on testing day. If you are not measuring the achievement gap, you can't deal with the achievement gap.

We need to make sure that enough students test, which is 95 percent, so that we can actually identify the achievement gaps and do something about it. Parents do have the right to opt out, but when the dust settles, at least 95 percent will have had to have taken the test.

We have situations now in which, if you eliminate that requirement, school systems can encourage people not to show up on testing day. They can have field trips on testing day and can manipulate the data so that, if only half of the students are taking the test and if you make sure that it is the good students who are taking the test, your scores all of a sudden will go up.

The requirement that 95 percent get tested means you have meaningful data so that you can find out what the problem is, and then you can deal with it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is expressing a concern here of parents, not of schoolteachers and principals who want to put together field trips. There is a great deal of anxiety on the part of some parents, and this is giving them some power.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the underlying legislation and to the Salmon amendment.

Once again, we are considering legislation that does nothing to improve equity in our public education system, assuring and ensuring that resources are focused on student populations that have been historically marginalized, primarily children of color, English language learners, children with disabilities, and poor kids. The lessons from No Child Left Behind are plentiful, some good that need improvement and some that need to be eliminated from a reauthorization.

This amendment, along with the underlying legislation, continues to dismantle and remove the ESEA's significant mission, to deal with the issue of poverty in this country, marginalized communities, and kids who are not achieving.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5 and this amendment. The current bill fails to provide all of our communities with equitable educations.

Portability eliminates a maintenance of effort, block grants don't ad-

dress charter school accountability, and it eliminates provisions to protect English learners in this country. With this amendment, we eliminate the Nation's responsibility to be accountable and to ensure that all children get an education.

I am astounded by the historical amnesia that goes on when we have these discussions. The ESEA was formed for a purpose: to improve and to create equity and opportunity for children who didn't have it.

We have not reached a stage in this country when we can say that States can take care of this. We can go back to those vestiges, as the ranking member said, in which there was no equality, there was no opportunity, and tell the States, "You can do what you want with this Federal money. And, by discretion, if you don't educate all of your children, that is okay. And if, by discretion, we can't hold anybody accountable for his lack of education, that is okay."

That is the message we are going back to, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I take serious umbrage with the arrogance that purveys this city in that we are the font of all knowledge. In fact, I lovingly joke with my constituents when I go back and say, "I am from Washington, D.C., and I am here to help you." It always draws a loud amount of laughter because everybody knows that that is not the way things really are.

If we can't trust our parents, who have the biggest vested interest in whether or not their children succeed in education, if we can't trust the local teachers, if we can't trust the local school boards, whose members also have to run for election, then we might as well just fold up and go home.

I have a lot more confidence in parents, in teachers, in our local school boards, than I do in some nameless, faceless bureaucrat here in Washington, D.C. I say we put the power back where it should be: in the hands of parents and teachers and local school boards.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, one parent recently wrote me that she prefers that students with special needs be required to take tests. In her words, "The tests gave us the data we needed to see where my son needed additional support."

I rise in opposition to Mr. SALMON's amendment.

Before No Child Left Behind was passed, schools across the country would systemically excluded students from tests in an effort to inflate a school's overall performance and sweep

deficiencies and discrimination under the rug.

This amendment, which would allow students to opt out of tests and allow those students to be omitted from the testing threshold, would make it easier to, once again, exclude historically marginalized students from accountability systems.

There would be almost no way of knowing which students truly opted out, which were pushed out, and which students stayed at home at their schools' suggestion or traveled on an optional field trip.

In my home State of Colorado, a similar provision was brought up in the State legislature, and over 400 business and community leaders strongly publicly opposed the bill and succeeded in defeating it.

In order to close achievement gaps, we need data on every student, regardless of race, background, or disability. This kind of policy allows the very data we need the most on the most needy kids to be swept under the rug.

For that reason, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

If this amendment passes, school systems will have an incentive to address achievement gaps not by the hard work that it takes to close the achievement gaps, but by just manipulating the data. That is wrong, and this amendment ought to be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part A of House Report 114-192.

Mr. POLIS. 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:

Strike section 112 and insert the following:

SEC. 112. STATE PLANS.

Section 1111 (20 U.S.C. 6311) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1111. STATE PLANS.

"(a) PLANS REQUIRED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For any State desiring to receive a grant under this part, the State educational agency shall submit to the Secretary a plan, developed by the State educational agency, in consultation with representatives of local educational agencies, teachers, school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, early childhood education providers, parents, community organizations, communities representing underserved populations, and Indian tribes,

that satisfies the requirements of this section, and that is coordinated with other programs of this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

“(2) CONSOLIDATED PLAN.—A State plan submitted under paragraph (1) may be submitted as a part of a consolidated plan under section 9302.

“(b) COLLEGE AND CAREER READY CONTENT STANDARDS, ASSESSMENTS, AND ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS.—

“(1) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each State plan shall include evidence that the State’s college and career ready content standards, assessments, and achievement standards under this subsection are—

“(A) vertically aligned from kindergarten through grade 12; and

“(B) developed and implemented to ensure that proficiency in the content standards will signify that a student is on-track to graduate prepared for—

“(i) according to written affirmation from the State’s public institutions of higher education, placement in credit-bearing, non-remedial courses at the 2-and 4-year public institutions of higher education in the State; and

“(ii) success on relevant State career and technical education standards.

“(2) COLLEGE AND CAREER READY CONTENT STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State plan shall demonstrate that, not later than the 2015–2016 school year the State educational agency will adopt and implement high-quality, college and career ready content standards that comply with this paragraph.

“(B) SUBJECTS.—The State educational agency shall have such high-quality, academic content standards for students in kindergarten through grade 12 for, at a minimum, English language arts, math, and science.

“(C) ELEMENTS.—College and career ready content standards under this paragraph shall—

“(i) be developed through participation in a State-led process that engages—

“(I) kindergarten through-grade-12 education experts (including teachers and educational leaders); and

“(II) representatives of institutions of higher education, the business community, and the early learning community;

“(ii) be rigorous, internationally benchmarked, and evidence-based, requiring students to demonstrate the ability to think critically, solve problems, and communicate effectively;

“(iii) be either—

“(I) validated, including through written affirmation from the State’s public institutions of higher education, to ensure that proficiency in the content standards will signify that a student is on-track to graduate prepared for—

“(aa) placement in credit-bearing, non-remedial courses at the 2-and 4-year public institutions of higher education in the State; and

“(bb) success on relevant State career and technical education standards; or

“(II) State-developed and voluntarily adopted by a significant number of States;

“(iv) for standards from kindergarten through grade 3, reflect progression in how children develop and learn the requisite skills and content from earlier grades (including preschool) to later grades; and

“(v) apply to all schools and students in the State.

“(D) ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Each State educational agency

shall develop and implement statewide, high-quality English language proficiency standards that—

“(i) are aligned with the State’s academic content standards;

“(ii) reflect the academic language that is required for success on the State educational agency’s academic content assessments;

“(iii) predict success on the applicable grade level English language arts content assessment;

“(iv) ensure proficiency in each of the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing in the appropriate amount of time; and

“(v) address the different proficiency levels of English learners.

“(E) EARLY LEARNING STANDARDS.—The State educational agency shall, in collaboration with the State agencies responsible for overseeing early care and education programs and the State early care and education advisory council, develop and implement early learning standards across all major domains of development for preschoolers that—

“(i) demonstrate alignment with the State academic content standards;

“(ii) are implemented through dissemination, training, and other means to applicable early care and education programs;

“(iii) reflect research and evidence-based developmental and learning expectations;

“(iv) inform teaching practices and professional development and services; and

“(v) for preschool age children, appropriately assist in the transition to kindergarten.

“(F) ASSURANCE.—Each State plan shall include an assurance that the State has implemented the same content standards for all students in the same grade and does not have a policy of using different content standards for any student subgroup.

“(3) HIGH-QUALITY ASSESSMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State plan shall demonstrate that the State educational agency will adopt and implement high-quality assessments in English language arts, math, and science not later than the 2016–2017 school year that comply with this paragraph.

“(B) ELEMENTS.—Such assessments shall—

“(i) be valid, reliable, appropriate, and of adequate technical quality for each purpose required under this Act, and be consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical standards;

“(ii) measure the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate proficiency in the academic content standards under paragraph (2) for the grade in which the student is enrolled;

“(iii) be developed as part of a system of assessments providing data (including individual student achievement data and individual student growth data), that shall be used to improve teaching, learning, and program outcomes;

“(iv) be used in determining the performance of each local educational agency and school in the State in accordance with the State’s accountability system under subsection (c);

“(v) provide an accurate measure of—

“(I) student achievement at all levels of student performance; and

“(II) student academic growth;

“(vi) allow for complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills including the ability to think critically, solve problems, and communicate effectively;

“(vii) be accessible for all students, including students with disabilities and English learners, by—

“(I) incorporating principles of universal design as defined by section 3(a) of the As-

sistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3002(a)); and

“(II) being interoperable when using any digital assessment, such as computer-based and online assessments;

“(viii) provide for accommodations, including for computer-based and online assessments, for students with disabilities and English learners to provide a valid and reliable measure of such students’ achievement;

“(ix) produce individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports that allow parents, teachers, and school leaders to understand and address the specific academic needs of students, and include information regarding achievement on academic assessments, and that are provided to parents, teachers, and school leaders, as soon as is practicable after the assessment is given, in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand; and

“(x) may be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks as long as such assessments meet the requirements of this subsection.

“(C) ADMINISTRATION.—Such assessments shall—

“(i) be administered to all students, including all subgroups described in subsection (c)(3)(A), in the same grade level for each content area assessed, except as provided under subparagraph (E), through—

“(I) a single summative assessment each school year; or

“(II) multiple statewide assessments over the course of the school year that result in a single summative score that provides valid, reliable, and transparent information on student achievement for each tested content area in each grade level;

“(ii) for English language arts and math—

“(I) be administered annually, at a minimum, for students in grade 3 through grade 8; and

“(II) be administered at least once, but not earlier than 11th grade for students in grades 9 through grade 12; and

“(iii) for science, be administered at least once during grades 3 through 5, grades 6 through 8, and grades 9 through 12.

“(D) NATIVE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENTS.—Each State educational agency with at least 10,000 English learners, at least 25 percent of which speak the same language that is not English, shall adopt and implement native language assessments for that language consistent with State law. Such assessments shall be for students—

“(i) for whom the academic assessment in the student’s native language would likely yield more accurate and reliable information about such student’s content knowledge;

“(ii) who are literate in the native language and have received formal education in such language; or

“(iii) who are enrolled in a bilingual or dual language program and the native language assessment is consistent with such program’s language of instruction.

“(E) ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS FOR STUDENTS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT COGNITIVE DISABILITIES.—In the case of a State educational agency that adopts alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities described in paragraph (4)(D), the State shall adopt and implement high-quality statewide alternate assessments aligned to such alternate achievement standards that meet the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C), so long as the State ensures that in the State the total number of students in each grade level assessed in each subject does not exceed the cap established under subsection (c)(3)(E)(iii)(II).

“(F) ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENTS.—Each State educational agency

shall adopt and implement statewide English language proficiency assessments that—

“(i) are administered annually and aligned with the State’s English language proficiency standards and academic content standards;

“(ii) are accessible, valid, and reliable;

“(iii) measure proficiency in reading, listening, speaking, and writing in English both individually and collectively;

“(iv) assess progress and growth on language and content acquisition; and

“(v) allow for the local educational agency to retest a student in the individual domain areas that the student did not pass, unless the student is newly entering a school in the State, or is in the third, fifth, or eighth grades.

“(G) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO BUREAU FUNDED SCHOOLS.—In determining the assessments to be used by each school operated or funded by the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Indian Education receiving funds under this part, the following shall apply:

“(i) Each such school that is accredited by the State in which it is operating shall use the assessments the State has developed and implemented to meet the requirements of this section, or such other appropriate assessment as approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

“(ii) Each such school that is accredited by a regional accrediting organization shall adopt an appropriate assessment, in consultation with and with the approval of, the Secretary of the Interior and consistent with assessments adopted by other schools in the same State or region, that meets the requirements of this section.

“(iii) Each such school that is accredited by a tribal accrediting agency or tribal division of education shall use an assessment developed by such agency or division, except that the Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that such assessment meets the requirements of this section.

“(H) ASSURANCE.—Each State plan shall include an assurance that the State educational agency will take steps to ensure that the State assessment system, which includes all statewide assessments and local assessments is coordinated and streamlined to eliminate duplication of assessment purposes, practices, and use.

“(I) ACCOMMODATIONS.—Each State plan shall—

“(i) describe the accommodations for English learners and students with disabilities on the assessments used by the State which may include accommodations such as text-to-speech technology or read aloud, braille, large print, calculator, speech-to-text technology or scribe, extended time, and frequent breaks;

“(ii) include evidence of the effectiveness of such accommodations in maintaining valid results for the appropriate population; and

“(iii) include evidence that such accommodations do not change the construct intended to be measured by the assessment or the meaning of the resulting scores.

“(J) ADAPTIVE ASSESSMENTS.—In the case of a State educational agency that develops and administers computer adaptive assessments, such assessments shall meet the requirements of this paragraph, and must measure, at a minimum, each student’s academic proficiency against the State’s content standards as described in paragraph (2) for the grade in which the student is enrolled.

“(4) COLLEGE AND CAREER READY ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State plan shall demonstrate that the State will adopt and implement college and career ready achievement standards in English language arts,

math, and science by the 2015–2016 school year that comply with this paragraph.

“(B) ELEMENTS.—Such academic achievement standards shall establish at a minimum, 3 levels of student achievement that describe how well a student is demonstrating proficiency in the State’s academic content standards that differentiate levels of performance to—

“(i) describe 2 levels of high achievement (on-target and advanced) that indicate, at a minimum, that a student is proficient in the academic content standards under paragraph (2) as measured by the performance on assessments under paragraph (3); and

“(ii) describe a third level of achievement (catch-up) that provides information about the progress of a student toward becoming proficient in the academic content standards under paragraph (2) as measured by the performance on assessments under paragraph (3).

“(C) VERTICAL ALIGNMENT.—Such achievement standards are vertically aligned to ensure a student who achieves at the on-target or advanced levels under subparagraph (B)(i) signifies that student is on-track to graduate prepared for—

“(i) placement in credit-bearing, non-remedial courses at the 2- and 4-year public institutions of higher education in the State; and

“(ii) success on relevant State career and technical education standards.

“(D) ALTERNATE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS.—If a State educational agency adopts alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, such academic achievement standards shall establish, at a minimum, 3 levels of student achievement that describe how well a student is demonstrating proficiency in the State’s academic content standards that—

“(i) are aligned to the State’s college and career ready content standards under paragraph (2);

“(ii) are vertically aligned to ensure that a student who achieves at the on-target or advanced level under clause (v)(I) signifies that the student is on-track to access a postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment;

“(iii) reflect concepts and skills that students should know and understand for each grade;

“(iv) are supported by evidence-based learning progressions to age and grade-level performance; and

“(v) establish, at a minimum—

“(I) 2 levels of high achievement (on-target and advanced) that indicate, at a minimum, that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities is proficient in the academic content standards under paragraph (2) as measured by the performance on assessments under paragraph (3)(E); and

“(II) a third level of achievement (catch-up) that provides information about the progress of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities toward becoming proficient in the academic content standards under paragraph (2) as measured by the performance on assessments under paragraph (3)(E).

“(E) STUDENT GROWTH STANDARDS.—Each State plan shall demonstrate that the State will adopt and implement student growth standards for students in the assessed grades that comply with this subparagraph, as follows:

“(i) ON-TARGET AND ADVANCED LEVELS.—For a student who is achieving at the on-target or advanced level of achievement, the student growth standard is not less than the rate of academic growth necessary for the student to remain at that level of student achievement for not less than 3 years.

“(ii) CATCH-UP LEVEL.—For a student who is achieving at the catch-up level of achievement, the student growth standard is not less than the rate of academic growth necessary for the student to achieve an on-target level of achievement within 3 or 4 years, as determined by the State.

“(F) PROHIBITION.—A State may not establish alternate or modified achievement standards for any subgroup of students, except as provided under subparagraph (D).

“(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (3) shall be construed to prescribe the use of the academic assessments established pursuant to such paragraph for student promotion or graduation purposes.

“(C) ACCOUNTABILITY AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SYSTEM.—The State plan shall demonstrate that not later than the 2016–2017 school year, the State educational agency, in consultation with representatives of local educational agencies, teachers, school leaders, parents, community organizations, communities representing underserved populations and Indian tribes, has developed a single statewide accountability and school improvement system (in this subsection known as the ‘accountability system’) that ensures all students have the knowledge and skills to successfully enter the workforce or postsecondary education without the need for remediation by complying with this subsection as follows:

“(1) ELEMENTS.—Each State accountability system shall, at a minimum—

“(A) annually measure academic achievement for all students, including each subgroup described in paragraph (3)(A), in each public school, including each charter school, in the State, including—

“(i) student academic achievement in accordance with the academic achievement standards described in subsection (b)(4);

“(ii) student growth in accordance with the student growth standards described in subsection (b)(4)(E); and

“(iii) graduation rates in diploma granting schools;

“(B) set clear performance and growth targets in accordance with paragraph (2) to improve the academic achievement of all students as measured under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and to close achievement gaps so that all students graduate ready for postsecondary education and the workforce;

“(C) establish equity indicators to diagnose school challenges and measure school progress within the improvement system described in section 1116, including factors to measure, for all students and each subgroup described in paragraph (3)(A)—

“(i) academic learning, such as—

“(I) percentage of students successfully completing rigorous coursework that aligns with college and career ready standards described under subsection (b)(2) such as dual enrollment, Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses;

“(II) percentage of students enrolled in arts courses;

“(III) student success on State or local educational agency end-of course examinations; and

“(IV) student success on performance-based assessments that are valid, reliable and comparable across a local educational agency and meet the requirements of paragraph (3)(B);

“(ii) student engagement, such as—

“(I) student attendance rates;

“(II) student discipline data, including suspension and expulsion rates;

“(III) incidents of bullying and harassment; and

“(IV) surveys of student engagement and satisfaction;

“(iii) student advancement, such as—

“(I) student on-time promotion rates;

“(II) on-time credit accumulation rates;
 “(III) course failure rates; and
 “(IV) post-secondary and workforce entry rates;
 “(iv) student health and wellness;
 “(v) student access to instructional quality, such as—
 “(I) number of qualified teachers and paraprofessionals;
 “(II) number of specialized instructional support personnel;
 “(III) instructional personnel attendance, vacancies, and turnover; and
 “(IV) rates of effective teachers and principals, as determined by the State or local educational agency;
 “(vi) school climate and conditions for student success, such as—
 “(I) the availability of up-to-date instructional materials, technology, and supplies;
 “(II) measures of school safety; and
 “(III) the condition of school facilities; including accounting for well-equipped instructional spaces; and
 “(vii) family and community engagement in education;
 “(D) annually differentiate performance and condition of schools based on—
 “(i) the achievement measured under subparagraph (A);
 “(ii) whether the school meets the performance and growth targets set under paragraph (2); and
 “(iii) to a lesser extent, data on the State-established equity indicators, as described in subparagraph (C); and
 “(E) identify using the differentiation described in subparagraph (D), for the purposes under section 1116—
 “(i) high priority schools that—
 “(I) according to the State-established parameters described in 1116(a)(2), have the lowest performance in the local educational agency and the State using current and prior year academic achievement, growth, and graduation rate data as described in subparagraph (A) and data on the state-established equity indicators described in subparagraph (C); or
 “(II) as of the date of enactment of the Student Success Act, have been identified under 1003(g); and
 “(ii) schools in need of support that have not met one or more of the performance targets set under paragraph (2) for any subgroup described in paragraph (3)(A) in the same grade level and subject, for two consecutive years; and
 “(iii) reward schools that have—
 “(I) the highest performance in the State for all students and student subgroups described in paragraph (3)(A); or
 “(II) made the most progress over at least the most recent 2-year period in the State in increasing student academic achievement and graduation rates for all students and student subgroups described in paragraph (3)(A); and
 “(III) made significant progress in overcoming school challenges identified using the State-established equity indicators, as described in subparagraph (C).
 “(2) GOALS AND TARGETS.—
 “(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency shall establish goals and targets for the State accountability and school improvement system that comply with this paragraph. Such targets shall be established separately for all elementary school and secondary school students, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and English learners and expect accelerated academic gains from subgroups who are the farthest away from college and career-readiness as determined by annual academic achievement measures described in paragraph (1)(A).

“(B) ACHIEVEMENT GOALS.—Each State educational agency shall set multi-year goals that are consistent with the academic and growth achievement standards under subsection (b)(4) to ensure that all students graduate prepared to enter the workforce or postsecondary education without the need for remediation.

“(C) PERFORMANCE TARGETS.—Each State educational agency shall set ambitious, but achievable annual performance targets separately for each subgroup of students described in paragraph (3)(A), for local educational agencies and schools, for each grade level and in English language arts and math that reflect the progress required for all students and each subgroup of students described in paragraph (3)(A) to meet the State-determined goals as required under subparagraph (B), as approved by the Secretary.

“(D) GROWTH TARGETS.—Each State educational agency shall set ambitious but achievable growth targets that—

“(i) assist the State in achieving the academic achievement goals described in subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) include targets that ensure all students, including subgroups of students described in paragraph (3)(A), meet the growth standards described in subsection (b)(4)(E).

“(E) GRADUATION RATE GOALS AND TARGETS.—

“(i) GRADUATION RATE GOALS.—Each State educational agency shall set a graduation rate goal of not less than 90 percent.

“(ii) GRADUATION RATE TARGETS.—Each State educational agency shall establish graduation rate targets which shall not be less rigorous than the targets approved under section 200.19 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

“(iii) EXTENDED-YEAR GRADUATION RATE TARGETS.—In the case of a State that chooses to use an extended year graduation rate in the accountability and school improvement system described under this subsection, the State shall set extended year graduation rate targets that are more rigorous than the targets set under clause (ii) and, if applicable, are not less rigorous than the targets approved under section 200.19 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

“(3) FAIR ACCOUNTABILITY.—Each State educational agency shall establish fair and appropriate policies and practices, as a component of the accountability system established under this subsection, to measure school, local educational agency, and State performance under the accountability system that, at a minimum, comply with this paragraph as follows:

“(A) DISAGGREGATE.—Each State educational agency shall disaggregate student achievement data in a manner that complies with the State’s group size requirements under subparagraph (B) for the school’s, local educational agency’s, and the State’s performance on its goals and performance targets established under paragraph (2), by each content area and each grade level for which such goals and targets are established, and, if applicable, by improvement indicators described in paragraph (1)(D) for each of the following groups:

“(i) All public elementary and secondary school students.

“(ii) Economically disadvantaged students.

“(iii) Students from major racial and ethnic groups.

“(iv) Students with disabilities.

“(v) English learners.

“(B) SUBGROUP SIZE.—Each State educational agency shall establish group size requirements for performance measurement and reporting under the accountability system that—

“(i) is the same for all subgroups described in subparagraph (A);

“(ii) does not exceed 15 students;

“(iii) yields statistically reliable information; and

“(iv) does not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

“(C) PARTICIPATION.—Each State educational agency shall ensure that—

“(i) not less than 95 percent of the students in each subgroup described subparagraph (A) take the State’s assessments under subsection (b)(2); and

“(ii) any school or local educational agency that does not comply with the requirement described in clause (i) of this subparagraph may not be considered to have met its goals or performance targets under paragraph (2).

“(D) AVERAGING.—Each State educational agency may average achievement data with the year immediately preceding that school year for the purpose of determining whether schools, local educational agencies, and the State have met their performance targets under paragraph (2).

“(E) STUDENTS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT COGNITIVE DISABILITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In calculating the percentage of students scoring at the on-target levels of achievement and the graduation rate for the purpose of determining whether schools, local educational agencies, and the State have met their performance targets under paragraph (2), a State shall include all students with disabilities, even those students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, and—

“(I) may include the on-target and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking alternate assessments under subsection (b)(3)(E) provided that the number and percentage of such students who score at the on-target or advanced level on such alternate assessments at the local educational agency and the State levels, respectively, does not exceed the cap established by the Secretary under clause (iii) in the grades assessed and subjects used under the accountability system established under this subsection; and

“(II) may include students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, who are assessed using alternate assessments described in subsection (b)(3)(E) and who receive a State-defined standards-based alternate diploma aligned with alternate achievement standards described in subparagraph (4)(D) and with completion of the student’s right to a free and appropriate public education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as graduating with a regular secondary school diploma, provided that the number and percentage of those students who receive a State-defined standards-based alternate diploma at the local educational agency and the State levels, respectively, does not exceed the cap established by the Secretary under clause (iii).

