

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5485, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5485.

Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1439

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. RIBBLE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 7, 2016, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 25, printed in House Report 114-639, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) had been postponed.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a new regulatory action for which the aggregate costs of State, local, and tribal government compliance or private sector compliance, as estimated under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform

Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532), will be \$100,000,000 or more.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that deals with an issue that quite often comes up on this floor. It is an issue about regulation and overregulation. What this amendment would do is prohibit the administration from using any of these funds to implement a rule that would cost the economy \$100 million more. This is kind of like the REINS Act, but the rule doesn't come back for a vote; it is just prohibited.

The reason is there have been so many new rules and regulations that our economy is having a hard time keeping up. Just last year alone, there were 3,400 new rules—administrative rules, not from Congress, but these are from agencies. There were 80,000-plus pages of rules and regulations last year alone, and over half a million regulation pages over this President's administration.

This is having a real impact on the American economy. We have businesses that are having a more difficult time accessing loans to expand their businesses, to grow their innovation, to invest in innovation and create good-paying jobs within our communities. We have an increased cost of financing business expansions and home financing because of the compliance cost of our whole financial sector.

The costs have increased so much because the rules are now so complex and so many that it is trickling down to the business community and to our families. It is impacting our economy.

So I think it is time. At least right now, for a year, in this funding bill, let's take a pause. Let's just take a break on all the regulation. Let's stop, let's review, and then we can have a discussion about how we move forward. But this is a pause on the big regulation.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

It is a surprise to the gentleman that we still have 6 months to go in this Congress and in this administration.

This amendment would limit the administration's ability to propose or finalize important rules or regulations.

The administration issues rules because Congress has conveyed a specific responsibility to them. Rather than enact every contingency into law, we rely on public comment and technical advice to make sure the laws are implemented efficiently.

Taking a myopic view of our Nation's regulatory practices is nothing new for the majority. Time and time again we have seen appropriations riders and authorizing legislation that only looks at the costs associated with agency rules and completely ignores the associated benefits. This amendment is no different.

These proposals overlook the extensive review process that already exists for rules. For example, every new rule is already scrutinized up and down by numerous Federal agencies as well as key stakeholders and the public. For economically significant rules, an agency must provide the Office of Management and Budget with an assessment and, to the extent possible, a quantification of the benefits and costs of the proposed rule.

In accordance with Executive Order 12866, the agency has to justify the costs associated with the rule, and these costs are justified with benefits—something this amendment appears to think don't exist. But that is just false. For example, in its 2015 analysis of the estimated cost and benefits of significant Federal regulations, OMB estimated that, over the last decade, the benefits of these rules outweighed the economic costs by up to 9 to 1.

This amendment would upend years of precedent and could prohibit agencies from revising rules and regulations in response to changes in technology, the economy, or public demand.

Republicans should stop trying to undermine the rulemaking process and should stop ignoring the real-world benefits of these rules to society.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment very strongly, and I urge a "nay" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), our chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this, and thank the gentleman for bringing this before the House.

We have an administration that just loves to regulate. They love to regulate. They have rules for everything. They have no regard for the cost of the regulations. Small businesses, governments, and States are all hard pressed to do all this stuff. The administration tries to sidestep us by going through executive orders and Presidential memorandums.

All this amendment does is force the administration to seek congressional approval on the most significant of the new regulations.

It is a great amendment, and I urge all the Members to support it.

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that my good friend across the aisle talks about the great review process that we have by Federal agencies. These are the faceless, nameless

bureaucrats who make rules that have huge impacts on our families, on our businesses, and on our economy.

I don't know about you, but people come to me and say: There is a horrible rule. Could you help me out, my Member of Congress? What I do is I write a letter.

We have disenfranchised the American people because we don't make the laws anymore. We have outsourced that to the regulators. Let's take that power back.

When we empower the Congress, we empower the American people to have a say in their government on the rules that have a huge impact on their lives. Let's have the backbone to take tough votes, to say "yes" or "no" to these kind of rules. But let's not outsource it to an agency that has no relationship with the American people and no accountability to the American people.