“(ii) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—If the number and percentage of students taking alternate assessments or receiving a State-defined standards-based alternate diploma exceeds the cap under clause (iii) at the local educational agency or State level, the State educational agency, in determining whether the local educational agency or State, respectively, has met its performance targets under paragraph (2), shall—

“(I) include all students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;

“(II) count at the catch-up level of achievement or as not graduating such students who exceed the cap;

“(III) include such students at the catch-up level of achievement or as not graduating in

each applicable subgroup at the school, local educational agency, and State level; and

“(IV) ensure that parents are informed of the actual academic achievement levels and graduation status of their children with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

“(iii) SECRETARIAL DUTIES.—The Secretary shall establish a cap for the purposes of this subparagraph which—

“(I) shall be based on the most recently available data on—

“(aa) the incidence of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;

“(bb) the participation rates, including by disability category, on alternate assessments using alternate achievement standards pursuant to subsection (b)(3)(E);

“(cc) the percentage of students, including by disability category, scoring at each achievement level on such alternate assessments; and

“(dd) other factors the Secretary deems necessary; and

“(II) may not exceed 1 percent of all students in the combined grades assessed.

“(4) TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take such steps as necessary to provide for the orderly transition to the new accountability and school improvement systems required under this subsection from prior accountability and school improvement systems in existence on the day before the date of enactment of the Student Success Act.

“(B) TRANSITION.—To enable the successful transition described in this paragraph, each State educational agency receiving funds under this part shall—

“(i) administer assessments that were in existence on the day before the date of enactment of the Student Success Act and beginning not later than the 2014–2015 school year, administer high-quality assessments described in subsection (b)(3);

“(ii) report student performance on the assessments described in subparagraph (I), consistent with the requirements under this title;

“(iii) set a new baseline for performance targets, as described in paragraph (2)(C) and (2)(D), once new high-quality assessments described in subsection (b)(3) are implemented;

“(iv) implement the accountability and school improvement requirements of sections 1111 and 1116, except—

“(I) the State shall not be required to identify new persistently low achieving schools or schools in need of improvement under section 1116 for 1 year after high-quality assessments described in subsection (b)(3) have been implemented; and

“(II) shall continue to implement school improvement requirements of section 1116 in persistently low achieving schools and schools in need of improvement that were identified as such in the year prior to implementation of new high-quality assessments; and

“(v) assist local educational agencies in providing training and professional development on the implementation of new college and career ready standards and high-quality assessments.

“(C) END OF TRANSITION.—The transition described in this paragraph shall be completed by no later than 2 years from the date of enactment of the Student Success Act.

“(d) OTHER PROVISIONS TO SUPPORT TEACHING AND LEARNING.—Each State plan shall contain the following:

“(1) DESCRIPTIONS.—A description of—

“(A) how the State educational agency will carry out the responsibilities of the State under section 1116;

“(B) a plan to identify and reduce inequities in the allocation of State and local resources, including personnel and nonpersonnel resources, between schools that are

receiving funds under this title and schools that are not receiving such funds under this title, consistent with the requirements in section 1120A, including—

“(i) a description of how the State will support local educational agencies in meeting the requirements of section 1120A; and

“(ii) a description of how the State will support local educational agencies to align plans under subparagraph (A), efforts to improve educator supports and working conditions described in section 2112(b)(3), and efforts to improve the equitable distribution of teachers and principals described in section 2112(b)(5), with efforts to improve the equitable allocation of resources as described in this subsection;

“(C) how the State educational agency will ensure that the results of the State assessments described in subsection (b)(3) and the school identifications described in subsection (c)(1), respectively, will be provided to local educational agencies, schools, teachers, and parents promptly, but not later than before the beginning of the school year following the school year in which such assessments, other indicators, or evaluations are taken or completed, and in a manner that is clear and easy to understand;

“(D) how the State educational agency will meet the diverse learning needs of students by—

“(i) identifying and addressing State-level barriers to implementation of universal design for learning, as described in section 5429(b)(21), and multi-tier system of supports; and

“(ii) developing and making available to local educational agencies technical assistance for implementing universal design for learning, as described in section 5429(b)(21), and multi-tier system of supports;

“(E) for a State educational agency that adopts alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities under subsection (b)(4)(D)—

“(i) the clear and appropriate guidelines for individualized education program teams to apply in determining when a student's significant cognitive disability justifies alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, which shall include guidelines to ensure—

“(I) students with the most significant cognitive disabilities have access to the general education curriculum for the grade in which the student is enrolled;

“(II) participation in an alternate assessment does not influence a student's placement in the least restrictive environment;

“(III) determinations are made separately for each subject and are re-determined each year during the annual individualized education program team meeting;

“(IV) the student's mode of communication has been identified and accommodated to the extent possible; and

“(V) parents of such students give informed consent that—

“(aa) their child's achievement be based on alternate achievement standards; and

“(bb) if applicable, that participation in such assessments precludes the student from completing the requirements for a regular secondary school diploma; and

“(ii) the procedures the State educational agency will use to ensure and monitor that individualized education program teams implement the requirements of clause (i); and

“(iii) the plan to disseminate information on and promote use of appropriate accommodations to increase the number of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed using achievement standards described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(4);

“(F) how the State educational agency will meet the needs of English learners, including—

“(i) the method for identifying an English learner that shall be used by all local educational agencies in the State;

“(ii) the entrance and exit requirements for students enrolled in limited English proficient classes, which shall—

“(I) be based on rigorous English language standards; and

“(II) prepare such students to successfully complete the State's assessments; and

“(iii) timelines and targets for moving students from the lowest levels of English language proficiency to the State-defined English proficient level, including an assurance that—

“(I) such targets will be based on student's initial language proficiency level when first identified as limited English proficient and grade; and

“(II) such timelines will ensure students achieve English proficiency by 18 years of age, unless the State has obtained prior approval by the Secretary;

“(G) how the State educational agency will assist local educational agencies in improving instruction in all core academic subjects;

“(H) how the State educational agency will develop and improve the capacity of local educational agencies to use technology to improve instruction; and

“(I) how any State educational agency with a charter school law will support high-quality public charter schools that receive funds under this title by—

“(i) ensuring the quality of the authorized public chartering agencies in the State by establishing—

“(I) a system of periodic evaluation and certification of public chartering agencies using nationally-recognized professional standards; or

“(II) a statewide, independent chartering agency that meets nationally-recognized professional standards;

“(ii) including in the procedure established pursuant to clause (i) requirements for—

“(I) the annual filing and public reporting of independently audited financial statements including disclosure of amount and duration of any nonpublic financial and in-kind contributions of support, by each public chartering agency, for each school authorized by such agency, and by each local educational agency and the State;

“(II) the adoption and enforcement of school employee compensation and conflict of interest guidelines for all schools authorized, which shall include disclosure of executive pay and affiliated parties with financial interest in the management operations, or contractual obligations of the school;

“(III) a legally binding charter or performance contract between each charter school and the school's authorized public chartering agency that—

“(aa) describes the rights, duties, and remedies of the school and the public chartering agency; and

“(bb) bases charter renewal and revocation decisions on an agreed-to school accountability plan which includes financial and organizational indicators, with significant weight given to the student achievement on the achievement goals, performance targets, and growth targets established pursuant to subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (c)(2), respectively, for each student subgroup described in subsection (c)(3)(A), as well as

“(iii) developing and implementing, in consultation and coordination with local educational agencies, a system of intervention, revocation, or closure for charter schools and public chartering agencies failing to

meet the requirements and standards described in clauses (i) and (ii), which, at a minimum provides for—

“(I) initial and regular review, no less than once every 3 years, of each public chartering agency; and

“(II) intervention, revocation, or closure of any charter school identified for school improvement under section 1116.

“(2) ASSURANCES.—Assurances that—

“(A) the State educational agency will participate in biennial State academic assessments of 4th, 8th, and 12th grade reading, mathematics, and science under the National Assessment of Educational Progress carried out under section 303(b)(2) of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, if the Secretary pays the costs of administering such assessments;

“(B) the State educational agency will—

“(i) notify local educational agencies and the public of the content and student academic achievement standards and academic assessments developed under this section, and of the authority to operate schoolwide programs; and

“(ii) fulfill the State educational agency’s responsibilities regarding local educational agency and school improvement under section 1116;

“(C) the State educational agency will encourage local educational agencies to consolidate funds from other Federal, State, and local sources for school improvement activities under 1116 and for schoolwide programs under section 1114;

“(D) the State educational agency has modified or eliminated State fiscal and accounting barriers so that schools can easily consolidate funds from other Federal, State, and local sources for schoolwide programs under section 1114;

“(E) that State educational agency will coordinate data collection efforts to fulfill the requirements of this Act and reduce the duplication of data collection to the extent practicable;

“(F) the State educational agency will provide the least restrictive and burdensome regulations for local educational agencies and individual schools participating in a program assisted under this part;

“(G) the State educational agency will inform local educational agencies in the State of the local educational agency’s authority—

“(i) to transfer funds under title VI;

“(ii) to obtain waivers under part D of title IX; and

“(iii) if the State is an Ed-Flex Partnership State, to obtain waivers under the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999;

“(H) the State educational agency will work with other agencies, including educational service agencies or other local consortia and comprehensive centers established under the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002, and institutions to provide professional development and technical assistance to local educational agencies and schools;

“(I) the State educational agency will ensure that local educational agencies in the State comply with the requirements of subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11117); and

“(J) the State educational agency has engaged in timely and meaningful consultation with representatives of Indian tribes located in the State in the development of the State plan to serve local educational agencies under its jurisdiction in order to—

“(i) improve the coordination of activities under this Act;

“(ii) meet the purpose of this title; and

“(iii) meet the unique cultural, language, and educational needs of Indian students.

“(e) FAMILY ENGAGEMENT.—Each State plan shall include a plan for strengthening

family engagement in education. Each such plan shall, at a minimum, include—

“(1) a description of the State’s criteria and schedule for review and approval of local educational agency engagement policies and practices pursuant to section 1112(e)(3);

“(2) a description of the State’s system and process for assessing local educational agency implementation of section 1118 responsibilities;

“(3) a description of the State’s criteria for identifying local educational agencies that would benefit from training and support related to family engagement in education;

“(4) a description of the State’s statewide system of capacity-building and technical assistance for local educational agencies and schools on effectively implementing family engagement in education practices and policies to increase student achievement;

“(5) an assurance that the State will refer to Statewide Family Engagement Centers, as described in section 5702, those local educational agencies that would benefit from training and support related to family engagement in education; and

“(6) a description of the relationship between the State educational agency and Statewide Family Engagement Centers, parent training and information centers, and community parent resource centers in the State established under sections 671 and 672 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

“(f) PEER REVIEW AND SECRETARIAL APPROVAL.—

“(1) SECRETARIAL DUTIES.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) establish a peer-review process to assist in the review of State plans;

“(B) appoint individuals to the peer-review process who are representative of parents, teachers, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and experts and who are familiar with educational standards, assessments, accountability, the needs of low-performing schools, and other educational needs of students;

“(C) approve a State plan within 120 days of its submission unless the Secretary determines that the plan does not meet the requirements of this section;

“(D) if the Secretary determines that the State plan does not meet the requirements of this section immediately notify the State of such determination and the reasons for such determination;

“(E) not decline to approve a State’s plan before—

“(i) offering the State an opportunity to revise its plan;

“(ii) providing technical assistance in order to assist the State to meet the requirements of this section; and

“(iii) providing a hearing; and

“(F) have the authority to disapprove a State plan for not meeting the requirements of this part, but shall not have the authority to require a State, as a condition of approval of the State plan, to include in, or delete from, such plan one or more specific elements of the State’s academic content standards or to use specific academic assessment instruments or items.

“(2) STATE REVISIONS.—A State plan shall be revised by the State educational agency if the revision is necessary to satisfy the requirements of this section.

“(3) PUBLIC REVIEW.—Notifications under this subsection shall be made available to the public through the website of the Department, including—

“(A) State plans submitted or resubmitted by a State;

“(B) peer review comments;

“(C) State plan determinations by the Secretary, including approvals or disapprovals;

“(D) amendments or changes to State plans; and

“(E) hearings.

“(g) DURATION OF THE PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State plan shall—

“(A) remain in effect for the duration of the State’s participation under this part or 4 years, whichever is shorter; and

“(B) be periodically reviewed and revised as necessary by the State educational agency to reflect changes in the State’s strategies and programs under this part, including information on the progress the State has made in fulfilling the requirements of this section.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A State educational agency that desires to continue participation under this part shall submit a renewed plan every 4 years, including information on progress the State has made in—

“(A) implementing college- and career-ready content and achievement standards and high-quality assessments described in paragraph (b);

“(B) meeting its goals and performance targets described in subsection (c)(2); and

“(C) improving the capacity and skills of teachers and principals as described in section 2112.

“(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—If significant changes are made to a State’s plan, such as the adoption of new State academic content standards and State student achievement standards, new academic assessments, or new performance goals or target, growth goals or targets, or graduation rate goals or targets, such information shall be submitted to the Secretary for approval.

“(h) FAILURE TO MEET REQUIREMENTS.—If a State fails to meet any of the requirements of this section, the Secretary may withhold funds for State administration under this part until the Secretary determines that the State has fulfilled those requirements.

“(i) REPORTS.—

“(1) ANNUAL STATE REPORT CARD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives assistance under this part shall prepare and disseminate an annual State report card. Such dissemination shall include, at a minimum, publicly posting the report card on the home page of the State educational agency’s website.

“(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The State report card shall be—

“(i) concise; and

“(ii) presented in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.

“(C) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—The State shall include in its annual State report card—

“(i) information, in the aggregate, and disaggregated and cross-tabulated by the same major groups as the decennial census of the population, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation and cross-tabulation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student on—

“(I) student achievement at each achievement level on the State academic assessments described in subsection (b)(3), including the most recent 2-year trend;

“(II) student growth on the State academic assessments described in subsection (b)(3), including the most-recent 2-year trend;

“(III) the four-year adjusted cohort rate, the extended-year graduation rate (where applicable), and the graduation rate by type of diploma, including the most recent 2-year trend;

“(IV) the State established equity indicators under subsection (c)(1)(C);

“(V) the percentage of students who did not take the State assessments; and

“(VI) the most recent 2-year trend in student achievement and student growth in each subject area and for each grade level, for which assessments under this section are required;

“(ii) information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels and growth of each group of students described in subsection (c)(3)(A) and the performance targets and growth targets in subsection (c)(2) for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments and for graduation rates required under this part;

“(iii) if a State adopts alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the number and percentage of students taking the alternate assessments and information on student achievement at each achievement level and student growth, by grade and subject;

“(iv) the number of students who are English learners, and the performance of such students, on the State’s English language proficiency assessments, including the students’ attainment of, and progress toward, higher levels of English language proficiency;

“(v) information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding school improvement, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116 and information on the outcomes of the equity indicators outlined in section 1111(c)(1)(C);

“(vi) the professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which, for the purpose of this clause, means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State;

“(vii) information on teacher effectiveness, as determined by the State, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which, for the purpose of this clause, means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State;

“(viii) a clear and concise description of the State’s accountability system, including a description of the criteria by which the State educational agency evaluates school performance, and the criteria that the State educational agency has established, consistent with subsection (c), to determine the status of schools with respect to school improvement; and

“(ix) outcomes related to quality charter authorizing standards as described in subsection (d)(1)(I), including, at a minimum, annual filing as described in subsection (d)(1)(I)(ii)(I).

“(2) ANNUAL LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY REPORT CARDS.—

“(A) REPORT CARDS.—A local educational agency that receives assistance under this part shall prepare and disseminate an annual local educational agency report card.

“(B) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—The State educational agency shall ensure that each local educational agency collects appropriate data and includes in the local educational agency’s annual report the information described in paragraph (1)(C) as applied to the local educational agency and each school served by the local educational agency, and—

“(i) in the case of a local educational agency—

“(I) the number and percentage of schools identified for school improvement under section 1116 and how long the schools have been so identified; and

“(II) information that shows how students served by the local educational agency achieved on the statewide academic assessment compared to students in the State as a whole;

“(III) per-pupil expenditures from Federal, State, and local sources, including personnel and nonpersonnel resources, for each school in the local educational agency, consistent with the requirements under section 1120A;

“(IV) the number and percentage of secondary school students who have been removed from the 4-year adjusted cohort by leaver code, and the number and percentage of students from each adjusted cohort that have been enrolled in high school for more than 4 years but have not graduated with a regular diploma; and

“(V) information on the number of military-connected students (students who are a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof) served by the local educational agency and how such military-dependent students achieved on the statewide academic assessment compared to all students served by the local educational agency; and

“(ii) in the case of a school—

“(I) whether the school has been identified for school improvement; and

“(II) information that shows how the school’s students achievement on the statewide academic assessments and other improvement indicators compared to students in the local educational agency and the State as a whole.

“(C) OTHER INFORMATION.—A local educational agency may include in its annual local educational agency report card any other appropriate information, whether or not such information is included in the annual State report card.

“(D) DATA.—A local educational agency or school shall only include in its annual local educational agency report card data that are sufficient to yield statistically reliable information, as determined by the State, and that do not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

“(E) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—The local educational agency shall publicly disseminate the report cards described in this paragraph to all schools in the school district served by the local educational agency and to all parents of students attending those schools in an accessible, understandable, and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand, and make the information widely available through public means, such as posting on the Internet, distribution to the media, and distribution through public agencies.

“(3) PREEXISTING REPORT CARDS.—A State educational agency or local educational agency that was providing public report cards on the performance of students, schools, local educational agencies, or the State prior to the date of enactment of the Student Success Act may use those report cards for the purpose of this subsection, so long as any such report card is modified, as may be needed, to contain the information required by this subsection.

“(4) COST REDUCTION.—Each State educational agency and local educational agency receiving assistance under this part shall, wherever possible, take steps to reduce data collection costs and duplication of effort by obtaining the information required under this subsection through existing data collection efforts.

“(5) ANNUAL STATE REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—Each State educational agency re-

ceiving assistance under this part shall report annually to the Secretary, and make widely available within the State—

“(A) information on the State’s progress in developing and implementing

“(i) the college and career ready standards described in subsection (b)(2);

“(ii) the academic assessments described in subsection (b)(3); and

“(iii) the accountability and school improvement system described in subsection (c); and

“(B) the annual State report card under paragraph (1).

“(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall transmit annually to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that provides national and State-level data on the information collected under paragraph (5).

“(7) PARENTS RIGHT-TO-KNOW.—

“(A) ACHIEVEMENT INFORMATION.—At the beginning of each school year, a school that receives funds under this subpart shall provide to each individual parent—

“(i) information on the level of achievement and growth of the parent’s child on each of the State academic assessments and, as appropriate, other improvement indicators adopted in accordance with this subpart; and

“(ii) timely notice that the parent’s child has been assigned, or has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by, a teacher who is not qualified or has been found to be ineffective, as determined by the State or local educational agency.

“(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—At the beginning of each school year, a local educational agency that receives funds under this part shall notify the parents of each student attending any school receiving funds under this part, information regarding the professional qualifications of the student’s classroom teachers, including, at a minimum, the following:

“(i) Whether the teacher has met State qualification and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which the teacher provides instruction.

“(ii) Whether the teacher is teaching under emergency or other provisional status through which State qualification or licensing criteria have been waived.

“(iii) Whether the teacher is currently enrolled in an alternative certification program.

“(iv) Whether the child is provided services by paraprofessionals or specialized instructional support personnel and, if so, their qualifications.

“(C) FORMAT.—The notice and information provided to parents under this paragraph shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.

“(j) PRIVACY.—Information collected under this section shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals.

“(k) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide a State educational agency, at the State educational agency’s request, technical assistance in meeting the requirements of this section, including the provision of advice by experts in the development of college and career ready standards, high-quality academic assessments, and goals and targets that are valid and reliable, and other relevant areas.

“(l) VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIPS.—A State may enter into a voluntary partnership with another State to develop and implement the academic assessments and standards required under this section.

“(m) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADJUSTED COHORT; EXTENDED-YEAR; ENTERING COHORT; TRANSFERRED INTO; TRANSFERRED OUT.—

“(A) ADJUSTED COHORT.—Subject to subparagraph (D)(ii) through (G), the term ‘adjusted cohort’ means the difference of—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the entering cohort; plus

“(II) any students that transferred into the cohort in any of grades 9 through 12; minus

“(ii) any students that are removed from the cohort as described in subparagraph (E).

“(B) EXTENDED YEAR.—The term ‘extended year’ when used with respect to a graduation rate, means the fifth or sixth year after the school year in which the entering cohort, as described in subparagraph (C), is established for the purpose of calculating the adjusted cohort.

“(C) ENTERING COHORT.—The term ‘entering cohort’ means the number of first-time 9th graders enrolled in a secondary school 1 month after the start of the secondary school’s academic year.

“(D) TRANSFERRED INTO.—The term ‘transferred into’ when used with respect to a secondary school student, means a student who—

“(i) was a first-time 9th grader during the same school year as the entering cohort; and

“(ii) enrolls after the entering cohort is calculated as described in subparagraph (B).

“(E) TRANSFERRED OUT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘transferred out’ when used with respect to a secondary school student, means a student who the secondary school or local educational agency has confirmed has transferred to another—

“(I) school from which the student is expected to receive a regular secondary school diploma; or

“(II) educational program from which the student is expected to receive a regular secondary school diploma.

“(ii) CONFIRMATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(I) DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED.—The confirmation of a student’s transfer to another school or educational program described in clause (i) requires documentation from the receiving school or program that the student enrolled in the receiving school or program.

“(II) LACK OF CONFIRMATION.—A student who was enrolled, but for whom there is no confirmation of the student having transferred out, shall remain in the cohort as a non-graduate for reporting and accountability purposes under this section.

“(iii) PROGRAMS NOT PROVIDING CREDIT.—A student enrolled in a GED or other alternative educational program that does not issue or provide credit toward the issuance of a regular secondary school diploma shall not be considered transferred out.

“(F) COHORT REMOVAL.—To remove a student from a cohort, a school or local educational agency shall require documentation to confirm that the student has transferred out, emigrated to another country, or is deceased.

“(G) TREATMENT OF OTHER LEAVERS AND WITHDRAWALS.—A student who was retained in a grade, enrolled in a GED program, aged out of a secondary school or secondary school program, or left secondary school for any other reason, including expulsion, shall not be considered transferred out, and shall remain in the adjusted cohort.

“(H) SPECIAL RULE.—For those secondary schools that start after grade 9, the entering cohort shall be calculated 1 month after the start of the secondary school’s academic year in the earliest secondary school grade at the secondary school.

“(2) 4-YEAR ADJUSTED COHORT GRADUATION RATE.—The term ‘4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate’ means the percent obtained by calculating the product of—

“(A) the result of—

“(i) the number of students who—

“(I) formed the adjusted cohort 4 years earlier; and

“(II) graduate in 4 years or less with a regular secondary school diploma; divided by

“(ii) the number of students who formed the adjusted cohort for that year’s graduating class 4 years earlier; multiplied by

“(B) 100.

“(3) EXTENDED-YEAR GRADUATION RATE.—The term ‘extended-year graduation rate’ for a school year is defined as the percent obtained by calculating the product of the result of—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) the number of students who—

“(I) form the adjusted cohort for that year’s graduating class; and

“(II) graduate in an extended year with a regular secondary school diploma; or

“(III) graduate before exceeding the age for eligibility for a free appropriate public education (as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) under State law; divided by

“(ii) the result of—

“(I) the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for that year’s graduating class; plus

“(II) the number of students who transferred in during the extended year defined in paragraph (1)(B), minus

“(III) students who transferred out, emigrated, or died during the extended year defined in paragraph (1)(B); multiplied by

“(B) 100.

“(4) LEAVER CODE.—The term ‘leaver code’ means a number or series of numbers and letters assigned to a categorical reason for why a student left the high school from which she or he is enrolled without having earned a regular high school diploma, except that—

“(A) an individual student with either a duplicative code or whom has not been assigned a leaver code shall not be removed from the cohort assigned for the purpose of calculating the adjusted cohort graduation rate; and

“(B) the number of students with either a duplicative leaver code or who have not been assigned a leaver code shall be included in reporting requirements for the leaver code.

“(5) MULTI-TIER SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS.—The term ‘multi-tier system of supports’ means a comprehensive system of differentiated supports that includes evidence-based instruction, universal screening, progress monitoring, formative assessment, and research-based interventions matched to student needs, and educational decision-making using student outcome data.

“(6) GRADUATION RATE.—The term ‘graduation rate’ means a 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and the extended-year graduation rate.

“(7) REGULAR SECONDARY SCHOOL DIPLOMA.—

“(A) The term ‘regular secondary school diploma’ means standard secondary school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with the State’s college and career ready achievement standards as described under subsection (b)(4), or a higher diploma. Such term shall not include GED’s, certificates of attendance, or any lesser diploma awards.

“(B) If a State adopts different paths to the regular secondary school diploma, such different paths shall—

“(i) be available to all students in the State;

“(ii) be equally rigorous in their requirements; and

“(iii) signify that a student is prepared for college or a career without the need for remediation.”.

Strike section 117 and insert the following:

SEC. 117. ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT; SCHOOL SUPPORT AND RECOGNITION.

Section 1116 (20 U.S.C. 6316) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1116. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT.

“(a) LOCAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall—

“(A) use the State academic assessments, including measures of student growth and graduation rates, and data on the state-established equity indicators described in section 1111(c)(1)(C) to review, annually, the progress of each school served under this part, and consistent with the parameters described in paragraph (2), to determine whether the school is—

“(i) meeting performance targets, growth targets, and graduation rate targets established under section 1111(c)(2); and

“(ii) making progress to address school challenges identified using the state-established equity indicators described in section 1111(c)(1)(C);

“(B) based on the review conducted under subparagraph (A), determine whether a school served under this part is—

“(i) in need of support as described under section 1111(c)(1)(E)(ii); or

“(ii) a high priority school that meets the State-established parameters under paragraph (2);

“(C) publicize and disseminate the results of the local annual review described in subparagraph (A) to parents, teachers, principals, schools, and the community so that the teachers, principals, other staff, and schools can continually refine, in an instructionally useful manner, the program of instruction to help all children served under this part meet the college and career ready achievement standards established under section 1111(b); and

“(D) use the equity indicators established under section 1111(c)(1)(C) to diagnose school challenges and measure school progress in carrying out the school improvement activities under this section.

“(2) HIGH PRIORITY SCHOOLS.—The State educational agency shall establish parameters, consistent with section 1111(c)(1)(E)(i), to assist local educational agencies in identifying high priority schools within the local educational agency that—

“(A) for elementary schools—

“(i) shall use student achievement on the assessments required under section 1111(b)(3), including prior year data;

“(ii) shall use student growth data on the assessments under section 1111(b)(3), including prior year data; and

“(iii) shall use, to a lesser extent than each of the parameters established in clauses (i) and (ii), data on the equity indicators established under section 1111(c)(1)(C); and

“(B) for secondary schools—

“(i) shall use student achievement on the assessments required under section 1111(b)(3), including prior year data;

“(ii) shall use student growth data on the assessments under section 1111(b)(3), including prior year data;

“(iii) shall use graduation rate data, including prior year data; and

“(iv) shall use, to a lesser extent than each of the parameters established in clauses (i) through clause (iii), data on the equity indicators established under section 1111(c)(1)(C); or

“(v) shall include schools with 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rates below 67 percent as high priority schools.

“(b) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each school served under this part determined to be a school in need of

support pursuant to section 1111(c)(1)(C)(ii) or a high-priority school pursuant to 1111(c)(1)(C)(i), shall form a school improvement team described in paragraph (2) to develop and implement a school improvement plan described in paragraph (3) to improve educational outcomes for all students and address existing resource inequities.

“(2) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each school described in paragraph (1) shall form a school improvement team, which shall include school leaders, teachers, parents, community members, and specialized instructional support personnel.

“(B) SCHOOLS IN NEED OF SUPPORT.—Each school improvement team for a school in need of support may include an external partner and representatives of the local educational agency and the State educational agency.

“(C) HIGH-PRIORITY SCHOOLS.—Each school improvement team for a high-priority school shall include an external partner and representatives of the local educational agency and the State educational agency.

“(3) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A school improvement team shall develop, implement, and make publicly available a school improvement plan that uses information available under the accountability and school improvement system established under section 1111(c), data available under the early warning indicator system established under subsection (c)(5), data on the improvement indicators established under section 1111(c)(1)(D), and other relevant data to identify—

“(i) each area in which the school needs support for improvement;

“(ii) the type of support required;

“(iii) how the school plans to use comprehensive, evidence-based strategies to address such needs;

“(iv) how the school will measure progress in addressing such needs using the goals and targets and improvement indicators established under paragraphs (2) and (1)(D) of section 1111(c), respectively, and identify which of the goals and targets are not currently being met by the school; and

“(v) how the school will review its progress and make adjustments and corrections to ensure continuous improvement.

“(B) PLANNING PERIOD.—The school improvement team may use a planning period, which shall not be longer than one school year to develop and prepare to implement the school improvement plan.

“(C) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Each school improvement plan shall describe the following:

“(i) PLANNING AND PREPARATION.—The activities during the planning period, including—

“(I) the preparation activities conducted to effectively implement the budgeting, staffing, curriculum, and instruction changes described in the plan; and

“(II) how the school improvement team engaged parents and community organizations.

“(ii) TARGETS.—The performance, growth, and graduation rate targets that contributed to the school's status as a school in need of support or high-priority school, and the school challenges identified by the school improvement indicators under section 1111(c)(1)(D).

“(iii) EVIDENCE-BASED, SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES.—Evidence-based, school improvement strategies to address the factors and challenges described in clause (ii), to improve instruction, including in all core academic subjects, to improve the achievement of all students and address the needs of students identified at the catch-up level of achievement.

“(iv) NEEDS AND CAPACITY ANALYSIS.—A description and analysis of the school's ability

and the resources necessary to implement the evidence-based, school improvement strategies identified under clause (iii), including an analysis of—

“(I) staffing resources, such as the number, experience, training level, effectiveness as determined by the State or local educational agency, responsibilities, and stability of existing administrative, instructional, and non-instructional staff;

“(II) budget resources, including how Federal, State, and local funds are being spent for instruction and operations to determine how existing resources can be aligned and used to support improvement;

“(III) the school curriculum;

“(IV) the use of time, such as the school's schedule and use of additional learning time; and

“(V) any additional resources and staff necessary to effectively implement the school improvement activities identified in the school improvement plan.

“(v) IDENTIFYING ROLES.—The roles and responsibilities of the State educational agency, the local educational agency, the school and, if applicable, the external partner in the school improvement activities, including providing interventions, support, and resources necessary to implement improvements.

“(vi) PLAN FOR EVALUATION.—The plan for continuous evaluation of the evidence-based, school improvement strategies, including implementation of and fidelity to the school improvement plan, that includes at least quarterly reviews of the effectiveness of such activities.

“(D) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH-PRIORITY SCHOOLS.—For a persistently-low achieving school, the school improvement plan shall, in addition to the requirements described in subparagraph (B), describe how the school will—

“(i) address school-wide factors to improve student achievement, including—

“(I) establishing high expectations for all students, which at a minimum, align with the achievement standards and growth standards under section 1111(b)(4);

“(II) improving school climate, including student attendance and school discipline, through the use of school-wide positive behavioral supports and interventions and other evidence based approaches to improving school climate;

“(III) ensuring that the staff charged with implementing the school improvement plan are engaged in the plan and the school turnaround effort;

“(IV) establishing clear—

“(aa) benchmarks for implementation of the plan; and

“(bb) targets for improvement on the equity indicators under section 1111(c)(1)(C);

“(ii) organize the school to improve teaching and learning, including through—

“(I) strategic use of time, such as—

“(aa) establishing common planning time for teachers and interdisciplinary teams who share common groups of students;

“(bb) redesigning the school calendar year or day, such as through block scheduling, summer learning programs, or increasing the number of hours or days, in order to create additional learning time; or

“(cc) creating a flexible school period to address specific student academic needs and interests such as credit recovery, electives, enrichment activities, or service learning; and

“(II) alignment of resources to improvement goals, such as through ensuring that students in transition grades are taught by teachers prepared to meet their specific learning needs;

“(iii) increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, as determined by the State or

local educational agency, including through—

“(I) demonstrating the principal has the skills, capacity, and record of success to significantly improve student achievement and lead a school turnaround, which may include replacing the principal;

“(II) screening all existing staff at the school, with the leadership team, through a process that ensures a rigorous and fair review of their applications;

“(III) improving the recruitment and retention of qualified and effective teachers and principals, as determined by the State or local educational agency, to work in the school;

“(IV) professional development activities that respond to student and school-wide needs aligned with the school improvement plan, such as—

“(aa) training teachers, leaders, and administrators together with staff from schools making achievement goals and performance targets under the accountability system under section 1111(c) that serve similar populations and in such schools;

“(bb) establishing peer learning and coaching among teachers; or

“(cc) facilitating collaboration, including through professional communities across subject area and interdisciplinary groups and similar schools;

“(V) appropriately identifying teachers for each grade and course; and

“(VI) the development of effective leadership structures, supports, and clear decision making processes, such as through developing distributive leadership and leadership teams;

“(iv) improve curriculum and instruction, including through—

“(I) demonstrating the relevance of the curriculum and learning for all students, including instruction in all core academic subjects, and may include the use of online course-work as long as such course-work meets standards of quality and best practices for online education;

“(II) increasing access to rigorous and advanced course-work, including adoption and implementation of a college- and career-ready curriculum, and evidence-based, engaging instructional materials aligned with such a curriculum, for all students;

“(III) increasing access to contextualized learning opportunities aligned with readiness for postsecondary education and the workforce, such as providing—

“(aa) work-based, project-based, and service-learning opportunities; or

“(bb) a high-quality, college preparatory curriculum in the context of a rigorous career and technical education core;

“(IV) regularly collecting and using data to inform instruction, such as—

“(aa) through use of formative assessments;

“(bb) creating and using common grading rubrics; or

“(cc) identifying effective instructional approaches to meet student needs; and

“(V) emphasizing core skills instruction, such as literacy, across content areas;

“(v) provide students with academic and social support to address individual student learning needs, including through—

“(I) ensuring access to services and expertise of specialized instructional support personnel;

“(II) supporting students at the catch-up level of achievement who need intensive intervention;

“(III) increasing personalization of the school experience through learning structures that facilitate the development of student and staff relationships;

“(IV) offering extended-learning, credit recovery, mentoring, or tutoring options of sufficient scale to meet student needs;

“(V) providing evidence-based, accelerated learning for students with academic skill levels below grade level;

“(VI) coordinating and increasing access to integrated services, such as providing specialized instructional support personnel;

“(VII) providing transitional support between grade-spans, including postsecondary planning.

“(VIII) meeting the diverse learning needs of all students through strategies such as a multi-tier system of supports and universal design for learning, as described in section 5429(b)(21); and

“(IX) engaging families and community partners, including community-based organizations, organizations representing underserved populations, Indian tribes (as appropriate), organizations assisting parent involvement, institutions of higher education, and businesses, in school improvement activities through evidence-based strategies.

“(E) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL.—The school improvement team shall submit the school improvement plan to the local educational agency or the State educational agency, as determined by the State educational agency based on the local educational agency’s ability to effectively monitor and support the school improvement activities. Upon receiving the plan, the local educational agency or the State educational agency, as appropriate, shall—

“(i) establish a peer review process to assist with review of the school improvement plan; and

“(ii) promptly review the plan, work with the school improvement team as necessary, and approve the plan if the plan meets the requirements of this paragraph.

“(F) REVISION OF PLAN.—A school improvement team may revise the school improvement plan as additional information and data is available.

“(G) IMPLEMENTATION.—A school with the support and assistance of the local educational agency shall implement the school improvement plan expeditiously, but not later than the beginning of the next full school year after identification for improvement.

“(4) EVALUATION OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) REVIEW.—The State educational agency or local educational agency, as determined by the State in accordance with paragraph (3)(D) shall, annually, review data with respect to each school in need of support and each high-priority school to set clear benchmarks for progress, to guide adjustments and corrections, to evaluate whether the supports and interventions identified within the school improvement plan are effective and the school is meeting the targets for improvement established under its such plan, and to specify what actions ensue for schools not making progress.

“(ii) DATA.—In carrying out the annual review under clause (i), the school, the local educational agency, or State educational agency shall measure progress on—

“(I) student achievement, student growth, and graduation rates against the goals and targets established under section 1111(c)(2); and

“(II) improvement indicators as established under section 1111(c)(1)(D).

“(B) SCHOOLS IN NEED OF SUPPORT.—If, after 3 years of implementing its school improvement plan, a school in need of support does not meet the goals and targets under section 1111(c)(2) that were identified under the school improvement plan as not being met by the school and the improvement indica-

tors established under section 1111(c)(1)(D), then—

“(i) the local educational agency shall evaluate school performance and other data, and provide intensive assistance to that school in order to improve the effectiveness of the interventions; and

“(ii) the State educational agency or the local educational agency, as determined by the State, shall determine whether the school shall partner with an external partner—

“(I) to revise the school improvement plan; and

“(II) to improve, and as appropriate, revise, school improvement strategies that meet the requirements of paragraph (3)(B)(iii).

“(C) HIGH-PRIORITY SCHOOLS.—If, after 3 years of implementing its school improvement plan, a high-priority school does not demonstrate progress on the goals and targets under section 1111(c)(2) that were identified under the school improvement plan as not being met by the school or the equity indicators established under section 1111(c)(1)(C), then—

“(i) the local educational agency, in collaboration with the State educational agency, shall determine actionable next steps which may include school closure, replacement, or State take-over of such school, shall provide all students enrolled with new high-quality educational options;

“(ii) the local educational agency, and as appropriate the State educational agency, shall develop and implement a plan to assist with any resulting transition of the school under clause (i) that—

“(I) is developed in consultation with parents and the community;

“(II) addresses the needs of the students at the school by considering strategies such as—

“(aa) opening a new school;

“(bb) graduating out current students and closing the school in stages; and

“(cc) enrolling the students who attended the school in other schools in the local educational agency that are higher achieving, provided the other schools are within reasonable proximity to the closed school and ensures receiving schools have the capacity to enroll incoming students; and

“(III) provides information about high-quality educational options and transition and support services to students who attended that school and their parents.

“(D) PERSISTENTLY LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOL.—If, after 5 years of implementing its school improvement plan, a persistently low achieving school does not demonstrate progress on the goals and targets under section 1111(c)(2) that were identified under the school improvement plan, then the local educational agency, in collaboration with the State educational agency, shall determine actionable next steps, which may include school closure, replacement, or State take-over of such school, and shall provide all students with enrolled new high-quality educational options, as described in subparagraph (C).

“(C) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—A local educational agency served by this part, in supporting the schools identified as a school in need of support or a high-priority school served by the agency, shall—

“(1) address resource inequities to improve student achievement by—

“(A) targeting resources and support to those schools identified as high priority or as in need of support, including additional resources and staff necessary to implement the school improvement plan, as described in subsection (b)(3)(C)(iv)(V), and

“(B) ensuring the local educational agency budget calendar is aligned with school staff and budgeting needs;

“(2) address local educational agency-wide factors to improve student achievement by—

“(A) supporting the use of data to improve teaching and learning through—

“(i) improving longitudinal data systems;

“(ii) regularly analyzing and disseminating usable data to educators, parents, and students;

“(iii) building the data and assessment literacy of teachers and principals; and

“(iv) evaluating at kindergarten entry the kindergarten readiness of children and addressing the educational and development needs determined by such evaluation;

“(B) addressing school transition needs of the local educational agency by—

“(i) using kindergarten readiness data to consider improving access to high-quality early education opportunities; and

“(ii) providing targeted research-based interventions to middle schools that feed into high schools identified for school improvement under this section;

“(C) supporting human capital systems that ensure there is a sufficient pool of qualified and effective teachers and school leaders, as determined by the State or local educational agency, to work in schools served by the local educational agency;

“(D) developing support for school improvement plans among key stakeholders such as parents and families, community groups representing underserved populations, Indian tribes (as appropriate), educators, and teachers;

“(E) carrying out administrative duties under this section, including evaluation for school improvement and technical assistance for schools; and

“(F) coordinating activities under this section with other relevant State and local agencies, as appropriate;

“(3) supporting professional development activities for teachers, school leaders, and specialized instructional support personnel aligned to school improvement activities;

“(4) address curriculum and instruction factors to improve student achievement by—

“(A) ensuring curriculum alignment with the State’s early learning standards and postsecondary education programs;

“(B) providing academically rigorous education options such as—

“(i) effective dropout prevention, credit and dropout recovery and recuperative education programs for disconnected youth and students who are not making sufficient progress to graduate high school in the standard number of years or who have dropped out of high school;

“(ii) providing students with postsecondary learning opportunities, such as through access to a relevant curriculum or course of study that enables a student to earn a secondary school diploma and—

“(I) an associate’s degree; or

“(II) not more than 2 years of transferable credit toward a postsecondary degree or credential;

“(iii) integrating rigorous academic education with career training, including training that leads to postsecondary credentials for students;

“(iv) increasing access to Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate courses and examinations; or

“(v) developing and utilizing innovative, high quality distance learning strategies to improve student academic achievement; and

“(C) considering how technology can be used to support school improvement activities;

“(5) address student support factors to improve student achievement by—

“(A) establishing an early warning indicator system to identify students who are at risk of dropping out of high school and to guide preventive and recuperative school improvement strategies, including—

“(i) identifying and analyzing the academic risk factors that most reliably predict dropouts by using longitudinal data of past cohorts of students;

“(ii) identifying specific indicators of student progress and performance, such as attendance, academic performance in core courses, and credit accumulation, to guide decision making;

“(iii) identifying or developing a mechanism for regularly collecting and analyzing data about the impact of interventions on the indicators of student progress and performance; and

“(iv) analyzing academic indicators to determine whether students are on track to graduate secondary school in the standard numbers of years; and

“(B) identifying and implementing strategies for pairing academic support with integrated student services and case-managed interventions for students requiring intensive supports which may include partnerships with other external partners;

“(6) promote family outreach and engagement in school improvement activities, including those required by section 1118, to improve student achievement;

“(7) for each school identified for school improvement, ensure the provision of technical assistance as the school develops and implements the school improvement plan throughout the plan’s duration; and

“(8) identify school improvement strategies that are consistently improving student outcomes and disseminate those strategies so that all schools can implement them.

“(d) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—A State educational agency served by this part, in supporting schools identified as a school in need of support or a high-priority school and the local educational agencies serving such schools, shall—

“(1) assess and address local capacity constraints to ensure that its local educational agencies can meet the requirements of this section;

“(2) target resources and support to those schools in the State that are identified as a school in need of support or a high-priority school and to local educational agencies serving such schools, including additional resources necessary to implement the school improvement plan as described in subsection (b)(3)(C)(iv)(V);

“(3) provide support and technical assistance, including assistance to school leaders, teachers, and other staff, to assist local educational agencies and schools in using data to support school equity and in addressing the equity indicators described in section 1111(c)(1)(C);

“(4) identify school improvement strategies that are consistently improving student outcomes and disseminate those strategies so that all schools can implement them;

“(5) leverage resources from other funding sources, such as school improvement funds, technology funds, and professional development funds to support school improvement activities;

“(6) provide a statewide system of support, including regional support services, to improve teaching, learning, and student outcomes;

“(7) assist local educational agencies in developing early warning indicator systems;

“(8) with respect to schools that will work with external partners to improve student achievement—

“(A) develop and apply objective criteria to potential external partners that are based

on a demonstrated record of effectiveness in school improvement;

“(B) maintain an updated list of approved external partners across the State;

“(C) develop, implement, and publicly report on standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by approved external partners, and for withdrawing approval from external partners that fail to improve high-priority schools; and

“(D) may identify external partners as approved, consistent with the requirements under paragraph (7), who agree to provide services on the basis of receiving payments only when student achievement has increased at an appropriate level as determined by the State educational agency and school improvement team under subsection (b)(2); and

“(9) carry out administrative duties under this section, including providing monitoring and technical assistance to local educational agencies and schools.

“(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school or local educational agency employees under Federal, State, or local laws (including applicable regulations or court orders) or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between such employees and their employers;

“(2) to require a child to participate in an early learning program; or

“(3) to deny entry to kindergarten for any individual if the individual is legally eligible, as defined by State or local law.

“(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘external partner’ means an entity—

“(1) that is an organization such as a non-profit organization, community-based organization, local education fund, service organization, educational service agency, or institution of higher education; and

“(2) that has demonstrated expertise, effectiveness, and a record of success in providing evidence-based strategies and targeted support such as data analysis, professional development, or provision of nonacademic support and integrated student services to local educational agencies, schools, or students that leads to improved teaching, learning, and outcomes for students.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, No Child Left Behind’s metrics are outdated and rigid. On that we agree. But H.R. 5 in its current form abandons provisions that are crucial to ensuring equal educational opportunities for all of our Nation’s students.

My amendment advances a more comprehensive and effective vision of accountability at the school district and State levels.

This new language expects States to set college- and career-ready standards rather than to allow them to dumb down their standards in order to inflate their results.

It also requires States to set performance growth and graduation rate targets that ensure that schools improve every year for all subgroups, including for students with disabilities.

One of the major deficiencies in H.R. 5 and one of the reasons that all of the advocacy groups for students with learning disabilities oppose the bill is it effectively removes the accountability we have for students with disabilities to ensure that they continue to learn.

There is currently a 1 percent cap on the students with the most severe disabilities who are not tested. H.R. 5 would eliminate the 1 percent cap on alternative assessments based on alternative achievement standards and would remove it altogether, allowing, ultimately, schools and States to decide not to have any accountability for those students who need programs that meet their learning needs the most.

□ 1700

The Democratic substitute amendment upholds our Nation’s civil rights and equity responsibilities to ensure that all students receive a high-quality education.

It reinstates the 1 percent cap on alternative assessments for students with disabilities. It makes sure that accountability is a meaningful word and takes meaningful steps toward getting accountability right, rather than allowing discrimination and bad choices to continue to result in an increasing achievement gap across our country.

This amendment is also reflected in the Democratic substitute and would make sure that we have an accountability system that prepares our students for the jobs and the workforce of the 21st century and to move on to higher education.

Absent including this language or the Democratic substitute in the final passage of the bill, the bill in its current form would be a step backward, a step to lower standards, a step to reduce accountability, and a step to allow deficiencies to be swept under the rug, as they once were.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

My daughters just completed third grade, and I strongly support higher standards for them and their generation, but we need to set up our children to succeed, not fail. We need to stop federally mandated overtesting in our schools.

This amendment would be a giant leap backwards for education reform. Rather than reforming the failed policies of No Child Left Behind, this amendment embraces the most problematic portions, continuing to obsess over federally mandated performance standards and using that to measure teacher performance.

What is most insulting is that this proposal is so flawed that the sponsor needs to leverage Federal money to lure cash-strapped States to buy in because the proposal doesn't stand on its own merits.

Our schools need greater flexibility and local control. This amendment would do the exact opposite, which is why I strongly oppose its passage and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member on the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the present law only requires that States identify achievement gaps and prescribes exactly what has to be done to address the achievement gaps.

Unfortunately, the one-size-fits-all prescription has often failed to effectively address the achievement gaps. The underlying bill goes overboard by eliminating any requirement that something gets done. The gentleman's amendment reinstates the requirement that something be done, but directs the States to develop their own locally tailored response to achievement gaps. This approach is much more likely to be effective and will be part of the Democratic substitute that will be voted on shortly.

Mr. Chairman, before we leave the bill, I would like to thank many members of our staff that have worked on this bill since January. They have spent days and nights and weekends working on the bill, and I would like to acknowledge them and their work today.

Denise Forte, Jacque Chevalier, Christian Haines, Ashlyn Holeyfield, Arika Trim, Tina Hone, Tylease Alli, Kiara Pesante, and Brian Kennedy all worked very hard on this bill and deserve significant recognition.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As a mayor and mainly as a mother—I have three children in public schools—I have found that the best solutions are found at the most local level.

This amendment puts a larger footprint in the hands of the Federal Government and gives more power to the Federal Government, instead of our local agencies. I believe that the best people to teach our students are the people at the local level. I trust teachers and parents to make decisions for students.

I made a promise that I was going to do everything I can to put the decision-making back into the hands of people, not into the hands of the Federal Government. I believe that this amendment actually puts it into the hands of the Federal Government and gives us a big step backwards.

I believe that we, as people, when we are given more options, we can make better decisions; and when we make

better decisions, we can do that at a local level and not at a Federal level. I ask that we vote against this amendment. I stand in opposition of this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I would like to inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Utah talked about decisions and implementation at the local level. On that, we agree. What this amendment is about is accountability metrics under whether we look at those decisions that are made locally and driven locally and by the State work or don't work.

We want to allow the flexibility to get things right and close the achievement gap but not the flexibility to continue to ignore persistent gaps in our education system that continue to poorly serve too many low-income students and minority students.

Given that my amendment is included in its entirety in the Democratic substitute upon which we will be voting, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-29 and part A of House Report 114-192 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-29:

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. ZELDIN of New York.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. HURD of Texas.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 33 by Ms. WILSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

Amendment No. 39 by Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

Amendment No. 40 by Mr. LOEBSACK of Iowa.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

Amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-192:

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. WALKER of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. SALMON of Arizona.

And amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 114-29 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 57, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—373

Abraham	Curbelo (FL)	Hill
Adams	Davis (CA)	Holding
Aderholt	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Aguilar	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Allen	DeFazio	Huelskamp
Amash	DeGette	Huffman
Amodei	Delaney	Huizenga (MI)
Ashford	DeLauro	Hultgren
Babin	DelBene	Hunter
Barletta	Denham	Hurd (TX)
Barr	Dent	Hurt (VA)
Barton	DeSantis	Israel
Bass	DesJarlais	Issa
Beatty	Diaz-Balart	Jackson Lee
Becerra	Doggett	Jeffries
Benishek	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Bera	Donovan	Jenkins (WV)
Bilirakis	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (GA)	F.	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (MI)	Duckworth	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Jolly
Black	Duncan (SC)	Jones
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Blum	Ellmers (NC)	Joyce
Bonamici	Emmer (MN)	Kaptur
Bost	Engel	Katko
Boustany	Eshoo	Keating
Boyle, Brendan	Esty	Kelly (IL)
F.	Farenthold	Kelly (MS)
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Brat	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Kilmer
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Kind
Brooks (IN)	Flores	King (IA)
Brown (FL)	Forbes	King (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Fortenberry	Kinzing (IL)
Buchanan	Fox	Kirkpatrick
Buck	Frankel (FL)	Kline
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Knight
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Bustos	Fudge	LaMalfa
Butterfield	Gabbard	Lamborn
Byrne	Garamendi	Lance
Calvert	Garrett	Langevin
Capuano	Gibbs	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Gibson	Larson (CT)
Carney	Gohmert	Latta
Carter (GA)	Goodlatte	Lawrence
Carter (TX)	Gosar	Lee
Cartwright	Gowdy	Levin
Castor (FL)	Graham	Lewis
Castro (TX)	Granger	Lieu, Ted
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Lipinski
Chaffetz	Graves (LA)	LoBiondo
Cicilline	Graves (MO)	Loeb sack
Clarke (NY)	Grayson	Long
Clawson (FL)	Green, Al	Loudermilk
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Love
Coffman	Griffith	Lowe y
Cole	Grothman	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Guinta	Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Lujan, Ben Ray
Comstock	Hahn	(NM)
Conaway	Hanna	Lummis
Connolly	Hardy	Lynch
Cook	Harper	MacArthur
Cooper	Harris	Maloney,
Costa	Hartzler	Carolyn
Costello (PA)	Hastings	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Heck (NV)	Marchant
Cramer	Heck (WA)	Marino
Crawford	Hensarling	Massie
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Matsui
Crowley	Hice, Jody B.	McCarthy
Cuellar	Higgins	McCaul

McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speler
Stefanik

Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—57

Beyer
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Capps
Carson (IN)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clever
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Gallego

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Johnson (GA)
Kildee
Sarbanes
Kuster
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
McCollum
McDermott
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascarell
Payne
Pingree

Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryanes
Schneider
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Takai
Takano
Torres
Van Hollen
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson Deutch Lofgren

□ 1743

Messrs. GRIJALVA, McDERMOTT, CUMMINGS, NEAL, TAKAI, and COHEN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. GOHMERT, KEATING, HIGGINS, LABRADOR, AGUILAR, SWALWELL of California, MILES, ESHOO, BASS, Messrs. CICILLINE, LANGEVIN, LEVIN, LEWIS, BERA, MILES, MAXINE WATERS of California, VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BEATTY, Messrs. CROWLEY, NORCROSS, VARGAS, SCHAKOWSKY, CUELLAR, McGOVERN, BECERRA, TONKO, MILES, SLAUGHTER, DUCKWORTH,

and Mr. CONNOLLY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. HURD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) 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 424, noes 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—424

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Babin
Franketta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)

Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores

Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee

Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes

Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—2

Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Buck Deutch Stutzman
Culberson Lieu, Ted
Davis, Rodney Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1743

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 411, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 411 on H.R. 5, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 228, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—199

Adams	Dent	Langevin
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Ashford	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Bass	Doggett	Lawrence
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Lee
Becerra	F.	Levin
Bera	Duckworth	Lewis
Beyer	Edwards	Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Lipinski
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers (NC)	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Engel	Loeb
Bonamici	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan	Esty	Lowey
F.	Farr	Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA)	Fattah	(NM)
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray
Brownley (CA)	Foster	(NM)
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	MacArthur
Butterfield	Fudge	Maloney,
Capps	Gabbard	Carolyn
Capuano	Galleo	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Matsui
Carney	Garrett	McCollum
Carson (IN)	Graham	McDermott
Cartwright	Grayson	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	Meeks
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	Meng
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Miller (MI)
Clark (MA)	Hahn	Moore
Clarke (NY)	Hastings	Moulton
Clay	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Cleaver	Higgins	Nadler
Clyburn	Himes	Napolitano
Cohen	Hinojosa	Neal
Connolly	Honda	Nolan
Conyers	Hoyer	Norcross
Cooper	Huffman	O'Rourke
Costa	Israel	Pallone
Costello (PA)	Jackson Lee	Pascarella
Courtney	Jeffries	Pelosi
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Cummings	Jones	Pingree
Curbelo (FL)	Kaptur	Pocan
Davis (CA)	Keating	Polis
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Davis, Rodney	Kennedy	Quigley
DeFazio	Kildee	Rangel
DeGette	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Delaney	Kind	Richmond
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (AL)
DelBene	Kuster	Ros-Lehtinen
Denham	Lance	Ross

Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benish
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson
Deutch

Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Clarke (MA)
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Cumings
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1746

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. WILSON OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) 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 237, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—192

Adams	Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray
Aguilar	Ellison	(NM)
Ashford	Engel	Lynch
Bass	Eshoo	Maloney,
Beatty	Esty	Carolyn
Becerra	Farr	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Fattah	Matsui
Beyer	Foster	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Blumenauer	Fudge	McGovern
Bonamici	Gabbard	McNerney
Boyle, Brendan	Galleo	McSally
F.	Garamendi	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Graham	Meng
Brown (FL)	Grayson	Moore
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Moulton
Bustos	Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)
Butterfield	Grijalva	Nadler
Capps	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Capuano	Hahn	Neal
Cárdenas	Hastings	Nolan
Carney	Heck (WA)	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Higgins	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Himes	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Pascarella
Castro (TX)	Honda	Payne
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Pelosi
Cicilline	Huffman	Perlmutter
Clark (MA)	Israel	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Clay	Jeffries	Pingree
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Cohen	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Connolly	Keating	Quigley
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Cooper	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Costa	Kildee	Richmond
Costello (PA)	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen
Courtney	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Cuellar	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Langevin	Rush
Curbelo (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	T.
DeFazio	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Levin	Sarbanes
Delaney	Lewis	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
DelBene	Lipinski	Schrader
DeSaulnier	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Loeb	Scott, David
Doggett	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lowey	Sewell (AL)
F.	Lujan Grisham	Sherman
Duckworth	(NM)	Simpson

Sinema	Titus	Walz
Sires	Tonko	Wasserman
Slaughter	Torres	Schultz
Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Waters, Maxine
Speier	Van Hollen	Watson Coleman
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Welch
Takai	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Takano	Vela	Yarmuth
Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	

NOES—237

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

NOT VOTING—4

Buck	Deutch
Culberson	Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1750

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. CARSON OF
INDIANA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) 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 245, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—186

Adams	Ellison	Lynch
Aguliar	Engel	Maloney,
Ashford	Eshoo	Carolyn
Bass	Esty	Maloney, Sean
Beatty	Farr	Matsui
Becerra	Fattah	McCollum
Bera	Foster	McDermott
Beyer	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	McNerney
Blumenauer	Gabbard	Meeks
Bonamici	Galleo	Meng
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	Moore
F.	Graham	Moulton
Brady (PA)	Grayson	Murphy (FL)
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Nadler
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Bustos	Grijalva	Neal
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Capps	Hahn	Norcross
Capuano	Hastings	O'Rourke
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Pallone
Carney	Higgins	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Himes	Payne
Cartwright	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Honda	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Peters
Chu, Judy	Huffman	Pingree
Ciçilline	Israel	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Cohen	Keating	Richmond
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kennedy	Ruiz
Cooper	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kilmer	Rush
Courtney	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Linda
Cuellar	Kuster	T.
Cummings	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lawrence	Schiff
DeGette	Lee	Schrader
Delaney	Levin	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lewis	Scott, David
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Deutch	Loeb sack	Sherman
Dingell	Lowenthal	Sinema
Doggett	Lowe y	Sires
Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
F.	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Edwards	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)

Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—245

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

NOT VOTING—2

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

Culberson	Lofgren
-----------	---------

□ 1754

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) 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 239, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—191

Adams	Eshoo	Maloney,
Aguilar	Esty	Carolyn
Ashford	Farr	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Fattah	Marchant
Beatty	Foster	Matsui
Becerra	Frankel (FL)	McCollum
Bera	Fudge	McDermott
Beyer	Gabbard	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Gallego	McNerney
Blumenauer	Garamendi	McSally
Bonamici	Gibson	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Graham	Meng
F.	Grayson	Moore
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	Moulton
Brown (FL)	Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Nadler
Bustos	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Butterfield	Hahn	Neal
Capps	Hastings	Nolan
Capuano	Heck (WA)	Norcross
Cárdenas	Higgins	O'Rourke
Carney	Himes	Pallone
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Cartwright	Honda	Payne
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Chu, Judy	Israel	Peters
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Quigley
Clyburn	Katko	Rangel
Cohen	Keating	Rice (NY)
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Conyers	Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Kilmer	Ruiz
Courtney	Kind	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Cuellar	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee	Schakowsky
Delaney	Levin	Schiff
DeLauro	Lewis	Schrader
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Scott, David
Deutch	Loebach	Serrano
Dingell	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	Lowey	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
F.	(NM)	Sires
Duckworth	Luján, Ben Ray	Slaughter
Edwards	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Ellison	Lynch	Speier
Engel		Swalwell (CA)

Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1757

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) 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 218, noes 213, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—218

Adams	Ellison	Lujan Grisham
Aguilar	Engel	(NM)
Ashford	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray
Bass	Esty	(NM)
Beatty	Farr	Lynch
Becerra	Fattah	Maloney,
Bera	Fitzpatrick	Carolyn
Beyer	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Marino
Blum	Fudge	Matsui
Blumenauer	Gabbard	McCollum
Bonamici	Gallego	McDermott
Bost	Garamendi	McGovern
Boyle, Brendan	Gibson	McKinley
F.	Graham	McNerney
Brady (PA)	Graves (MO)	McSally
Brown (FL)	Grayson	Meeks
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Meng
Burgess	Green, Gene	Mooney (WV)
Bustos	Griffith	Moore
Butterfield	Grijalva	Moulton
Capps	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Capuano	Hahn	Nadler
Cárdenas	Hanna	Napolitano
Carney	Hastings	Neal
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Nolan
Cartwright	Herrera Beutler	Norcross
Castor (FL)	Higgins	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Himes	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Cicilline	Honda	Payne
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Pearce
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Pelosi
Clay	Israel	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Peters
Clyburn	Jeffries	Peterson
Cohen	Jenkins (WV)	Pingree
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Cooper	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Costa	Katko	Quigley
Costello (PA)	Keating	Rangel
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Reichert
Crowley	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Cuellar	Kildee	Richmond
Cummings	Kilmer	Rooney (FL)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
DeFazio	Kuster	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Langevin	Rush
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Dent	Lawrence	T.
DeSaulnier	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Deutch	Levin	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lewis	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schrader
F.	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	Loebach	Scott, David
Edwards	Lowenthal	Serrano
	Lowey	Sewell (AL)
	Lucas	Sherman

NOES—239

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

Culberson

Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen

NOT VOTING—3

Lofgren

Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zinke

NOES—213

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curbelo (FL)
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

NOT VOTING—2

Culberson Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1801

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa changed his vote
from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 205, noes 224,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—205

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
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—224

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

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson Hurt (VA)
Huelskamp Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1804

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 241, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—189

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

NOES—241

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

NOT VOTING—3

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1808

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 235, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—195

Abraham	Griffith	Paulsen
Aderholt	Grothman	Pearce
Allen	Guinta	Perry
Amash	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amodei	Harper	Pitts
Babin	Harris	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hartzler	Pompeo
Barr	Hensarling	Posey
Barton	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hill	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Ribble
Black	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Blum	Hultgren	Roby
Boustany	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Issa	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Burgess	Jolly	Royce
Byrne	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Jordan	Salmon
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Clawson (FL)	Kinzing (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	Labrador	Sessions
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Comstock	Latta	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Long	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Love	Stewart
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Crenshaw	Lummis	Stutzman
DeSantis	Marchant	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Marino	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Massie	McCarthy
Duffy	McCaul	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Trott
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Wagner
Ellmers (NC)	McMorris	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	Rodgers	Walker
Farenthold	McSally	Walorski
Fincher	Meadows	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Mica	Webster (FL)
Flores	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Forbes	Moolenaar	Westerman
Fortenberry	Mooney (WV)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wittman
Garrett	Neugebauer	Womack
Gibbs	Newhouse	Woodall
Gohmert	Noem	Yoder
Goodlatte	Nugent	Yoho
Gosar	Nunes	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Olson	Young (IN)
Granger	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Palmer	Zinke
Graves (LA)		

NOES—235

Adams	Beatty	Beyer
Aguilar	Becerra	Bishop (GA)
Ashford	Benishek	Blumenauer
Bass	Bera	Bonamici

Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Foxo
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez

NOT VOTING—3

Cuellar Culberson Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1811

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 419, I mistakenly voted “no” on the Walker Amendment. I should have and would have voted “yes.”

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 419, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 178, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—251

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk

Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson

Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski

NOES—178

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson Lofgren
Israel Smith (NE)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1814

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
Stated for:

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 420, I mistakenly voted “no” on the Salmon Amendment. I meant to vote “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 244, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—187

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

SchultzWaters,
Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—244

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

NOT VOTING—2

Culberson

Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1819

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, 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. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 125, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ESTY. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 25, after line 14, insert the following:

“(F) GUARANTEEING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES, INCLUDING STUDENTS WITH AUTISM, DOWN SYNDROME, AND OTHER DISABILITIES.—Each State plan shall demonstrate that the development and adoption of the academic content standards and academic achievement standards under this paragraph does not—

“(i) result in lower academic standards for children with disabilities than the standards adopted for students without disabilities;

“(ii) deny students with disabilities, including students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, access to a regular secondary school diploma;

“(iii) deny any parent the right to give informed consent before determining whether to apply alternate achievement standards to the assessment of his or her child or any relevant information needed to make such determination;

“(iv) otherwise lower expectations or academic achievement for students with disabilities, including students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; or

“(v) deny educational opportunities for students or any subgroup of students described in section 1111(b)(3)(B)(ii)(II), including racial and ethnic minority students who are identified for special education services at a rate disproportionately higher than their peers.”.

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 802. PROTECTING CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES FROM ABUSIVE SECLUSION AND RESTRAINT PRACTICES.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to ensure a safe learning environment and to protect each elementary and secondary school student from physical or mental abuse, aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety, or any physical restraint or seclusion when there is no imminent threat of physical injury or in a manner otherwise inconsistent with the purposes of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (21 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.).

(b) **REGULATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall promulgate regulations providing, at minimum, that school personnel shall be prohibited from imposing on any elementary or secondary school student the following:

- (1) Mechanical restraints.
- (2) Chemical restraints.
- (3) Physical restraint or physical escort that restricts breathing.
- (4) Aversive behavioral interventions that compromise health and safety such as excessive pain, use of heat or cold, spraying bleach infused water in faces, and depriving students of food and bathroom access for hours on end.

Ms. ESTY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with serious concerns.

Today, we are voting on a bill that guts education funding; fails to provide adequate support for our hard-working teachers; and turns our back on our schools, our communities, and our children.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are not fixing No Child Left Behind, which has long needed to be fixed, but instead, we are moving in the wrong direction. As a room parent, as a PTA mom, I strongly believe that every child deserves the opportunity for a quality education, and every child deserves to be treated with dignity and respect.

The amendment I am offering today provides us the opportunity to live up to those goals. My amendment would guarantee continued funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, known as IDEA.

Just today, I met with school superintendents from Connecticut who emphasize the critical role of Federal funding for IDEA, which provides important support for students with autism and cognitive disabilities, and my

amendment would protect children with disabilities from abusive seclusion and restraint practices.

Last year, I met with a group of students from the FOCUS Center for Autism in Canton, Connecticut, in my district. They were incredible students, who bravely advocated for themselves and bluntly talked about the challenges they face in the classroom.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, 1 in 68 American children is now on the autism spectrum, a tenfold increase in the last 40 years. In Connecticut, too many students, particularly students who are on the autism spectrum, face unnecessary and dangerous seclusion and restraint.

According to the Connecticut State Department of Education and the Office of the Child Advocate, there were 35,000 incidents of children being restrained or placed in seclusion last school year. Over 80 percent of these children were boys; the majority of them children of color, many of them were in elementary school—even as young as preschool—and many of them were on the autism spectrum.

Earlier this year, the Office of the Child Advocate in Connecticut released a report showing that, in the last 3 years, more than 1,300 Connecticut schoolchildren were injured during such restraint or seclusion. Nationwide, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office found hundreds of cases of alleged child abuse, including at least 20, that is 20 deaths of children related to the use of these harmful methods during the last two decades.

These stories are truly horrific: a 7-year-old dying after being held face down for hours by school staff, 5-year-olds with broken arms and bloody noses after being tied to chairs with bungee cords and duct tape by their teacher, and a 13-year-old who hung himself in the seclusion room after prolonged confinement.

This is absolutely unacceptable. While Congress surely should not micromanage discipline in local schools, we should—we should—step up to set standards to ensure that all our children are safe, and we should fully fund IDEA to ensure support for all children with disabilities.

Now, let me be clear. Many teachers do an outstanding job in what can often be a challenging classroom environment. Having children with disabilities in the classroom can be a rewarding experience for the child and for their classmates.

Children with learning disabilities will learn and excel with the right support. It is just not acceptable to say that we don't have enough time or enough money to provide that support.

Today, let's fully fund IDEA, support special education and services for all children with disabilities, and restrict the dangerous practices of seclusion and restraint. We can do better; we must do better for our children.

I ask all House Members to join me to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, we know this is a procedural attempt, a usual procedural attempt, at the eleventh hour to derail this legislation. It is unfortunate because the American people have waited long enough for Congress to fix the problems plaguing our elementary and secondary education system.

My colleagues, because it has been months since we have debated the underlying bill and the challenge we face, I want to remind my colleagues of what is at stake here.

It has been more than 7 years since No Child Left Behind expired—7 years. That means, for 7 years, this Congress has failed to meet its basic responsibility to replace the law. Each year we fail to act is another year States are tied to flawed policies and students are trapped in failing schools. No Child Left Behind continues as the law.

Education is a deeply personal issue for many Americans. It is a topic discussed around kitchen tables, whether it is a child's report card, a change taking place in a local school district, or perhaps even policy changes being debated by Federal officials.

We were reminded of this reality just a few months ago.

□ 1830

In February, we were making progress in advancing the Student Success Act, and we witnessed just how frustrated the American people are with the Federal role in K-12 education and how that frustration has grown worse under this administration.

Rather than work with Congress to replace the law, the Obama administration has spent years imposing its agenda on schools through pet projects and conditional waivers.

Just listen to the national debate raging over Common Core and you will quickly learn about the backlash against the Federal Government that has taken place under this administration.

Because of this administration's unprecedented overreach, public anxiety and opposition to Federal intrusion is greater than it has ever been. The simple fact that Congress was considering changes to the law led countless individuals to speak out and raise concerns.

Unfortunately, some of those concerns were based on misinformation, but they ultimately stem from a strong skepticism about the Federal role in education, a skepticism that I and many others share.

Teachers, principals, parents, and education leaders desperately want

Congress to replace No Child Left Behind, but they are not just concerned with getting rid of a bad law, they also deeply care about what replaces it. The public response we witnessed earlier this year made that clear. We are here today because we are listening to the American people.

The Student Success Act is a strong proposal to replace No Child Left Behind. It would eliminate dozens of ineffective and duplicative programs, repeal Federal mandates dictating State spending, teacher quality, accountability, and school improvement, and provide parents vital support to hold schools accountable and rescue children from underperforming schools.

Throughout this legislative process, we have adopted bipartisan improvements to the bill, thanks to the work of both Republican and Democrat Members. Now it is time to move forward.

We have an urgent responsibility to replace a flawed law with bold solutions that will help provide every child in every school an excellent education. That responsibility grows more urgent each day.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to recommit and to vote “yes” on the Student Success Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of the bill, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 244, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—185

Adams	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Aguilar	Cartwright	DeGette
Ashford	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Bass	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Beatty	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Becerra	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bera	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael
Bonamici	Clyburn	F.
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	Duckworth
F.	Connolly	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Ellison
Brown (FL)	Cooper	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Eshoo
Bustos	Courtney	Esty
Butterfield	Crowley	Farr
Capps	Cuellar	Fattah
Capuano	Cummings	Foster
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Frankel (FL)
Carney	Davis, Danny	Fudge

Gabbard	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Gallego	Lujan Grisham	Rush
Garamendi	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Graham	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Grayson	(NM)	T.
Green, Al	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	Maloney,	Sarbanes
Grijalva	Carolyn	Schakowsky
Hahn	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Hastings	Neal	Schrader
Heck (WA)	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Higgins	McCollum	Scott, David
Himes	McDermott	Serrano
Hinojosa	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Honda	McNerney	Sinema
Hoyer	Meeks	Sinema
Huffman	Meng	Sires
Israel	Moore	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Takai
Kaptur	Neal	Takano
Keating	Nolan	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	O'Rourke	Titus
Kildee	Pallone	Tonko
Kilmer	Pascarell	Torres
Kind	Payne	Tsongas
Kirkpatrick	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Kuster	Perlmutter	Vargas
Langevin	Peters	Veasey
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Vela
Larson (CT)	Pingree	Velázquez
Lawrence	Pocan	Visclosky
Lee	Polis	Walz
Levin	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Lewis	Quigley	Schultz
Lieu, Ted	Rangel	Waters, Maxine
Lipinski	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Loebisack	Richmond	Welch
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
	Ruiz	Yarmuth

NOES—244

Abraham	Duncan (SC)	Jordan
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	Joyce
Allen	Ellmers (NC)	Katko
Amash	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (MS)
Amodei	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Babin	Fincher	King (IA)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Barr	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Barton	Fleming	Kline
Benishek	Flores	Knight
Bilirakis	Forbes	Labrador
Bishop (MI)	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lamborn
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Blum	Garrett	LoBiondo
Bost	Gibbs	Long
Boustany	Gibson	Loudermilk
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Love
Brat	Goodlatte	Lucas
Bridenstine	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (AL)	Gowdy	Lummis
Brooks (IN)	Granger	MacArthur
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Buck	Graves (LA)	Marino
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	Massie
Burgess	Griffith	McCarthy
Byrne	Grothman	McCaul
Calvert	Guinta	McClintock
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	McHenry
Carter (TX)	Hanna	McKinley
Chabot	Hardy	McMorris
Chaffetz	Harper	Rodgers
Clawson (FL)	Harris	McSally
Coffman	Hartzer	Meadows
Cole	Heck (NV)	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Messer
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Hill	Miller (MI)
Cook	Holding	Moolenaar
Costello (PA)	Hudson	Mooney (WV)
Cramer	Huelskamp	Mullin
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Hunter	Neugebauer
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Newhouse
Denham	Hurt (VA)	Noem
Dent	Issa	Nugent
DeSantis	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes
DesJarlais	Jenkins (WV)	Olson
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
Dold	Johnson, Sam	Palmer
Donovan	Jolly	Paulsen
Duffy	Jones	Pearce

Perry	Royce	Upton
Pittenger	Russell	Valadao
Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Wagner
Poe (TX)	Salmon	Walberg
Poliquin	Sanford	Walden
Pompeo	Scalise	Walker
Posey	Schweikert	Walorski
Price, Tom	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Reed	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Reichert	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Renacci	Shuster	Westerman
Ribble	Simpson	Westmoreland
Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Whitfield
Rigell	Smith (NE)	Williams
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Woodall
Rohrabacher	Stivers	Yoder
Rokita	Stutzman	Yoho
Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry	Young (IA)
Roskam	Tiberi	Young (IN)
Ross	Tipton	Zeldin
Rothfus	Trott	Zinke
Rouzer	Turner	

NOT VOTING—4

Lofgren
Sherman

□ 1838

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 422, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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 218, noes 213, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—218

Abraham	Collins (NY)	Gowdy
Aderholt	Comstock	Granger
Allen	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Amodei	Cook	Griffith
Babin	Costello (PA)	Grothman
Barletta	Cramer	Guinta
Barr	Crawford	Guthrie
Barton	Crenshaw	Hanna
Benishek	Curbelo (FL)	Hardy
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Bishop (MI)	Denham	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hartzler
Black	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Blackburn	Dold	Hensarling
Blum	Donovan	Herrera Beutler
Boehner	Duffy	Hill
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Brady (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Huizenga (MI)
Brat	Emmer (MN)	Hultgren
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Hurd (TX)
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Hurt (VA)
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Issa
Burgess	Flores	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Forbes	Jenkins (WV)
Calvert	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Carter (GA)	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Jolly
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Katko
Chaffetz	Garrett	Kelly (MS)
Coffman	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)
Cole	Goodlatte	King (IA)
Collins (GA)	Gosar	King (NY)

Kinzing (IL)	Olson	Shuster
Kline	Palazzo	Simpson
Knight	Palmer	Smith (MO)
Labrador	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
LaMalfa	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Lamborn	Perry	Smith (TX)
Lance	Pittenger	Tiberi
Latta	Pitts	Stefanik
Long	Poe (TX)	Stewart
Loudermilk	Poliquin	Stivers
Love	Pompeo	Thompson (PA)
Lucas	Posey	Thornberry
Luetkemeyer	Price, Tom	Tipton
Lummis	Ratcliffe	Trott
MacArthur	Reed	Turner
Marchant	Reichert	Upton
Marino	Renacci	Valadao
McCarthy	Ribble	Wagner
McCauley	Rice (SC)	Walberg
McClintock	Rigell	Walden
McHenry	Roby	Walker
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Walorski
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
McSally	Rokita	Webster (FL)
Meehan	Rooney (FL)	Westerman
Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
Mica	Roskam	Whitfield
Miller (MI)	Ross	Williams
Moolenaar	Rouzer	Wilson (SC)
Mooney (WV)	Royce	Wittman
Mullin	Russell	Womack
Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Yoder
Neugebauer	Scalise	Young (AK)
Newhouse	Schweikert	Young (IA)
Noem	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)
Nugent	Sessions	Zeldin
Nunes	Shimkus	Zinke

NOES—213

Adams	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Lawrence
Amash	F.	Lee
Ashford	Duckworth	Levin
Bass	Edwards	Lewis
Beatty	Ellison	Lieu, Ted
Becerra	Engel	Lipinski
Bera	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Beyer	Esty	Loebsack
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lowe
Bonamici	Fleming	Lujan Grisham
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	(NM)
F.	Frankel (FL)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brady (PA)	Fudge	(NM)
Brooks (AL)	Gabbard	Lynch
Brown (FL)	Gallego	Maloney
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	Carolyn
Buck	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Bustos	Gohmert	Massie
Butterfield	Graham	Matsui
Capps	Graves (LA)	McCollum
Capuano	Graves (MO)	McDermott
Cárdenas	Grayson	McGovern
Carney	Green, Al	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	Meadows
Cartwright	Grijalva	Meeks
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	Meng
Castro (TX)	Hahn	Miller (FL)
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Moore
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Moulton
Clark (MA)	Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Nadler
Clawson (FL)	Himes	Napolitano
Clay	Hinojosa	Neal
Cleaver	Honda	Nolan
Clyburn	Hoyer	Norcoss
Cohen	Huelskamp	O'Rourke
Connolly	Huffman	Pallone
Conyers	Israel	Pascarella
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Payne
Costa	Jeffries	Pelosi
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Cuellar	Jones	Peterson
Cummings	Jordan	Pingree
Davis (CA)	Joyce	Pocan
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Polis
DeFazio	Keating	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Delaney	Kennedy	Rangel
DeLauro	Kildee	Rice (NY)
DelBene	Kilmer	Richmond
DeSantis	Kind	Rohrabacher
DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick	Rothfus
DesJarlais	Kuster	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	Langevin	Ruiz
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger

Rush	Sires	Veasey
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Vela
Sanchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
T.	Speier	Visclosky
Sanchez, Loretta	Stutzman	Walz
Sanford	Swalwell (CA)	Wasserman
Sarbanes	Takai	Schultz
Schakowsky	Takano	Waters, Maxine
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wenstrup
Scott, David	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Torres	Yarmuth
Serrano	Tsongas	Yoho
Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen	
Sinema	Vargas	

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson	Lofgren	Sherman
-----------	---------	---------

□ 1848

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 423, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2822.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 333 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. 2822.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1855

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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, 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, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 132, line 24.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term “Fair Labor Standards Act” and such disposition is listed as “willful” or “repeated”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss my amendment, which is to prevent wage theft from violators who commit acts that are repeated and willful and to stop such actors from partaking of Federal procurement in this bill, I would like to set the table just a little bit.

In 1980, Mr. Chair, CEO-to-worker pay ratio for Fortune 500 companies was 20 to 1. Today it is 204 to 1, according to Bloomberg. At the same time, the buying power of the minimum wage is now less than it was in the 1960s.

The Economic Policy Institute found that, in total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning \$2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing about 15 percent of their earned income. It is particularly egregious in the fast-food sector. A recent study by Hart Research of fast-food workers found that about 89 percent reported some form of wage theft.

Lastly, in this case, I would like to point out, Mr. Chair, that the recent report by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the U.S. Senate revealed that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

As I bring this amendment before the body today, Mr. Chairman, it is simply to recognize that the hard work and the work that workers do who work for Federal contractors must be recognized. We are not debating today over increasing or decreasing the minimum wage. We are just saying the people who work hard ought to get the money that they earned.

I would hope that everyone in this body would be willing to say wage theft is not okay. No hard-working American should ever have to worry that her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or take money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor.

This practice, as I mentioned already, is called wage theft. Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are still allowed to apply for Federal contracts.

□ 1900

This amendment seeks to ensure that funds may not be used to enter into a contract with a government contractor that willfully or repeatedly violates the Fair Labor Standards Act—willfully or repeatedly.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, to point out that it is not easy to get a violation. You have got to work at it.

There is a database called the FAPISS database, to begin with, in which contractors have to report all their violations. Just because a wage and hour complaint comes to your door, it doesn't necessarily mean you get a violation. In order to get a violation in the database, you have to have a criminal conviction, a civil proceeding with a finding of fault, or an administrative proceeding with a finding of fault or a penalty of \$5,000 or more or damages of \$100,000 or more. You have got to really work at it. In other words, if you are found to owe back wages and you agree to pay them, there is not going to be a case for you to have to report.

This amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support. And we should reward good actors.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. The amendment doesn't recognize the suspension and debarment process that is already in place for Federal contractors. It does not provide exceptions for critical, urgent, or compelling needs or allow for the consideration of mitigating factors.

I am concerned that this amendment would impose strict legal triggers and take away the ability for Federal agencies to investigate and determine appropriate remedies. I am also concerned that it would deny the due process that the current suspension and debarment system provides. And finally, this is an issue that should be thoroughly vetted through the authorization process, not through the appropriation process.

I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Minnesota.

Every worker is entitled to receive pay for the hours they work; however, there are employers that refuse to pay for overtime, make their employees work off the clock, or refuse to pay

minimum wage. At the very least, we should take steps to ensure that these employers don't receive new Federal contracts.

This amendment would ensure that lawbreaking contractors don't get rewarded for stealing from their employees.

I support this amendment, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. CALVERT. I would just, again, oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Members, this has nothing to do with debarment. Debarment is a quasi-judicial process in which evidence is gathered and findings are made. This is saying that, after somebody has been found to engage in repeated and willful violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, such persons are not the kind of people we want to reward through our procurement system. This is totally different from debarment.

What it is really saying is it reflects our values as a body and reflects our value of the dignity of work and that a dollar earned is a dollar that must be paid. And we should never be the kind of body that says: "Commit willful violations all you want; take workers' money away; you can still get another contract if you please." That is not the kind of body that we are, and I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

Mr. BUCK. 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:

STUDY

SEC. _____. Of the amounts made available by this Act to pay retention bonuses to Senior Executive Service personnel at the Environmental Protection Agency, not more than \$50,000 shall be made available to be used by the Department of the Interior to conduct a study on whether *Agricola Americus* should be classified as an endangered species.

Mr. CALVERT. 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 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, my amendment appropriates up to \$50,000 from the retention bonuses of Senior Executive Service personnel at the EPA to conduct a study of whether *Agricola Americus*, the American farmer, should be classified as an endangered species.

This money should be used to determine whether there is crucial habitat that is essential for the conservation of the species and acting in accordance with 16 U.S.C. chapter 35 if such a finding is made.

The Federal Government is no stranger to using its regulatory powers to interfere in important national issues, so it came as a surprise when I discovered that the Federal Government had overlooked the most endangered species in America.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has been so thorough in designating animals as endangered all around farms, but for some reason hasn't seen the plight of the American farmer.

Paul Harvey recognized, in 1978, that God made *Agricola Americus* with a unique set of characteristics essential to our Nation, so I am troubled that the number of farmers in America has steadily declined over the last six decades.

Not only has the number of American farmers shrunk, but so has the number of farms. Those lost have mainly been family farms, passed down through generations of hard work and built up with years of sweat equity. They have faced numerous manmade obstacles that interfere with their environment and encroach on their natural territory. They have been subject to the ravages of wolves released by the very agency that should be tasked with protecting this essential American species.

Yet the Department of the Interior does not have a monopoly on society's invasion of the American farmer and the habitat. Family farms have been destroyed by the death tax, regulated out of business by FDA and EPA mandates, and forced to dump crops by outdated government programs that even now are being struck down by the Supreme Court.

How much more of this regulatory onslaught can the *Agricola Americus* take before we recognize the harm of our actions and work to make sure that we are not complicit in its disappearance? We cannot leave the farmer alone in the eye of this regulatory storm.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part:

"An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law."

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel or any other entity to negotiate or conclude a settlement with the Federal Government that includes terms requiring the defendant to donate or contribute funds to an organization or individual.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, my amendment bars the EPA and the Department of the Interior and any of its agencies from requiring mandatory donations to third-party groups as part of any settlement agreements the agencies enter into.

In agencies across the government, settlement funds are being funneled to third-party groups, contravening congressional budget authority. A recent investigation by the House Judiciary and Financial Services Committees found as much as half a billion dollars had been diverted by the Department of Justice to third parties as a result of these settlements in the past year. This is inexcusable, and it is not unique to the Department of Justice.

The Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service routinely sue and then enter into settlements with businesses and individuals who are then forced to make donations to third-party groups.

This is all made possible because community service is expressly allowed as a condition of probation by the United States Criminal Code. In addition, the United States sentencing guidelines allow community service where it is reasonably designed to repair the harm caused by the offense. This results in settlement funds being directed to supposed "community service" groups. This is a practice that must be brought to an end.

As Thomas Jefferson once wrote:

To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions

which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical.

In this case, businesses and individuals are being sued by the government for violating environmental regulations, and then as part of the settlement, they have to make payments to the environmental organizations that engage in advocacy supporting the regulations. This power grab is abhorrent.

Please support my amendment and stop these agencies from funneling court settlement funds to radical environmentalists.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. The fact is that this is a very broadly written amendment that would prevent the Federal Government from requiring polluters to pay for cleanup costs. Specifically, I would point out that the EPA is involved in numerous consent decree negotiations that result in payments to the Federal Government by responsible parties.

The ability of the Federal Government to recoup these funds from polluters is an essential part of maintaining good environmental policy and protecting public health and protecting taxpayers, not polluters. For example, some Superfund sites that the EPA may spend Superfund trust moneys up front to initiate the cleanup of a potential responsible party are not yet identified or the cleanup order or settlement agreement with the identified parties is not yet finalized.

In the event that the EPA does expend Superfund moneys at a site with veritable parties, reimbursements may be included in the terms of any settlement agreement that may be entered into with the parties. However, this amendment would prevent the EPA from receiving such reimbursements from the responsible parties in such an instance.

There are also times when defendants in settlement negotiations seek payments to third parties rather than the Federal Government. One such example is the settlement negotiations that followed the catastrophe at the Deepwater Horizon spill in the Gulf of Mexico.

As part of the criminal settlements that BP and Transocean reached with the Federal Government, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, a congressionally chartered nonprofit, received the funds to undertake the projects to help remedy the harm that occurred in the Gulf of Mexico—something I would agree all needed to happen—yet under this amendment, those payments would have been prohibited. It would be completely irresponsible.

This amendment is bad for the taxpayer, bad for public policy, and very bad for the environment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, once again, voting for this amendment and having it move forward would be completely irresponsible. This amendment is bad public policy, bad for environment, and it is bad for the taxpayer. I urge defeat of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

Mr. BUCK. 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 pay a Federal employee for any period of time during which such employee is using official time under section 7131 of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit paying any Federal employee for the time spent not working for the taxpayers but working for a third party, a labor union. This practice is known as "official time."

□ 1915

Unlike any other type of third-party organization, labor unions have been granted the privilege of being able to have taxpayer-funded employees do their business on duty time, instead of doing the taxpayers' work.

Like any other type of private entity, labor unions should pay for their own employees to work for them. The taxpayers should not be picking up the tab for this practice.

According to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, this practice costs taxpayers approximately \$156 million per year. That is assuming that the agencies are correctly reporting the amounts spent, and there have been indications that this number actually underreports the total cost.

In some instances, we are not talking about just a few minutes here and there for an agency employee who is a union official to confer with management about a workplace issue. Sometimes, the agency employee is actually working full time for the labor union, all the while being paid by the taxpayers for this union work.

For instance, the IRS has more than 200 employees working full time for labor unions; the VA has over 250 employees working full time for labor unions—this at a time when there is a significant backlog of cases to be processed.

One of these employees doesn't even work in a VA facility but, instead, works remotely from a private office in D.C.

The EPA, while not having as many personnel on full-time official time as some agencies, still pays over \$1.6 million just for those personnel who are working full time for their union.

Some agencies, such as the Department of Transportation, have numerous employees making over \$170,000 per year, while working full time for the union. This is more than almost all Federal employees make, higher than the salaries of many Senate-confirmed Assistant Secretaries.

My amendment would not prohibit this practice, but would make certain that the right party pays for this work, the labor union. It is not right to force our taxpayers to pay the bill to subsidize these private organizations any more than it would be right to force them to subsidize other private organizations such as the National Rifle Association or the Sierra Club.

Like any business, labor unions should pay the cost for their own employees, not taxpayers.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clearly would serve no purpose but to erode collective bargaining rights for civil service employees and may violate collective bargaining agreements negotiated between workers and these agencies.

Federal unions are legally required to provide representation to all members of bargaining units, whether or not those workers elect to pay voluntary union dues. Representation for employees working their way through the administrative procedures is a cost-effective process for administering and adjudicating agency policies.

The alternative for official time is for the government agencies to pay for costly third-party attorney and arbitration fees. Eliminating official time would increase costs, and it would increase more time and effort for agencies to work out any conflicts with employees. That drives up the cost for taxpayers.

Official time is essential to maintaining workplace safety. Union representation uses official time to set procedures to protect employees from on-the-job hazards. Official time is used to allow employees to participate in work groups with management teams to improve the process and improve performance outcomes.

Under current law, official time may not be used to solicit membership, may not be used to conduct internal union meetings, may not be used to elect union officers, may not be used to engage in any partisan activities, and the notion that official time is used for any of these purposes is false.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, once again, this amendment would serve no purpose but to erode the collective bargaining rights of civil service Federal employees, hard-working Americans.

For that reason, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Chair, I would like to commend Chairman CALVERT, Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, and the Appropriations Committee staff for their efforts in bringing this important bill to the floor.

I would also like to congratulate Chairman CALVERT on his leadership in overseeing this measure and his continued success as chairman of the subcommittee.

I want to take this opportunity to highlight just a small portion of the needs and shortfalls that the territories are facing. In particular, I want to bring to your attention some of the funding issues facing American Samoa.

Each year, the Office of Insular Affairs provides grant funds to American Samoa for the operation of local government, including the judiciary, Department of Education, and the local hospital. The purpose of this program is to fund the difference between budget needs and local revenues.

Mr. Chairman, the world has changed much since the inception of this program to assist American Samoa government operations, and additional needs have arisen.

Local revenues have remained relatively constant; the infrastructure has become dated and in disrepair, and outside influences, particularly China, have begun to make inroads into the region with the development of a port in the neighboring independent Samoa and future plans for a naval base in the same area.

We have also seen a dramatic spike in world conflict since the inception of the program. This increased military activity by both friendly and hostile nations has simultaneously created the need for increased border security, an element severely lacking in American

Samoa and one not funded under the current parameters of the program.

American Samoa is also facing severe infrastructure deficiency, which has caused undue hardship to both our people and businesses that rely upon our roads, airport, and port.

In fact, the recent decision by the NOAA National Weather Service to terminate weather observation service in American Samoa, which our local airport relies upon for flight operations, has prompted the need for the construction of a tower at Pago Pago International Airport. This facility would serve as a standard control tower and would also contain the weather monitoring service after NOAA ceases operations in American Samoa.

Mr. Chairman, my home district was devastated by a tsunami on September 29, 2009, that killed many of our people. I was there at the time. If it hadn't been for the fact that I had a scheduled meeting at that very time and was already awake, I could have been killed by the wave. We lost our tuna cannery the day after the tsunami, which was half of our private sector employment.

We also are suffering from the prolonged recession here in the States and suffered another setback with the recent longshoremen's strike that exposed just how dependent we are on outside resources.

Chairman CALVERT, I encourage the committee that, when considering funding levels for the territories, to keep in mind our economic and geographic isolation and the extreme disparity in opportunities for growth between these regions and the States.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the committee to increase funding for the territories which will help alleviate the many issues we are facing.

Mr. CALVERT. As someone who has always had the utmost respect for our fellow countrymen from the territories, I look forward to working with the gentlewoman from American Samoa, and I want to thank her for her efforts to inform the committee on the issues of the insular areas.

I am well aware of just how dedicated to our country the people of American Samoa are, as displayed by their extremely high rate of enlistment in our Nation's Armed Forces.

Your membership in this body is highly valued, and the appointment as vice chairman of the Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs Subcommittee as a first-term member is a testament to the perspective and leadership you bring to Congress.

Through your leadership, your people are well respected and have found themselves a champion for their cause.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. At a time when we are faced with the need to reduce funding in many areas of government, I thank the committee for preserving the budgetary assistance to American Samoa.

I want to thank the chairman for his kind words and continued leadership,

and I look forward to working with him to ensure that the territories are given the same opportunity as the States.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. 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 regulate the location of the placement of a monitor of pollutants under the clean air act in any county provided such county has at least one monitor.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, right now, the Environmental Protection Agency makes the determination whether a county is what they call a nonattainment zone based on readings, the amount of ozone that various monitors come up with. If you are a nonattainment zone, it results in problems for both individuals and business.

Individuals in counties in my area have two problems. First of all, if you are nonattainment, you might have to have gasoline that is probably a little bit inferior in quality, as well as more expensive.

I always think the price of gasoline is an important thing because it doesn't matter; either wealthy or poor, it is something you have to be able to afford. If you are knocking up your price of gasoline by 5 or 10 cents a year, that can be a very damaging thing for someone who doesn't have that great a salary.

Secondly, if you are a nonattainment zone, every car has to be checked for emissions. Maybe there are some wealthy environmentalists that it is no big deal—if their car fails the emissions test, they can afford to spend another \$900 on a catalytic converter or something wildly more expensive. For somebody not well off, it maybe puts you in a position which you have to buy a whole new car.

It is another problem for businesses. Manufacturing is very important to this country. If you crack down on a business and say that you have to do different things to affect the amount of ozone that may be emitted from your factory, it can be very cost prohibitive and put American business at a competitive disadvantage.

These determinations are made by air monitors. In every county, the amount of ozone that is detected by these monitors may vary greatly from one part of the county to another part of the county.

It is our opinion that sometimes in the past, in my district, if you put an

air monitor right on Lake Michigan, due to the effect the sun has on the water, you might get disproportionately high readings and wind up having to put your individuals and businesses in a situation which they are in nonattainment.

This is particularly onerous because, sometimes, whether or not you have a high ozone rating or not has nothing whatsoever to do with anything that is going on within your county.

My district, for example, is maybe 70 miles from Chicago, where most of the pollutants come from; so here you are, stuck trying to make your air cleaner and cleaner, and there is very little you can do to affect it anyway.

In any event, it seems fair that you should be able to put an air monitor anywhere within that county. You shouldn't have a situation in which, in the past, an air monitor was placed at an area where you got a disproportionately high reading.

The purpose of this amendment is to say that the Environmental Protection Agency, that I am sure has a budget tight as a drum, should not have to waste any time worrying about where that air monitor is and where we are determining whether or not we have an ozone problem in a county.

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

□ 1930

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin would prohibit funds for regulating the location of air monitors in counties.

The Clean Air Act requires every State to establish a network of air monitoring stations for criteria pollutants, using criteria set by the EPA for their location and operation.

EPA's ambient air monitoring network assessment guidance provides States and counties with information about the assessment of technical aspects of ambient air monitoring networks. The guidance is designed to be flexible and expandable. It does not dictate specific locations for placement for air monitors.

The amendment would block EPA oversight of air quality monitoring, making possible a scenario in which counties could game the system by locating monitors in places that show the lowest amount of pollution rather than where they get the best representative data.

Let us look no further than today's paper to understand why we need to ensure the proper collection of air quality data.

A headline in the Wisconsin Ag Connection reads: Canadian Wildfires Prompt State to Issue Air Quality Notice.

The article reports that the Department of Natural Resources has issued

an air quality notice for all 72 Wisconsin counties this week. State air quality monitors are recording elevated concentrations of fine particles at several locations around the State, particularly across northern and western Wisconsin.

And some sites are recording values in the "unhealthy for sensitive" category, which includes children, elderly people, individuals with respiratory and cardiac problems, and people engaged in strenuous activities for prolonged periods of time.

This amendment would stop a transparent, science-based process to locate monitors where they will provide the most useful information about air quality.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think it is appropriate to dictate a nationwide moratorium on air quality monitoring in response to what appears to be a local issue perhaps in the gentleman's State of Wisconsin.

This amendment is harmful to local governments that depend on EPA's technical expertise when determining the best location for an air monitor placement. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, first of all, the gentlewoman from Maine makes a point not about this amendment specifically, but about the overall program.

And that is you have a situation right now in which, apparently, the Department of Natural Resources is making a determination that we have unsafe air based upon fires that are hundreds of miles away that the local people can't do anything about.

Secondly, the gentlewoman says it is tying the hands of local units of government. That is not true. Under this amendment, the local units of government have more flexibility.

The question is can the Federal Government tie the hands of local units of government, which they shouldn't be able to do.

So it is a good amendment. I think it is something that is going to, in the long term, benefit American business and, even more, benefit American individuals, particularly poor people, who don't have a lot of extra money, are stuck spending a lot more money on their cars because of determinations made by Federal bureaucrats in far-away cities who probably have enough money to be able to afford to deal with these problems anyway.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I will just reiterate the points I made before and urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

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:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR OIL AND GAS
LEASE SALE 260 IN LEASING PROGRAM

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for oil and gas lease sale 260 included in the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2017–2022 (DPP), or in any subsequent proposed or final iteration of such Program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, 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. Chair, I rise in utter respect for my colleague from California and his colleagues and the Interior bill that they created and all the good that it does.

This is, in essence, just a very small refining amendment that, as was described in the reading, would simply prohibit the Department of the Interior from moving forward on sales within block 260. I think that this is important for a number of different reasons that I will enumerate.

But I want to be clear. This is not an amendment about a belief in there being dangers with regard to technology that is used and employed offshore. I have been quite impressed in all the studies I have done in the technological advancements that have taken place.

Nor is it an amendment about the belief that we shouldn't be using fossil fuels. I think that fossil fuels are very important in the mix with regard to energy independence in this country.

What this amendment is simply about is the age-old notion that Washington doesn't always know best, that the Founding Fathers were really deliberate in their belief in this notion of Federalism; that they divided power not only laterally, but vertically; that there was a Federal Government, but there was also a State and a local government; and those municipalities or those States should have a voice, too.

It is about recognizing that there is a difference between comment and control. And what municipalities, what people back home in South Carolina along the coast, are saying is: We want to have more than just a comment. We want to have control over our destiny in the way that the coast develops.

For that reason, nine communities in my district alone as well as 65 communities up and down the eastern seaboard have added comments, saying: We want to push the pause button here.

And, indeed, that is all this amendment does. It says: Let's pause so that we can do a cost-benefit analysis going forward. I think that this is important, given the large context.

You know, we are talking about 4 percent of the oil reserves within the Continental U.S. We are talking about a 5-month supply. These communities are saying a 5-month supply versus a lifetime impact in a place like Saint Helena Sound.

If you look at the ACE Basin, it has been nationally recognized as a treasure. It is about 250,000 acres on the coast of South Carolina. The Federal Government put a lot of money into preserving it, as did State and private interests.

And what people are saying is: Given the amount of industrialization that has to take place to support the offshore rigs, do you bring those pipes and that supply in through a place like Saint Helena Sound?

Again, what people have said along the coast of South Carolina is: Let's pause and reflect on that. And that is what this amendment does.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I must rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the mirror opposite, as the gentleman knows, of the Hudson amendment that is currently pending via a rollcall vote.

The Hudson amendment would allow lease 260 to move forward under the Department of the Interior's next 5-year offshore leasing plan for 2017 through 2022.

The Sanford amendment would prevent lease 260 from moving forward under the next 5-year plan. And given the competing amendments, I must oppose this amendment, since we accepted the other amendment last night.

So I would ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, again, I respect the Solomon's wisdom that would be required by the chairman and others on the committee in dividing the different interests, and that is why I think the Founding Fathers had it right.

They said that, ultimately, nobody in Washington can have Solomon's wisdom when you talk about local perspective and local interests, that there was a real value to local voice, those nine communities.

If you think about Saint Helena Sound as the example that I just cited, the little town south of there, Beaufort, drew up a resolution, and the county and the city council moved forward, saying: We don't want to move forward with this.

The little town to the east, Edisto Beach, moved forward with the resolu-

tion citing the same. The larger town to the north, Charleston, did the same.

Those local inputs, those local people, have said: We have seen what might or might not come here. We think it is worthy of a pause. Again, that is all this amendment does.

It doesn't say: We will forever not have offshore drilling in sale 260.

What it says is: For the next 5 years, why don't we allow for more public input and more voice, given the fact that there are lifetime impacts and really long-lasting impacts in certain pristine and/or developed areas along the coast of South Carolina or other coastal areas along the block of 260.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I will just restate my opposition to this amendment. And I would hope that the gentleman could work with his colleagues in South Carolina and work all this out. But I must oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I just wanted to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

I was here last night and had a chance to speak against the Hudson amendment for the very reasons that he is articulating.

Coming from Maine and being from a State where people take very seriously our waterfronts, our fisheries, our livelihood that we make on the water, there are deep concerns about the challenges that might come up with oil and gas leases.

And I think everyone in many coastal States wants to just make sure we go through the most thorough process possible. So I heartily support the concerns that he is raising, and I support this amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANFORD. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, there are many of us here in Congress who want to build a better America, a stronger America, a healthier America. And there are many of us here who are willing to work and fight to move our country in that direction forward,

which is the direction the American people want to go.

For most Americans, for families and communities all across this country, protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink is an essential role of government. The American people expect Congress to protect the public's health from polluters who are all too willing to reap larger and larger profits as they pump poison into our air and water.

We hear all too often the cries of "burdensome regulation" from those who defend the polluters. But rarely do we hear the cries of "burdensome asthma" or "burdensome cancer" from average Americans who all too often suffer in silence when they are sick because the air, water, or land they need has been poisoned.

My Republican colleagues are very content to cut funding and place riders on the enforcement of environmental standards to make life easier for the polluters.

But what about the families and the communities put at risk? What about the children who are at risk because avoiding environmental regulations to pump up profits is more important than public health?

The role of the Environmental Protection Agency is to protect the public, to protect our health, to protect our water, to protect our air, to protect our land from polluters who are all too willing to cut corners, enabling them to reap larger profits.

Investing in environmental regulation to protect the American people is a government function that is not burdensome. It is essential.

□ 1945

We should all want to protect the public's health and the vital role that the Environmental Protection Agency plays on behalf of the American people, but this bill fails to protect the American people. It fails to protect the public's health, and it fails to provide the tools necessary to hold polluters accountable for poisoning our air, our water, and our land. If this bill ever finds its way to the President's desk, President Obama will veto it.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill, and the investments we make together in this Interior-Environmental Appropriations bill speak to our values as a nation. We are the stewards of a bounty of resources, the inheritors of a nation of natural treasures; and there are 300 million Americans who depend on this Congress to ensure those resources, including our clean air and clean water, are protected.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, very sadly, this bill lets them down. So I will urge my colleagues at the end of the day to vote against final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

Mr. PALMER. 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. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for grants under title VII, subtitle G of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The aggregate amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Environmental Protection Agency-State and Tribal Assistance Grants", and the amount provided under such heading for grants under title VII, subtitle G of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, are each hereby reduced by \$50,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment limits the funding of the EPA's Diesel Emissions Reduction Program. The Diesel Emissions Reduction Program is part of the National Clean Diesel Campaign. This grant program was created in 2005 as a short-term effort to assist States and local government to meet new diesel emissions standards for older diesel engines.

According to the Obama administration, the overall impact of the program has been marginal. Currently, there are 14 grant and loan programs at the Department of Energy, the Department of Transportation, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, plus three tax activities that have as a goal reducing mobile source diesel emissions. In addition, each of the 14 programs, according to the GAO, overlaps with at least one other program in the specific activities they fund, the program goals, or the eligible recipients of funding.

GAO also identified several instances of duplication where more than one program provided grant funding to the same recipient for the same type of activities. One example identified by GAO showed a nonprofit organization received \$1.1 million from EPA's Diesel Emissions Reduction Act program to install emission reduction and idle reduction technologies on 1,700 trucks, as well as \$5.6 million from a State infrastructure bank established under DOT's program to equip trucks and truck fleets with emissions control and idle reduction devices—essentially the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has become so large, it is impossible to grasp its true size and scope to pay for its cost. With the country facing unprecedented levels of debt, taxpayers expect the Federal Government to run more efficiently, guarding against careless waste of precious resources. It is essential that Congress, the administration, and Federal agencies do everything in their power to cut spending, reduce duplication, and rein in waste, fraud, and abuse. My amendment does just that, and it would have an annual savings of \$50 million.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I know a lot about the DERA program, obviously, from southern California, probably the most controlled air quality area in the United States, and there are a lot of things in EPA that don't work. There are a lot of things that EPA does to regulate, to create paperwork, and to create headaches for small- and large-business people. We have included a great number of policy provisions to address this EPA regulatory overreach in this bill. We have cut the EPA budget dramatically, as the gentlewoman just referred to. However, I believe this specific amendment targets a program that actually yields great benefits.

Many counties across the Nation are currently in nonattainment with EPA's existing standards for the particulate matter and ozone. We are not talking about the standards that are being talked about. We are talking about the standards that were put in place in 2008.

In many instances, these counties have been in nonattainment for years, and those communities need help to improve their air quality. The Diesel Emission Reduction Program, or DERA, is a proven, cost-effective program that provides grants to States to retrofit old diesel engines. So it is a program that supports manufacturing jobs while reducing pollution.

Another benefit is that these grants are highly leveraged, producing \$13 of economic benefit for every Federal grant dollar. Today's newer engines produce 90 percent—let me say that again—90 percent less toxic emissions than the older diesel engines. Remember, I have experience with trucks, and these independent truck drivers, those who have those trucks, get a lot of miles out of those trucks, sometimes well over a million miles off a truck. However, only 30 percent of the trucks and heavy-duty vehicles have transitioned to cleaner technologies, typically because especially these small truck companies just can't afford to get this new technology. We need to follow the science and accelerate the replacement of older engines with these new, clean engines, which, by the way, get better mileage and, at the same time, clean up the air considerably.

This is a program that is actually working. We have seen significant—I know the Obama administration doesn't like this program. They don't like programs that actually work. They want to get rid of the programs that work and have money be put into these esoteric climate change studies and so forth and so on, and I can tell

the gentleman, from experience, that this had significant impacts in the South Coast Air Quality District where I live in, an area that has probably been impacted with all the problems of air quality more than any other region in the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge Members to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague from California for his remarks, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since 1984, the EPA has lowered the amount of pollutants from diesel engines by more than 98 percent. Since 1980, despite the fact that the gross domestic product has grown by over 460 percent, vehicle miles have increased by 94 percent, the population has grown 38 percent, energy production 32 percent, emissions have gone down 50 percent. In regard to the impact of these programs, you have 14 programs that the GAO has identified as overlapping. It will do little harm to the overall effort for air quality to eliminate one program that is clearly a duplication in several instances identified by the GAO.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, in regard to air quality, while air quality has improved dramatically—emissions are down 50 percent since 1980—respiratory illnesses such as asthma have gone up, and that is largely a byproduct of income. So I would commend to you that we need to reduce the number of regulations, the cost of regulations, to allow more economic activity and provide better job opportunities for people, which will have a direct impact on their overall welfare, including their health.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a program that has worked, continues to work, and has had significant improvement in my area in California and, I know, throughout the United States, where we have a program that actually does work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), my ranking member, who has a couple of comments.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from California's opposition to this amendment.

It has been used in my State and States all over to improve air quality, and, yes, pollutants have been cut. But as I just pointed out, Mr. Chairman, we still have a long way to go before we can turn to our children and say that we did everything we could to make sure that respiratory illness is decreased and that the air quality in this country is better.

So I strongly oppose this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from

California for his opposition to it as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have one point because asthma has been brought up.

When I was chairman of the Environment Committee a number of years ago, we had done significant studies on the increase in asthma. The gentleman is correct on income levels.

The lower income folks are suffering from asthma at greater numbers primarily because of indoor pollution. One of the reasons, if we can get into the specifics of why that has occurred, is because we have carpets now and drapes and we don't use linoleum and so forth that we used to have, and so we have the growth of indoor air pollution, and kids don't get outside as much as they used to.

So I think we sometimes blame other factors for asthma, and sometimes the other factors are more to blame. But this program, DERA, is a program that works, continues to work; and I know it has in my area, and I know it has in other areas throughout the United States.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to again point out that it was a study from the University of California, Los Angeles that pointed out that children from low-income households suffer disproportionately from asthma, and as we continue to overregulate our economy and reduce the economic opportunities for people, we are going to continue to see these high rates of respiratory illnesses.

My final point is that we are not eliminating this clean diesel program. We are eliminating one program out of 14.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" 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 Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

Mr. PALMER. 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 by the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out the powers granted under section 3063 of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Protection Agency spends more than \$45 million a year to fund a criminal enforcement division that employs almost 200 armed Federal agents. These agents have been involved in a number of troubling raids in Alaska, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Massachusetts, North Carolina, and in my own State of Alabama.

In Alaska, EPA agents wearing flak jackets and carrying M-16s showed up to review paperwork at a family-owned mining operation. In North Carolina, armed EPA agents visited Larry Keller after he sent an email to the regional administrator. In my home State of Alabama, armed EPA agents took over two waste treatment facilities in Dothan, Alabama. These agents were posted at each entrance to the plant and recorded identification information of all those going in and going out.

Mr. Chairman, more than 70 Federal departments now employ armed personnel, most of which most Americans would never associate with law enforcement. These agencies include the EPA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Federal Reserve Board, and the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funding for these activities at EPA. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand that we have taken a lot of shots at the EPA for their overreach, and I am one of them; however, this amendment reaches just a little too far. We may not always agree on where it is appropriate to draw the line on environmental laws and regulations. Some think standards are too stringent; others will say they are not tough enough. That is a fair policy debate, and we have it.

Back in 1968 when the Environmental Protection Agency was created, we had rivers that would light on fire. We had air that was so thick, back when I played football, you couldn't see the other goalposts on the other end of the football field. So we have made a lot of gains.

□ 2000

At the same time, as it has been discussed, I think the EPA has gone way too far. We get to the point where we start regulating smaller and smaller

numbers and making it very difficult; for instance, when we start talking about 70 parts per billion versus 60 parts per billion, we have gone a long ways.

However, we do know that no matter where the line is ultimately drawn, there are individuals out there that are willingly and knowingly trying to find ways around the law. As such, EPA needs to have the ability to look into criminal activity, whether it is illegal dumping of waste, which unfortunately happens; negligent dumping of toxics or oil, which unfortunately happens; and the illegal transportation or importation of products from other countries by those who would choose to ignore U.S. law.

We can debate the laws and what is appropriate, but we can't give criminals a free pass to ignore the law or the laws that are on the books.

Again, I'm sorry. I must oppose the amendment and strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleague from California, no one is in favor of allowing criminals to commit crimes at any level of the Federal Government or any part of the country.

I do think it should be troubling to every Member of this body that we have gone over the line in regard to becoming what could be viewed as a police state.

In regard to the raid on the Dothan wastewater treatment facility, that is a city facility; that is the Federal Government sending armed agents in full body armor with weapons to a municipal facility. I would beg the question: What was the threat assessment?

This is going on in other parts of the country as well, and I think we have a responsibility to draw a line where law enforcement is involved. If there is a threat assessment that would indicate the need to have armed officers assist the EPA in an investigation or a raid, there is ample law enforcement available to do that.

In that regard, I think this is an area where the EPA has overreached in respect to their responsibilities as regulators of the environment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this is an important debate. I recognize that we have had Federal agencies that have had overreach and have done things that go beyond their training and possibly should be done by other agencies. I won't disagree with that; but doing this in an appropriation bill is not the right place to do this.

The authorizers should have this debate, and we shouldn't be making these determinations with an appropriations bill which just broadly states that we are going to get rid of a whole swath of law enforcement, whether they are good or bad. It doesn't determine that because we can't do that in this type of legislative process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM).

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, if I may inquire how much time is remaining so I don't consume all the gentleman's time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 45 seconds remaining.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I will just be short and sweet. I support the gentleman from California's strong objection to this amendment and would encourage people not to vote for it.

Let me conclude with this: an EPA law enforcement official deserves the right to come home to their families safe at night, and so they should have the tools that they need in order to do that.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Minnesota's response. I, too, agree that every Federal official deserves to be able to go home safe and sound to their family.

That, though, does not address the specific issue here in regard to what is going on with the EPA. If there is a need for armed intervention with a business or, in this case, with a municipality, there should be a clear threat assessment. There isn't any. There was no reason for anyone to think that they needed to go in, in full body armor, with weapons drawn.

I think that that is part of what is going on here that a lot of American citizens are concerned about, is the overreach of the government and particularly in regard to 70 Federal agencies having armed agents in their employment.

I agree with the gentleman from California; this needs to be a broader discussion. In that regard, I think we should have that.

In respect to my amendment, I think we need to divert this funding away from this armed agency that the EPA is deploying, I think, without proper course.

In that regard, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this.

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

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

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. CALVERT. 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, 21ST CENTURY CURES ACT

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-193) on the resolution (H. Res. 350) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century cures, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 333 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. 2822.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2009

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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, 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, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 132, line 24.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS for his leadership and support. Under his guidance, the Appropriations Committee is again setting the standard for getting things done in the House. This is the seventh of the appropriation bills that have come to the floor that we, hopefully, will be able to pass tomorrow.

I also want to thank my good friend and Ranking Member McCOLLUM for

her partnership and work on this bill. Finally, I want to thank each of our committee members for their efforts and their collegiality. It continues to be the hallmark of our subcommittee's deliberations.

Even though we may have differences of opinion within this bill, I greatly appreciate the members' constructive contributions, and I mean that sincerely. The committee has made some very difficult choices in preparing this bill.

As reported by the Appropriations Committee, the fiscal year 2016 Interior Appropriations bill is funded at \$30.17 billion, which is \$246 million below the fiscal year 2015 enacted level and \$3 billion below the budget request. We have made a sincere effort to prioritize the needs within our 302(b) allocation.

I would like to point out some of the highlights of the bill. Again, this year, the committee has provided robust wildland fire funding, fire suppression accounts. The Department of the Interior and Forest Service are fully funded at the 10-year average level. The hazardous fuel program was increased by \$75 million to \$526 million in fiscal year 2015 enacted, and that increase has been maintained in this bill.

The bill also continues critical investments in Indian Country, a non-partisan priority of this committee. Building upon the bipartisan work, former subcommittee chairman MIKE SIMPSON, Jim Moran, Norm Dicks, and, certainly, my friend Ms. MCCOLLUM, the bill continues to make investments in education, public safety, and health programs in Indian Country.

Overall funding for the Indian Health Service has increased by \$145 million or 3 percent, while funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education is increased by \$165 million or 6 percent from fiscal year 2015 levels, the largest percentage increase in this bill.

The bill provides full funding for fiscal year 2016 for payments in lieu of taxes, or the PILT program. PILT payments are made to 49 of the 50 States, as well as the District of Columbia, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The bill provides \$2.7 billion for the National Park Service, included more than \$60 million in new funding relating to the centennial of the National Park Service.

We have also addressed a number of priorities within the Fish and Wildlife Service accounts. The bill funds popular cost-shared grant programs above fiscal year 2015 enacted levels. It also provides for additional funds to combat international wildlife trafficking, protects fish hatcheries from cuts and closures, continues funding to fight invasive species, and reduces the backlog of species that are recovered but not yet delisted.

The bill provides \$248 million for the land and water conservation fund, programs that enjoy broad bipartisan support. Some Members would prefer more

funding; others would prefer less funding for LWCF. We have attempted to forge a middle ground that begins to return an emphasis of the LWCF to its original intent of recreation in the States and local acquisitions.

Overall, funding for EPA was reduced by \$718 million or 9 percent from fiscal year 2015 enacted levels.

Members of the Great Lakes region will be pleased to know that the Great Lakes restoration initiative is maintained at fiscal year 2015 enacted level of \$300 million. Rural water technical assistance grants and many categorical grants, including radon grants, are level funded at the fiscal year 2015 enacted level.

Again, this year, there is a great deal of concern over a number of regulatory actions being pursued by EPA, which we have discussed over the last day and the absence of legislation without clear congressional direction.

For this reason, the bill includes a number of provisions to stop unnecessary and damaging regulatory overreach by the agency.

□ 2015

I would like to address the Endangered Species Act. We have had a number of amendments over the last day about this subject. Certainly, this committee has no interest in interfering with science or in letting any species go extinct, but we are concerned about Federal regulatory actions lacking in basic fairness and common sense. The provisions in this bill address problems created by the ESA—not by science but by court orders—that drain limited agency resources and force departments to cut corners to meet arbitrary deadlines.

Nowhere is this more evident than with the sage-grouse. States are rightfully concerned that a listing or unnecessary restricted Federal land use plans will jeopardize existing conservation partnerships with States and private landowners. These partnerships are necessary to save both sagebrush ecosystems and local economies. So long as sage-grouse are not under imminent threat of extinction, cooperative conservation must be given a chance to work.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, so long as sage-grouse are not under imminent threat of extinction, cooperative conservation must be given a chance to work. That is why this bill maintains a 1-year delay in any decision to list the sage-grouse along with full funding to implement conservation efforts.

House consideration of this bill is the next step in a long legislative process. I hope, over the coming months, we will come together, as we do each year,

to find common ground. In that spirit, I look forward to continuing to work with Ms. MCCOLLUM and Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. As this bill moves forward, hopefully, the Senate will act on a bill soon, and we will be able to get back to regular order, which is, I think, the hope for both sides.

In closing, I want to thank the staffs on both sides for their hard work on this bill. On the minority side, I would like to thank Rick Healy, Rita Culp, Joe Carlile, as well as Rebecca Taylor. They played an integral role in the process, and their efforts are very much appreciated. On the majority side, I would like to thank subcommittee staff Kristin Richmond, Jackie Kilroy, Betsy Bina, Jason Gray, Darren Benjamin, and Dave LesStrang. On my personal staff, I would also like to thank Ian Foley, Rebecca Keightley, Alexandra Berenter, and Tricia Evans for their great work.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I have enjoyed the debate over the last couple of days.

One thing I also want to talk about under my 5 minutes is on the wildfire and hazardous fuel management program. It was mentioned earlier in the debate that we are attempting to work out an agreement on both sides so that we can move Mr. SIMPSON's language forward in his hazardous wildfire bill, H.R. 167. We are looking for cosponsors of the bill, and we hope to get more support for that bill as we move this process forward.

As I mentioned earlier, we did fund the bill to the 10-year average, but this is still not going to be sufficient if we have the significant wildfire year that we expect. A catastrophic fire can literally burn through any amounts of money that we may have set aside, and it causes disruptions within the Department of the Interior and the Department of Forestry in how they manage those accounts, which we also discussed, which is not good management on our part. So I would hope we can move ahead with Mr. SIMPSON's bill as quickly as possible.

We also discussed the Endangered Species Act, and we continue to talk about the States and the difficulties that they are having in working with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with other agencies in trying to work out their State plans that deal with these significant issues. As we look at our sage-grouse strategy, we have 11 States involved in this program. We are doing everything we can to have a cooperative program with private landowners, the State land, and the Federal land to make sure that we continue to have sage-grouse. We want to make sure that the sage-grouse persists, and that is why we funded both the BLM and the Fish and Wildlife Service to the requested amounts in order to make sure that we have the resources available to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done a yeoman's job of shepherding this appropriations bill through this House.

I would like to thank the ranking member, Ms. McCOLLUM, for her efforts.

I sat in that chair last night where you are, Mr. Chairman, and presided over many different amendments. There was much discussion on a wide variety of issues, but it is what we came here to do in this institution—to debate the issues and to work in a process that I call our constitutional appropriations process. If we are to regain the power of the purse here in the House, we ought to be able to work through the appropriations process that so many hard-working colleagues of mine, like Chairman CALVERT, have put so much effort into.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for us to begin the process, once again, of prioritizing how Washington spends money, which I remember not too long ago was the way Washington spent money, Mr. Chairman, when Washington was not nearly as broken. We have an opportunity to come here to the floor to debate the issues and to get an up-or-down vote. When our amendments may not pass, that doesn't mean that we shouldn't regain the power that Congress has been given in our Constitution, and that is by supporting great bills like this.

I congratulate the chairman. I look forward to supporting his bill. I had a great time in presiding over the debate yesterday, and I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman in the future.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, next week, we will be having other bills in front of us. We are looking forward to having the Financial Services bill on the floor next week, and I believe we will have other appropriations bills for the balance of the month. As we get back to regular order, we want to have all 12 bills brought to the floor and debated. The chairman has done a great job of moving this committee back to its historic importance in this institution, and we appreciate your continued support in that process.

As I mentioned on the Forest Service funding allocations, we are continuing to work to make sure that moneys are available to fund Forest Service research and development and to make sure that the analysis and inventory

program continues to be funded. The forests, we recognize, are a renewable resource. Domestically produced timber supports local communities and the U.S. industry, especially in the West. It also helps reduce fuel loads in our national forests. This is greatly needed, especially now, because these fires are burning hotter, fire seasons are growing longer, and more communities are at risk.

Our forests need to be managed, Mr. Chairman. The Forest Service estimates that up to 2 million acres of land need to be actively managed. In the Rocky Mountains alone, 45 million acres have been affected by the bark beetle. We have seen results of the bark beetle back in my area of southern California where thousands of acres have been devastated by this beetle that attacks weakened trees, which certainly exposes a problem to wildfire conditions. Once those wildfires start, then those fires quickly become catastrophic as we have seen just recently in a fire in the San Bernardino National Forest.

We were fortunate that the 2014 fire season was well below the normal with just 87 percent of the 10-year average. We are praying that that is going to occur in the 2015 fire season, but we can't be sure. Most people believe that that is not going to occur and that, because of the drought, especially in the West, we could have catastrophic conditions and that we could have wildfires that can certainly grow out of control.

Mr. Chairman, 2 percent of the wildfires cost more money than the other 98 percent, so that is why we need to continue to invest resources wisely and to make sure that we get rid of hazardous materials, that we manage our forests properly in order for us not to have these catastrophic fires. These figures are combined with the fact that California, my home State, suffers through this exceptional drought. Other parts of the country, including Minnesota, have the potential for above normal wildfire activity in the next few months, and that is extremely, extremely worrisome.

I would like to talk a little bit about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I know we would have liked to have appropriated more money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but we are acting under these allocations, and we were just restricted on what we could do. Yet what we wanted to do was to focus back to the original intent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was recreation and State and local acquisitions. In this bill, the administration is directed to prioritize limited Federal acquisitions in which opportunities for recreation and local and State congressional support are the strongest.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, we extend the authority of recreation fee programs; we prohibit the Interior from administratively creating new wilderness areas; we provide the full funding of \$452 million for payments in lieu of taxes, which is extremely important to almost every State in the Union; and we increase the forest products account by \$16 million so that the Forest Service can increase timber harvests.

We lost a lot of the timber operations in the West after the issue with the spotted owl. After that 20-year experiment that most people realize was a failure, we now have forests that have become overgrown, especially in the West, and we have poorly managed some of those forests. We need to go back and thin those forests out. There are two ways to thin a forest, Mr. Chairman. Either God does it, or we allow for good timbering operations that are done in a new scientific manner that help clear out that forest in a healthy way, that bring back animals that sometimes have abandoned the region because of overgrowth—operations that make for a healthier forest in the long run.

These are good goals. We want to work with the Department of Forestry to make sure that they continue to make progress on this, and we will continue to do that.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT

Mr. CALVERT. 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. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prohibit the display of the flag of the United States or the POW/MIA flag, or the decoration of graves with flags in the National Park Service national cemeteries as provided in National Park Service Director's Order No. 61 or to contravene the National Park Service memorandum dated June 24, 2015, with the subject line containing the words "Immediate Action Required, No Reply Needed" with respect to sales items.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2030

Mr. CALVERT. This amendment will codify existing National Park Service policy and directives with regard to the declaration of cemeteries and concession sales. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I am actually quite surprised that we find ourselves here tonight attempting to overturn the National Park Service recent policy changes to stop allowing the Confederate flag to be displayed or sold in national parks.

Mr. Chair, just yesterday, this House passed amendment after amendment supporting the removal of the symbol of racism from our national parks, which are visited every day by Americans and foreign visitors of every race.

We have read about the divisive tactics happening in the South Carolina statehouse as they debate the removal of the Confederate flag after the murder of nine Black parishioners.

I never thought that the U.S. House of Representatives would join those who would want to see this flag flown by passing an amendment to ensure the continuing flying of the Confederate flag. I strongly urge every Member to stand with the citizens of all races and to remove this symbol of hatred from our National Park Service.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I want to restate: On June 25 when National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis requested that Confederate flag sales be removed from national park bookstores and gift shops, he also followed a decision by several large national retailers—Walmart, Amazon, and Sears—to stop selling items with Confederate flags on them, and I agreed with these decisions. I commend those for their prompt action.

While in certain and very limited circumstances, it might be appropriate in a national park to display the image of the Confederate flag in a historical context—and I say that as a social studies teacher—the general display or sale of Confederate flag items is inappropriate and divisive. I support limiting their use.

I strongly oppose this amendment, which is an attempt to negate amendments which were approved yesterday without any opposition to limit the displaying of the Confederate flag, and so we should make sure that we uphold what this House stood for yesterday, which is to say no to racism, which is to say no to hate speech.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 California will be postponed.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as we prepare to finish consideration of H.R. 2822, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate my subcommittee chairman, KEN CALVERT, for getting this bill to this point.

It has not been an easy process, as we just realized a few moments ago. We have had to consider nearly twice as many amendments as any other appropriations bill taken up in the House this year.

While I have not agreed with a considerable number of the amendments that have been made to the bill, I do appreciate that the chairman and I have been able to disagree when necessary without ever being disagreeable. My working relationship with Chairman CALVERT has been first rate. I appreciate the hard work and effort he has put into the bill.

Let me also express my sincere thanks to the committee staff on both sides of the aisle, as well as the personal staff in both of our respective offices for their work on the bill. They put in long hours to smooth a way for consideration of this bill, and I appreciate their efforts.

Once again, I want to say that we have had a good working relationship, Mr. Chair, but I cannot hide my surprise and my outrage that we find ourselves here tonight attempting to overturn the National Park Service recent policy change to stop allowing the Confederate flag to be displayed or sold at our national parks.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I just want to say that I enjoyed and continue to enjoy working with the gentlewoman as we move this process forward and appreciate her courtesy and kindness.

As I say, we will continue to work at this process as we move ahead.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016”.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POLQUIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, 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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment,

and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 5, to include corrections in section numbers, section headings, cross references, punctuation, and indentation, and to make any other technical and conforming change necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of our Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of my colleagues who are here tonight at this late hour to talk about the weak negotiations that are taking place in Vienna on the nuclear deal with Iran.

We have a number of distinguished speakers tonight who will address this looming topic that is of great urgency.

Let me begin by yielding to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Trusting that Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, has suddenly had a change of heart in its decades-long quest to obtain a nuclear weapon is just simply naive at best.

Legislation that was signed into law in May would allow Congress to review and vote on any deal that the administration makes with Iran. Those I represent believe Congress should have the final say on any deal, and I couldn't agree more.

America's national security, as well as global security, will be jeopardized if the administration gets this wrong. We must ensure it doesn't. The stakes are simply too high.

If Iran is actually serious about re-engaging with the global community,

they cannot continue to hold American citizens as political prisoners or harass and provoke U.S. Navy ships in international waters.

Iran should stop provoking direct military confrontation, immediately release all detained U.S. citizens, and provide any information it possesses regarding any U.S. citizens that have disappeared within its borders.

The fact that the Iranian regime won't even do these basic actions indicates to me that counting on them to honor commitments they make around a negotiating table can't be taken seriously.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. JOHNSON for his comments. I think he highlighted the basic problems that we have in dealing with a rogue regime like Iran that cannot be trusted, that has not been dealing with us in a straight manner. I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to address this threat as well.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns over the potential deal regarding Iran's nuclear program, and I stand here thanking my colleague from the great State of Florida for putting this Special Order together on such a very important and timely issue.

I want to read a quote:

They will freeze and then dismantle their nuclear program. Our other allies will be better protected. The entire world will be safer as we slow the spread of nuclear weapons. The United States and international inspectors will carefully monitor them to make sure it keeps its commitments.

Sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? That is what President Clinton told the American people about the North Korean nuclear deal in 1994. Today, North Korea has anywhere from 10 to 20 nuclear weapons in their arsenal, and that number is expected to grow to 50 in the next 5 years.

Now, we are hearing this same type of posturing from this administration about the Iran negotiations. The United States seems destined to repeat history, unwilling to hold their ground, and granting Iran extension after extension and concession after concession.

As a strong supporter of increasing sanctions against Iran, which brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place, it is common sense that additional sanctions could even put more pressure on them when they are already hurting from the low price of their most prized commodity, oil.

Nobody believes Iran when they say their nuclear infrastructure is in place for peaceful purposes. If that were the case, they would have no need to enrich uranium past 3.5 percent. Iran has a record filled with lies, deceit, sponsored terrorism, human rights violations, and the list goes on and on.

Just as North Korea couldn't be trusted two decades ago, neither should

Iran today. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear Iran is not only a grave danger to American interests, but to Israel—our strongest ally in the Middle East—and our many allies throughout the world.

Of course, the world would be a much safer place if Iran were to neutralize their nuclear production facilities, if they would allow inspections at any time, if they would disclose all military implications of their nuclear program, or if Iran were to demonstrate a better record on human rights.

□ 2045

Unfortunately, these are just what-ifs that have failed to happen today and I am afraid will never happen under this proposed deal.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. DAVIS, I quite agree with you.

The more we know about this deal, Mr. Speaker, the more we know it is a weak, dangerous, bad deal.

Thank you, Mr. DAVIS, for sharing your insight with us.

I yield to Mr. LANCE of New Jersey, who has long been speaking about the dangers of a nuclear Iran.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida for her magnificent service regarding the foreign policy of this country and her continued expertise that is of benefit to the entire Nation.

In the coming days, the American people and those of us in Congress will be able to scrutinize an anticipated agreement between Iran and the P5+1 countries and Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Congress will debate and consider the administration's proposal, and I will be looking to ensure that any agreement achieves the paramount goal that Iran will never get nuclear weapons.

A nuclear Iran would fundamentally change the international dynamic and put the United States and our allies, including Israel, in extreme peril. The balance of power in the world would slip away from those who have given blood and treasure in the fight for freedom and justice, while rewarding the perpetrators of some of the most heinous crimes against humanity.

The principle of peace through deterrence would be compromised and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty would be a footnote in history as rival and regional powers race to acquire their own nuclear weapons. A nuclear arms race will be yet another element of unpredictability in the world's most volatile region.

I do not oppose any agreement; I oppose a bad agreement. Sanctions brought Iran to the table, and sanctions will keep Iran there. Any deal that needlessly surrenders that valuable leverage in the name of taking Iran's word is a bad agreement. There is simply not the trust that state sponsors of terror will suddenly and uncharacteristically prove to be honest.

As Ronald Reagan famously said, "Trust, but verify." That was true

then; it is as true now as then. It is certainly true regarding Iran.

A successful nuclear agreement must include tangible Iranian concessions. Steps to dismantle its nuclear infrastructure, a commitment to a robust inspections regime, and a cease to its dubious terror-related activities must be included in any agreement.

The entire world will be watching, not only the 315 million people of this country, but certainly the people in the Middle East, which is extremely dangerous.

This matter of great consequence will have far-reaching ramifications, and certainly, I hope that the President, the Secretary of State, and the administration will heed the bipartisan concerns that exist here in Congress.

The President reluctantly signed the legislation that reached his desk. That was an expression of the will of the American people through elected Representatives here and in the other House of Congress, overwhelming in its nature; and certainly, I hope that the President and Secretary of State and the administration will recognize that the American people are deeply concerned about what appears to be the parameters of an agreement.

There is still time to reach a better agreement. Let me repeat, no agreement is superior to a bad agreement, as Prime Minister Netanyahu stated in this Chamber this spring.

I hope that Iran will come meaningfully to the table. I hope that Iran will cease its terrorist activities across the globe. I hope Iran will recognize that, if it were to achieve nuclear weapons, it would be the beginning of a situation with unintended consequences for the Middle East, the most dangerous part of the world; terrible consequences for our friend and ally, a country that believes in democracy, Israel; terrible consequences for other Arab nations, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and places beyond that; and that we want to live in peace with the Iranian people.

The Iranian people are a great people, a talented people, a well-educated people; and certainly, I hope that the people of Iran recognize that it is not in their best interest that their leaders develop nuclear weapons.

Again, I commend with every breath I take the superb work of the gentlewoman from Florida. I am pleased to be able to join with her and with others this evening to caution that we must ensure a strong agreement and, if that is not possible, then no agreement at all.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Mr. LANCE. May it be so; from your words to God's ears, may we get this strong deal that can truly be verified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), my colleague, a man with whom I have had the honor of talking about this issue, the danger that a nuclear Iran imposes for the stability of the world, not just

for Israel, not just for the neighborhood, and not just for the United States.

Thank you, Mr. CURBELO, for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my colleague for her steadfast leadership on this issue, but really on all issues having to do with foreign relations in this Chamber for so many years. She has set the example and a very high bar for all of us who serve in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by reiterating just how serious the security threat Iran is to the United States and to our allies.

As my colleagues have expressed here, Iran can never attain nuclear capabilities. Any deal reached must ensure that the Iranian regime completely abandons its nuclear ambitions and dismantles its nuclear infrastructure.

It is absolutely critical that the Obama administration be unyielding when dealing with Iran. Additional concessions are simply not an option. A weak deal that gives the regime an opening to obtain nuclear weapons down the road is not good for the United States or its allies, especially Israel. It isn't good for the entire world.

Even while nuclear negotiations between the P5+1 and Iran took place, Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei openly supported the destruction of Israel and supported Hamas' attacks against Israel from Gaza. He also boasted Iranian technology was being used by Hamas to attack Israel and openly called for all Palestinians in the West Bank to join Hamas in Gaza in an armed rebellion against Israel, promising to arm those who participated.

We cannot continue to view Iran's nuclear program as existing in a vacuum. It would be irresponsible to ignore the regime's continued support for terrorism, its pursuit of ballistic missiles, and its failure to comply with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Moving forward, several things must be present in an acceptable deal, including a robust inspection regime and the resolution of issues of past and present concern. Only then could a deal even begin to be considered as acceptable.

Snapback sanctions relief could be difficult to implement and is not in the best interests of the United States. We must protect the sanctions infrastructure that this body put in place rather than rely on reactive tactics if the Iranian regime does not comply with the terms of the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to an agreement with Iran, we need to ask ourselves: Does this agreement prevent Iran from achieving nuclear capabilities and keep the United States and its allies safe? Anything other than that is totally unacceptable.

The central question here, Mr. Speaker, is: What kind of a world do we want to live in? What kind of a world

do we want for our children, for our grandchildren, for our families?

A world in which the most radical terrorist regime acquires nuclear weapons—whether it is in 2 years, in 5 years, in 10 years, or in 15 years—is totally unacceptable. This is a government that, again, has pledged to annihilate the only democracy in the Middle East, our best ally in the world, the country that stands with us no matter what, our friends in Israel.

Some in this administration have unjustly criticized Prime Minister Netanyahu. For what? It is for simply wanting his country to survive and his people to live in peace and security.

This is the same government that when the Ayatollah sent their representative—then Mr. Ahmadinejad—to Cuba in 2007, he pledged that, together with Cuba's dictators and the rest of their rogue allies throughout the world, they would bring the United States to its knees. I know my colleague recalls that.

What kind of a world do we want to live in? It is still not too late to walk away from this table and to tell the mullahs that they will never acquire nuclear weapons as long as the United States is the greatest superpower in the world and a beacon for democracy, for peace, and for opportunity for all people.

I, once again, thank my colleague for this special opportunity to highlight an issue that is of vital importance for the entire Nation and for the entire world.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. CURBELO, you certainly have been a leader in this fight.

It is interesting that you should bring up the dangerous clown, Khamenei, because he has been replaced by an equally murderous, sadistic thug, Rouhani; but now, the international community likes to call him the "moderate" leader, where they have had more executions in Iran under the so-called moderate than ever.

The "Death to America," "Death to Israel" chants continue, just as they continued during Ahmadinejad's time. Whether it is Ahmadinejad, whether it is a moderate Rouhani, it is a Supreme Leader who calls the shots.

Nothing in Iran, sadly, has changed. They are calling for the destruction of our ally, and they are calling for destruction of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, who was chairwoman when I was on the Foreign Affairs Committee. She has stepped up and always been a voice, especially in this area. I also want to thank Mr. CURBELO and also Mr. DAVIS.

For a moment, I want to just stop here, and let's put some things in perspective. It has been said over and over—but we are going to talk about this—a bad deal is worse than no deal. I am going to say it again. A bad deal is worse than no deal.

A deal the U.S. and the rest of the international community can accept should be one in which Iran is no longer a nuclear threat. At what point did we forget this, Mr. President? At what point did we lay down and decide that a nuclear Iran, if it is 20 years from now, is better than what a nuclear Iran is now? Mr. President, you have got to listen to what you are saying.

Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu explained to President Obama that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action "threatens the survival of the State of Israel." It threatens the survival of the State of Israel.

I believe that Congress should not be party to any agreement that fails to protect the vital interest of Israel and other allies in the region. That is why I voted "no" on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

I am not in disagreement with Congress providing oversight of a final comprehensive deal, but a horrible deal isn't something Congress should even have to consider.

I have previously stated and will say again that I have always made the security of our strongest ally in the Middle East a priority and will not support any deal that allows Iran the opportunity to develop a nuclear weapon.

Though a final deal has not been yet announced, we know, based off the details of the JCPOA announced in April, of the potential for a bad deal. Under the framework announced in April, Iran will be able to maintain over 6,000 centrifuges they possess. Of the 6,000 centrifuges, 5,000 of those will continue to enrich uranium.

□ 2100

Five thousand, what part of not having a nuclear Iran are we kidding ourselves here with?

And then his wonderful snap back provisions. I am one of those that said we shouldn't have a snap back. They should have never gone away in the process.

Why are we talking about snap back provisions when this body has clearly spoken that the sanctions should stay and, if anything, they should get tighter? But we are now talking about snap back provisions. What a world we live in.

If they don't fulfill their commitment, sanctions will magically snap back. When I read that, it just amazes me, Mr. Speaker, that if they don't keep their commitments—why do we believe they are going to keep any commitments?

This is just an amazing thought to me. It took several years of U.S. pressuring for our European allies before they started seriously enforcing the U.N. Security Council sanctions currently in place.

While a U.S. President can unilaterally reinstitute sanctions that were previously waived, the European Union has to receive support from all 28 members for reimposition of former sanctions. Think about that. That is something we ought to talk about.

A similar scenario could be observed at the U.N. Security Council. A unanimous vote by all 15 U.S. Security Council members in the affirmative would be needed for sanctions to be put back in place.

How many of us in this room tonight, and how many of you who may be thinking about this, actually believe that will actually happen? Do you believe that would? I don't.

China and Russia, both permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, have the most to gain from having unfettered access to Iranian markets. It has been widely reported that Russia is moving forward with the selling of S-300s, the anti-aircraft weapon, to Iran. Such a weapon system makes the potential for Israeli or American airstrikes against Iranian nukes just that much more difficult to carry out.

Russia, whose own economy is hurting as a result of the sanctions, is looking to diversify its investments in other economies that show strong potential for growth. China is always looking for new sources of energy, and with the elimination of international sanctions, Iran will have the ability to sell more oil on the international market.

Then there is the issue of possible military dimensions. To receive an accurate picture of Iran's nuclear capabilities, it is imperative to know how close they got to developing or have gotten to developing a nuclear weapon. It is only after we can determine if Iran ever developed a nuclear warhead or triggering mechanism that the international community can actually know Iran's breakout time. Iran's PMDs must be made known to the international community prior—to any permanent sanction relief being instituted.

You know, this pending bad deal makes the region and the greater national community worse off.

What I have heard in this Chamber tonight is very disturbing. What I have heard from leaders in this administration is even more disturbing. They have willingly determined, in my mind, to throw Israel under the bus and, I believe, maybe for a peace prize.

Mr. Kerry, maybe you didn't make a mark in the Senate. Mr. Kerry, maybe you didn't make a mark as Secretary of State. Maybe you are looking for a peace prize. Your peace prize should be come home now and walk away from a bad deal. If you want to be recognized in the world for standing up for what is right, then walk away from a bad deal.

No one wants Iran to have a nuclear weapon. They are not capable of handling one. They are the biggest suppliers to terrorism around the world. And yet we are talking about talking to a country that says just recently, just in the last 2 days, their leader has said it is now time for us to spout hatred at the Zionists.

And we are negotiating with them?

They don't want to say Israel has even a right to exist, and we are sitting

at the table with them? We want to let 5,000 centrifuges keep spinning and keep spinning and keep spinning and keep spinning, and we are going to negotiate with them?

You do not negotiate with unstable people, Mr. Speaker. You negotiate with people who want to live in the bonds of a civil society, in a civil world, and Iran's leadership is not that person.

We are fooling ourselves. This administration has become just completely tunnel-visioned toward legacy. When you have a domestic agenda that has been as terrible as this administration, I don't blame you for looking overseas. But your domestic agenda is no comparison to the failure of a foreign policy, when world leaders ask what is America's role because they don't even know.

Tonight I hope the crescendo of voices in this Chamber reaches across the ocean to Vienna. The last words I would like Secretary Kerry to hear before he sits down with the Iranians are "a bad deal is worse than no deal."

"Death to America," not shouted on the streets here in Washington, not shouted on the streets in New York City or San Francisco or Atlanta. It was shouted in the Parliament of Iran just recently, when they said we are not going to allow inspections. And we are sitting down to negotiate with them?

"Death to America"? And we are sitting down negotiating with them as if they are reasonable people?

Have we lost our focus? Have we lost our vision of being the shining light to the world for freedom and hope, and decided that it is much better off, maybe for our political world, or maybe our personal achievements, to sit down with a government that says Israel should not even have the right to exist, and if we could, we would annihilate them tomorrow?

We are going to continue funding those who have lobbed bombs on innocent men and women in Israel and who will sit down at a negotiating table and say: We are not going to allow you to inspect wherever you want; we are going to keep what we want to keep.

And, by the way, even the administration's own belief is we are going to keep 5,000 spinning, centrifuges spinning, 5,000 spinning.

You know what? Some have said time is Iran's friend. I agree. As long as they can keep our Secretary of State at that table, those centrifuges spin. As long as they keep us tied up debating this in this administration, the centrifuges spin. As long as we keep doing this, the centrifuges spin.

It is time to put sanctions back in place because they are spinning. It is time to tighten the screws on Iran because those centrifuges are spinning. It is time for us not to let up because the centrifuges are spinning.

And I do not want to see a world in which my children grow up and the people in Israel grow up knowing that

Iran has a bomb when they are ready to take them out in a certain notice.

Tonight is important. Tonight is important.

Mr. President, I pray that you listen. I don't think you will.

Mr. Secretary, maybe you are looking for a peace prize. How about winning a prize in the hearts of the freedom-loving people all across the world and walking away from a bad deal?

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Mr. COLLINS. I think you laid it out in a thoughtful manner. No deal is better than a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on this important issue, your leadership with America's foreign policy. I know that my constituents all the way up in New York are more secure and free due to your work through the years here in the Halls of Congress. I thank you for your leadership.

This past weekend we celebrated the Fourth of July, 239 years since America declared its independence. What makes America great is what we stand for: freedom and liberty.

And then there is Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terror, a nation overthrowing foreign governments, unjustly imprisoning United States citizens, including a United States Marine.

Iran blows up mock U.S. warships, develops ICBMs. They pledge to wipe Israel off the map. And in their streets, in their halls, they are chanting, "Death to America."

And none of what I just described is even part of the negotiations. Think about that.

The President says the only alternative to whatever deal he presents us with is war. I reject that. The deal the President is finalizing may actually pave the path to more instability in the Middle East and a nuclear arms race triggered in the region.

Will the agreement be accurately translated between both languages?

If the President presents Americans with a version in English and the Iranians are interpreting any different terms refuting our interpretation of that agreement in English, then there is no agreement. There is no meeting of the minds.

Will Iran continue spinning centrifuges, enriching uranium and maintaining any of their nuclear infrastructure?

Will weapons inspectors have unfettered access to Iran's nuclear infrastructure? Honestly, I doubt it.

I believe that we are propping up the wrong regime in Iran.

Six years ago, the Green Revolution, millions of Iranians took to the streets protesting after an undemocratic election. The economy in Iran was doing better at that time than it is today. Oil, twice the value as today.

The President said that what was going on in Iran was none of our business, and look where we are today.

I unapologetically love my country, and I am proud to be an American. As elected officials who took an oath to protect and defend our Constitution, we have a responsibility to protect our country.

We must fight on behalf of our great Nation, which generations before us have fought and sacrificed so much to protect. And that is how we celebrate another 239 years of American exceptionalism.

The President, when sitting down at the negotiating table, inherits the goodwill of generations, centuries of men and women who have come before them that sacrificed so much to make America the greatest Nation in the world. When someone says they want to run to be President of the United States, with that, you inherit all of that goodwill, all of that American exceptionalism.

And when sitting at the table, you have no business trying to equalize yourself with the person you are negotiating with. That isn't your goodwill to expend.

It is important for American greatness to grow. And I am concerned that we are on pace to enter into a bad deal with Iran.

Here, with the leadership of colleagues like the gentlewoman from Florida, who I am very grateful for putting together this Special Order tonight, and other colleagues, like the gentleman from Florida, who will be speaking right after me, there is so much passion amongst my colleagues for wanting to do the right thing to protect our Nation, understanding that it is a fundamental basic that the United States strengthens our relationships with our allies and treats our enemies for exactly who they are.

I used the analogy a couple of weeks ago of playing Texas Hold'em, and the President inherits pocket aces every time he sits down at the table. The Iranians may inherit the 7-2 off suit, the worst hand that you could possibly have in poker.

The President, for whatever reason, as a negotiating style, will offer to switch hands. We saw it in Cuba, where dozens of good-faith concessions were made asking for nothing in return. Why is that?

For one, the President isn't a very good negotiator. He still has a year and a half left on his second term in office, and I want him to strengthen his hand. He has it. He inherits it. That is what comes with being the President of the United States. That is what he signed up for.

And what did we sign up for here in the Halls of Congress? To hold this President's feet to the fire if he chooses to sign a bad deal with Iran.

I thank, again, the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership. I am looking forward to hearing Mr. YOHO and his passionate words to follow.

And I would encourage the President and Secretary Kerry, the leaders of the Obama administration, to do the right thing. Take a walk, strengthen your hand, and don't sell out America's goodwill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Florida, Dr. YOHO.

□ 2115

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my very dear colleague from Florida for bringing this very important topic to light. This is something the American people need to weigh in on; and this is something, as you heard the passion tonight, the people talking about how this is not a good deal. This is not a good deal for anybody but Iran.

I would like to do a chronological anthology of Iran's nuclear weapons program. If you go back 30 years ago, they were working on gaining the technology and the material to develop nuclear weapons.

John Bolton, in his book "Surrender is Not an Option," talked about the cat-and-mouse game that Iran had played over the last 30 years of saying, No, we are not developing nuclear weapons; and they wouldn't allow the inspectors in.

The U.N. had resolutions and sanctions, and eventually, the IAEA inspectors—the International Atomic Energy Agency—was allowed to come in. They caught Iran redhanded, developing nuclear weapons.

They apologized. They said: I am sorry. You are right. We were bad. We are not going to do it again.

Then it started over again and then over again and over again. For 30 years, we have been playing the cat-and-mouse game. It hasn't gone away. Their mission is to get nuclear weapons.

When I look at George Bush, when he put sanctions in the 2000s on Iran to say enough is enough, the sanctions were in place, and they started. To President Obama's credit, he tightened them up, and it put more pressure on Iran, and then it brought them to the negotiation table.

When you negotiate on a deal—any deal—there should be mutual benefits to both sides. At the end of this, you will see there is no benefit to America, to the Middle East, and to world peace because, when those negotiations started, as my colleague from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) brought up, there was no negotiation to release our four American hostages.

If you think that the sanctions were bad enough to put Iran in this great economic tragedy or pressure that was just crippling Iran and they couldn't do anything and they came to the table to release the sanctions so that they could move on, but during that time period—this is what the American people need to know—during that time period, Iran was extending their arm and

their reach into the Western Hemisphere through Bolivia, through Venezuela; and they were funding their terrorist arm, Hezbollah, that caused two terrorist attacks in Argentina in the nineties that was responsible for over 100 deaths and over 300 injured people—Iran was doing this at the time when the sanctions were on them, and they were supposed to be under this great economic stress—but they were doing that because they were funneling money through Venezuela and getting money for fuel plus armaments that they were selling. During this time, when we think our sanctions are working, Iran is working against us.

I have been here in the House for 2½ years, and I sit on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During those 2½ years, we have had experts come in, over and over again, telling us about the threat of Iran creating new clear weapons.

Over and over again, they said that Iran would have enough nuclear-enriched material to have enough material within 6 months to a year to have five to six atomic bombs. That was over 2 years ago, so one could only reasonably expect that Iran has enough material for five to six nuclear bombs.

This was backed up by Henry Kissinger and George Shultz in The Wall Street Journal editorial about 3 months ago, that they claim that Iran was about 2½ months to 3 months from having nuclear material.

Then we moved down to the negotiation. The negotiation was started—if people will go back and research the news—from the administration, from John Kerry. He said negotiations have started and that the whole purpose was Iran cannot and will not be permitted to have a nuclear weapon. Now, we are just going to delay them for 10 years.

As my colleague from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) brought up, the snapback, if they break any part of this deal, there is going to be snapback. I mean, you have got to be from another planet to think that that is going to happen because we are going to rely on China and Russia to say: Yes, we are with you.

Russia has already sold \$800 million worth of antimissile defense systems. In addition, during this period, when Iran had all these tough sanctions blocking their economy, Iran has been developing an ICBM program.

An ICBM program stands for an intercontinental ballistic missile system. That is not for their neighbors. That is for Europe. That is for the United States. It is for people way outside of Iran. They have done this with the economic sanctions.

In addition, there is evidence that they have detonated a trigger device for a nuclear weapon. They have gone through expensive remediation, covering up the site, covering up the soil, paving it, and not allowing our inspectors to go in there and inspect that—the IAEA inspectors that we are supposed to depend on to prove that what they are doing is for peaceful purposes.

Then I look at what Iran has done over the years, when we have been in the Middle East, with our brave young men and women in the Middle East, fighting for security for this country and for the neighbors in the Middle East. Seventy percent of the wounds to our soldiers have come from IEDs. Ninety percent of those IEDs were created by Iran.

Then, as we talked about in this nuclear negotiation, Iran has got to be limited to the amount of centrifuges for their peaceful nuclear program.

Now, get this, for a peaceful nuclear program, you need tens of thousands of centrifuges to produce nuclear material to run nuclear reactors; yet, in this deal, we are only limiting them to 5,000 centrifuges. You only need a few thousand centrifuges to create nuclear weapons. It just doesn't match up.

As we talked about, in a negotiation, there should be a mutual benefit. I see no benefit for America.

Again, talking to the experts in Foreign Affairs, I asked them this question: With our negotiation with Iran, where we have given into everything and we have got nothing—keep in mind, we are supposedly the lone superpower of the world—when you go into a negotiation like this and you are operating from a level of weakness and not strength, how does that affect us around the world community?

The experts told me that it has weakened America's standing in the world. It has weakened our negotiation power in the world. It has weakened and threatened our security in the Western Hemisphere.

I agree with Mr. COLLINS. I hope the President is listening, but I am sure he is not; I hope Mr. Kerry is listening, but I am sure he is not, but I hope this message gets to them—that, if they are going to negotiate for America, they should negotiate from a point of strength, a point for what is right, not just for our country, but for the Middle East and for the rest of the world because, if America is not strong and if we do not stand strong, there is not a secure world.

I thank my colleague from Florida for bringing this up because this is a debate the American people need to hear. I hope they put pressure on the people in charge of this and bring this negotiation—as they have said over and over again, a bad deal they will not stand for—this is a bad deal, and this is something they need to walk away from.

We, in the House of Representatives, need to block this in any way that we can. I will not, I shall not, and I cannot support this because what I see is we are trying to prevent that which we can't, instead of preparing for that which will be.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank you, Dr. YOHO, and I think you laid out the chronology of the long timetable of the deceit that Iran has been dealing with in terms of their nuclear program.

I thank all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, who joined tonight's Special

Order to discuss Iran's nuclear negotiations that are going on in Vienna as we speak. After missing deadline after deadline and allowing for extension after extension, we are now hearing that these negotiations may be open-ended.

It is our job in Congress to conduct proper oversight on any proposed deal and to reject any deal that is not in the best interests of our national security or the security and stability of the entire region.

As current law stipulates, if a deal is submitted for congressional review before tomorrow, then Congress only has a 30-day review period. However, if this deal is submitted after tomorrow, we will have 60 days to review the terms of the agreement.

Why should the administration fear an additional 30 days of review? If this deal is so good, as the administration keeps telling us, then it should be strong enough to stand up to congressional review and congressional scrutiny; but the administration knows just how weak this deal will be.

Mr. Speaker, let's review, as my colleagues have done, how far back we have slid from conditions that we placed on Iran when we started and how much the P5+1 countries have caved through its concessions to this rogue and dangerous regime.

Let's start with this: there are six United Nations Security Council resolutions against Iran and its nuclear program. Each one of those resolutions puts restrictions on Iran and calls for a complete stop on uranium enrichment, a complete stop.

The Supreme Leader argued that it had a right to enrich under the non-proliferation treaty, the NPT, to which it is a signatory, but of course, all of these alleged rights should have been forfeited once it was discovered that Iran had been in violation of the non-proliferation treaty and other international obligations for decades because it has been operating a covert nuclear program; yet the P5+1 countries inexplicably ceded the so-called right to Iran.

In fact, in 2009, the President clearly stated: "Iran must comply with U.N. Security Council resolutions and make clear it is willing to meet its responsibilities as a member of the community of nations."

That ended up not being true, as the President has caved on that commitment. The President has repeatedly stated in the past that Iran doesn't need to have a fortified underground facility in Fordo, a heavy water reactor in Arak, or some of the other advanced centrifuges that they currently possess in order to have a peaceful nuclear program; yet where are we now?

Well, Iran will maintain Fordo and its capacity to produce and store heavy water while continuing to not just operate advanced centrifuges, Mr. Speaker, but to also test and conduct research and development on them as well—how far we have moved those goalposts.

There is also a serious and dangerous issue of the possible military dimensions, PMD, and Iran's past nuclear activity.

Just 3 weeks ago, Secretary Kerry confirmed what we long suspected, that disclosure of past nuclear activity is no longer a must-have for this administration in this nuclear deal.

How would any agreement that doesn't demand that Iran at least come clean about the extent of its program going to be a good deal, Mr. Speaker? Don't forget that the Supreme Leader has also repeatedly stated that Iran's military sites would not be accessible to international inspectors.

Let's not forget one of the most important things here, the ultimate gift we have given Iran. This deal will help legitimize this rogue regime that will not only allow Iran to be viewed as a responsible nation, but it is no longer going to be the pariah state. We are going to say it is a trusted member of the international community, and we have done that. We have granted that legitimacy with these conversations.

Also, the reports indicate—and I don't hear any words to the contrary—that Iran may receive a \$50 billion signing bonus, as if this is the NFL draft, a signing bonus which it will then use to support terror, which it will use to foment instability, which it will use to stoke sectarian tensions, which it will use to continue to threaten Israel, which it will continue to undermine U.S. national security interests.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, that is what their signing bonus will do. That is what sanctions relief will do. If the United States is willing to overlook all of these transgressions, all of these crimes, and negotiate a deal with Iran without pressing for changes in its actions, then it will be seen as an endorsement of those actions.

Mr. Speaker, we have every indication that we are not going to get what any of us would remotely consider to be even a halfway good deal. The requirements for a good deal went out the window when the negotiators allowed Iran to maintain its entire nuclear infrastructure and continue to enrich uranium.

It is our obligation, then, to conduct our proper oversight and review and reject any nuclear deal that we feel is not in the best interests of our U.S. national security. If we do that, we must move swiftly to reimpose any sanctions that have been suspended, any sanctions that have been waived against the regime, and to ensure that all sanctions are fully and vigorously enforced. Then we must move to enact additional sanctions on the regime until it meets its international obligations and abandons its pursuit of an illicit nuclear weapons program. Once upon a time, that was the goal.

From the very beginning, Mr. Speaker, I have been saying that Iran is following the North Korean playbook: offering to negotiate in return for concessions but never delivering on anything tangible, only to break off when they no longer need what we have been giving them.

I wrote this op-ed on October 19, 2012, "Ros-Lehtinen: Obama Still Trying to Sweet-Talk Iran Out of Building the Bomb," and I was talking about the North Korea deal and how that dovetails with the Iranian deal. I wrote of the dangers of the Obama administration's naive view that if we keep talking, if we keep engaging with this rogue regime, then Iran will stop its drive for nuclear capability.

I stated then, and I believe now, that this is what we are witnessing today, Mr. Speaker, that the Iranians will give the impression that a deal will be likely only to then pull away, that Iran benefits from dragging out the negotiations as long as possible because, as Mr. COLLINS of Georgia said, the centrifuges are still spinning, and they want to provide its nuclear program extra time in order to convince the world that an agreement is possible, leaving the administration and the EU to quietly ease sanctions enough to revive the stagnant Iranian economy that had been on the brink of collapse thanks to the sanctions that Congress placed on them; because that was the intent and the purpose and the objective of the sanctions, not to get them to negotiate, but to collapse their economy so that they could not pour money into their terrorist activities and their covert nuclear program.

But what we are seeing now is the administration and other P5+1 countries will allow the terms of the JPOA and, thus, the easing of sanctions to continue to be in place despite having overextended several deadlines. Iran never had any intention of coming to a real agreement, and we would be foolhardy to believe that it does now, not when it is already getting everything it wants. Why should they concede anything now?

Mr. Speaker, the only way that Iran will say yes to a deal is if it is so bad and so weak that Iran would be stupid and silly to walk away from it. Yet that is precisely what we are looking at right now, Mr. Speaker. Either Iran keeps dangling an agreement in front of the P5+1 and continues to get more sanctions relief, or the P5+1 completely and utterly capitulates to Iranian demands.

So it is incumbent upon us, Mr. Speaker, to reject any deal that we view to be weak, any deal that we perceive to be a bad deal, any deal that is not in the interests of our U.S. national security interests.

We must also continue to push back on this false binary notion that tells you that it is either this deal—no matter how bad it is—or going to war. That has been a fundamental misunderstanding of the purpose of the Iranian

sanctions themselves. The fact that some believe that Iranian sanctions were designed only to get Iran to the negotiation table could not be further from the truth. The Iranian sanctions were designed to force the region to abandon completely its nuclear weapons ambitions, to give up its enrichment, and to dismantle its nuclear program.

I should know, Mr. Speaker, because I am the author of several Iran sanctions bills, including the toughest set of sanctions against this terrible regime that are currently on the books right now. Sanctions, I might remind my colleagues and the American people, that the Obama administration fought us every step of the way or until it was clear that the administration could not stop our sanctions from becoming law, and then they said, Okay, we will accept them. So there is an alternative to these misguided talks.

That is how I am going to conclude my Special Order tonight, Mr. Speaker. We must abandon these talks that are just patently a farce. We immediately reinstate all sanctions against Iran that have been eased, that have been waived, that have been lifted, and that have been ignored by the Obama administration and enact even tougher sanctions on the regime.

We were on the brink until Iran received the lifeline that it needed. We gave it to them, and now we are the ones dangling on it as Iran's economy is being brought back to life because of sanctions relief, and the regime has been gaining concession after concession while never once making any change that would substantially and significantly set back its nuclear ambitions.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the end, I will conclude with this: Reinstating and strengthening these sanctions, coupled with the credible threat that all options are on the table, including the military option, could act as the deterrent, but only if Iran recognizes that we are in a position of strength. That is why it is important that this body speak up. That is why it is important that we reject any deal we find to be insufficient, but we must also not let billions of dollars flow to the Iranian regime. We must start passing legislation that would impose tougher sanctions.

This is a matter of utmost concern to our national security. I urge my colleagues to remain engaged on this issue.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for July 7 and today on account of a family obligation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill

of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 91. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 9, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2062. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Beef From a Region in Argentina [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0032] (RIN: 0579-AD92) received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2063. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Beef From a Region in Brazil [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0017] (RIN: 0579-AD41) received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2064. A letter from the Program Manager, BioPreferred Program, Office of Procurement and Property Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0599-AA23) received July 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2065. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Prohibition on Contracting with Inverted Domestic Corporations — Representation and Notification [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2015-006; Item II; Docket No.: 2015-0006, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM85) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2066. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Prohibition on Contracting with Inverted Domestic Corporations [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2014-017; Item V; ; Docket No.: 2014-0017, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM70) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2067. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Defining Larger Participants of the Automobile Financing Market and Defining Certain Automobile Leasing Activity as a Financial Product or Service [Docket No.:

CFPB-2014-0024] (RIN: 3170-AA46) received July 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2068. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maine: Alna, Town of Lincoln County [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8387] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2069. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 35th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (the Age Act) for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to Sec. 308(b) of the Age Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2070. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received July 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2071. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Conventional Ovens [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-TP-0013] (RIN: 1904-AC71) received July 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2072. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Review of Federal Drug Regulations with Regard to Medical Gases", pursuant to Sec. 1112(a)(2) of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act of 2012, Pub. L. 112-144; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2073. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of General Safety Test Regulations That Are Duplicative of Requirements in Biologics License Applications [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-1110] received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2074. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs): Revisions to Manifesting Regulations; Item Number [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2011-0524; FRL-9929-92-OSWER] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2075. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0649; FRL-9928-93] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2076. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Feather

River Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0164; FRL-9927-76-Region 9] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2077. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0037; FRL-9928-50-Region 9] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2078. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — S-metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0284; FRL-9927-85] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2079. 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; Nebraska; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0106; FRL-9926-49-Region 7] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2080. 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; Kansas; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0104; FRL-9926-48-Region 7] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2081. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Mineral Wool Production and Wool Fiberglass Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-1041 and EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-1042; FRL-9928-71-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ90) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2082. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revised Exhibit Submission Requirements for Commission Hearings [Docket No.: RM15-5-000; Order No.: 811] received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2083. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department of Defense's intent to sign the agreement between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the Kingdom of Spain for Research, Development, Test, Evaluation, and Prototyping Projects, pursuant to Sec. 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 01-15; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2084. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding commitments in the Joint Plan of Action, pursuant

to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 Secs. 1245(d)(5) and 1245(d)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2085. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-114; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2086. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Venezuela Sanctions Regulations received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2087. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas 2014 management report and financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2088. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2089. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's small entity compliance guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-83; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051; Sequence No.: 3] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2090. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-83; Item VII; Docket No.: 2015-0052, Sequence No.: 2] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2091. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Permanent Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Certain Commercial Items [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2015-010; Item VI; Docket No.: 2015-0010, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN06) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2092. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Clarification on Justification for Urgent Noncompetitive Awards Exceeding One Year [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2014-020; Item IV; Docket No.: 2014-0020, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM86) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2093. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Update to Product and Service Codes [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2015-008; Item III; Docket No.: 2015-0008, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN08) received July

2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2094. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-83; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051; Sequence No.: 3] received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2095. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds [FAC 2005-83; FAR Case 2014-022; Item I; Docket No.: 2014-0022, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM80) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2096. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's report on Federal agencies' use of the physicians' comparability allowance program, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5948(j) and Executive Order 12109; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2097. A letter from the Chairwoman, Vice Chair, and Commissioner, United States Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the 2014 Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS) Comprehensive Report; to the Committee on House Administration.

2098. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA FAR Supplement Regulatory Review No. 3 (RIN: 2700-AE19) received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2099. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Clarifications to the Requirement in the Treasury Regulations Under Sec. 501(r)(4) that a Hospital Facility's Financial Assistance Policy Include a List of Providers [Notice 2015-46] received July 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2100. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge [Docket No.: SSA-2015-0010] (RIN: 0960-AH75) received July 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Plan for Expanding Data in the Annual Comprehensive Error Rate Testing (CERT) Report", pursuant to Sec. 517 of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114-10; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2102. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "The Medicare Secondary Payer Com-

mmercial Repayment Center in Fiscal Year 2014", pursuant to Sec. 1893(h) of the Social Security Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 350. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century cures, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-193). 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. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2962. A bill to provide greater access to higher education for America's students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KIND, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2963. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2964. A bill to provide for enhanced Federal, State, and local assistance in the enforcement of the immigration laws, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to authorize appropriations to carry out the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan):

H.R. 2965. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide certain exceptions to the maintenance of effort requirement for local educational agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the purposes of TANF to include reducing poverty by increasing employment entry, retention, and advancement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2967. A bill to develop a database of projects that are proven or promising in terms of moving welfare recipients into work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2968. A bill to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to provide coordinated case management services for TANF recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 2969. A bill to eliminate the separate participation rate for 2-parent families receiving TANF assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KIND (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 2970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on domestic manufacturing income to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 2971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to bring certainty to the funding of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DeLAURO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BASS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California,

Mr. KILMER, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 2972. A bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every woman, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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 Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require for purposes of education tax credit that the student be lawfully present and that the taxpayer provide the social security number of the student and the employer identification number of the educational institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 2974. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to increase the duration of follow-up care provided under the Veterans Choice Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2975. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs repays the misused benefits of veterans with fiduciaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FARR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BERA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2976. A bill to replace references to "wives" and "husbands" in Federal law with references to "spouses", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 2977. A bill to ensure the privacy and security of sensitive personal information, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to provide notice of security breaches involving sensitive personal information, and to enhance law enforcement assistance and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR,

Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 2978. A bill to require the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Sesquicentennial Anniversary of the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which officially marked the abolishment of slavery in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 2979. A bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 2980. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 400th anniversary of arrival of the Pilgrims; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 2981. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that congressional testimony by Department of Veterans Affairs employees is official duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 2982. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to modify premium charges and the dollar amount limitation on loans for financing alterations, repairs, and improvements to, or conversion of, existing structures, including energy efficiency or water conserving home improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. LEE, Mr. BERA, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 2983. A bill to provide drought assistance and improved water supply reliability to the State of California, other western

States, and the Nation; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, 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. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2984. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide that any inaction by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that allows a rate change to go into effect shall be treated as an order by the Commission for purposes of rehearing and court review; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2985. A bill to require Federal law enforcement agencies to report to Congress serious crimes, authorized as well as unauthorized, committed by their confidential informants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2986. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to certain tort claims arising out of the criminal misconduct of confidential informants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 2987. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to clarify the treatment of certain debt and equity instruments of smaller institutions for purposes of capital requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2988. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a grant program to fund additional school social workers and retain school social workers already employed in high-need local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. LEE, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 2989. A bill to encourage the warring parties of South Sudan to resolve their conflict peacefully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H. Res. 349. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Family, Career and Community Leaders of America; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. REICHERT, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H. Res. 351. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding hydroelectric power; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 352. A resolution expressing support for the designation of a "Prisoners of Conscience Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FARR, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 353. A resolution honoring the accomplishments and legacy of Juan Felipe Herrera; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 "necessary and proper" clause.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 2965.

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;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 2966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 2969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 2971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2972.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution and section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

The Congress shall have Power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the authority to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;"

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 2981.

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. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 office thereof.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare, and to regulate commerce among the states.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 2987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I Section 8 of the U.S. 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 Governance of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof." Under Article 1 Section 8 clauses 2 and 5 of the Constitution, Congress possesses the authority to "borrow Money on the credit of the United States," and "coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standards of weights and measures". Given the Congressional authorities enumerated above, I submit the attached legislation.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—to regulate commerce with foreign nations, & among the several states, and with indian tribes; to make all laws which shall be necessary & proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers—

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 167: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 169: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 210: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 213: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 251: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 291: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 318: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 320: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 348: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 353: Mr. PERRY and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 423: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 456: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 465: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 508: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 510: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 540: Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 556: Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 602: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 625: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 680: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 692: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTI, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 699: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 700: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 703: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 704: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 748: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 767: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 768: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 771: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 785: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 799: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 824: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 840: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 842: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 879: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 885: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 953: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 969: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 985: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 986: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 997: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1002: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1027: Mr. COHEN and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1086: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1087: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1089: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1094: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS

of Illinois, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1100: Mr. WALKER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1112: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1130: Mr. HONDA and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1148: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1174: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1178: Mr. WELCH, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1197: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1215: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1270: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1288: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1299: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1301: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1378: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1427: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1448: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1475: Mr. GIBSON and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1478: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1479: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1528: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1559: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1600: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1604: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1610: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1625: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1627: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1655: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1671: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1683: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1684: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1686: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1688: Mr. KILDEE and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1717: Mr. NADLER, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1733: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1737: Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1814: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ESTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1836: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1853: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 1861: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1884: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1921: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1926: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1942: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1969: Mrs. BUSTOS and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1977: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1986: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2005: Mr. TITUS.

H.R. 2009: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2016: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2030: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2041: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2083: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2110: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2130: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 2138: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 2221: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 2259: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 2285: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2287: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2293: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2302: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2304: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2315: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 2335: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2342: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2355: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2361: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2398: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2403: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2404: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2407: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BARR, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2410: Ms. ADAMS and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2429: Ms. LEE, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2441: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2449: Mr. KEATING, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2450: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2466: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2500: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2520: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2521: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2526: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2551: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 2557: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2590: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2604: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2606: Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 2610: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2646: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BERA, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2653: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. FOX.

H.R. 2654: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2658: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2659: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2675: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 2698: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2713: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2742: Mr. POCAN and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2749: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2752: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2769: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 2799: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2800: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 2802: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2805: Mr. CARNEY and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2811: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2815: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 2817: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2824: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2849: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2850: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2863: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2866: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2867: Mr. POLIS, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2878: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 2903: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2905: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2909: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2920: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2937: Mr. KATKO, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2941: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. BOSTANY.
H.J. Res. 14: Mr. BRAT.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. NEAL and Mr. POLIS.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. GRIF-FITH.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BASS, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 50: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 57: Ms. ESTY.
H. Res. 24: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 112: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 235: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Res. 282: Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 293: Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 294: Mr. SIRES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 310: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 337: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H. Res. 344: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.