This is saying "no." Let's take a stop and let's reempower the Congress to have a say, which, again, empowers the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing. I think it could be December 31 of this year and we would still be trying to find a way to make the President look bad. That is what this is about. It is about this President having an administration.

If it was up to some on the other side, there would be no Federal agencies, there would be no Federal employees, they might invent a new computer that would run the whole government, and the rest of us would just sit around. But be careful, because then somebody would suggest that there should not be a Congress.

This should be left alone. We have agencies. We have secretaries. These agencies carry out. And when they don't carry out to our understanding, believe me, just look at the appropriations bills. There are riders upon riders upon riders to try to undo what is being done, which, in many cases, is excellent work. This is just more of the same.

It may come as a shock to you, but the President is still around for 6 more months and we are around for 6 more months and those administrators are around for 6 more months, so we better learn to get along for those 6 months.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. CRENSHAW OF FLORIDA

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 794, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 27, 48, 53, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 69, printed in House Report 114-639, offered by Mr. CRENSHAW of Florida:

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY OF WISCONSIN

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to the case *Rainey v. Merit Systems Protection Board* (United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; No. 2015-3234, decided on June 7, 2016).

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to enforce section 540 of Public Law 110-329 (122 Stat. 3688) or section 538 of Public Law 112-74 (125 Stat. 976; 6 U.S.C. 190 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the relocation of the Office of Disability Adjudication and Review of the Social Security Administration located at 111 Livingston Street in Brooklyn, New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 11, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,250,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,000,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 46, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 90, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES OF CONNECTICUT

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,784,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,784,000)".

Page 114, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,784,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$800,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$800,000)".

Page 113, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$800,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 6, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,300,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,300,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,300,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 117, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for—

(A) commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract;

(B) violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or

(C) commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property;

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments en bloc. They are noncontroversial amendments that affect a variety of topics, such as whistleblower protection, property disposal, and reducing drug trafficking.

Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to the consideration of these amendments en bloc.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a historic moment, so let's pay attention.

I rise in support of the en bloc amendments. I appreciate the chairman's inclusion of amendments for Democratic Members.

I urge a "yes" vote on the en bloc amendment. I think it is a fine example of what we can do every so often.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

I rise to support a bipartisan amendment that I have offered with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), which helps communities combat the opioid and heroin epidemic by increasing funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program by \$2 million.

Across the country, HIDTA officials are doing important work to curb drug trafficking and bring law enforcement and community stakeholders together to stem the tide of drugs like heroin and fentanyl. Providing these additional resources will allow for even more local partnerships to fight drug trafficking.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

I rise to offer my amendment to the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act to improve the FTC enforcement of the Do Not Call Registry list, and to improve public education about FTC-supported solutions that can block these malicious and annoying robocalls.

Mr. Chair, all of us have suffered the repeated ringing from calls from unknown numbers from robocalls.

It only takes one day sitting at home to realize how invasive robocalls have become. This is what our elderly and retired citizens have to deal with every single day.

Robocall scammers steal over \$350 million every year from those who fall prey to incessant calls. Without proper enforcement and support from the FTC, these calls will continue and all of our constituents will continue to suffer. This amendment I offer today would increase funding for the FTC for the purpose of additional enforcement of the Do Not Call Registry and for educating for consumers about their options.

The relatively small increase in this amendment would result in 6.5 percent more funds for enforcement. Since 2004, the FTC has brought in \$41 million in penalties. That's a paltry \$3.4 million each year. Considering scammers owe the FTC an estimated \$1.2 billion in penalties, there's a lot more that can be done.

For the past several years, the FTC has held contests to support the development of robocall blocking apps such as Nomorobo and Robokiller. However, many people don't know that they are free and are effective solutions for some consumers. By allowing the FTC to conduct more education and outreach, this amendment would further leverage existing FTC investment in this area.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. This amendment would provide a significant increase to the FTC's ability to crack down on illegal robocalls and provide our constituents some peace for the constant robocall ringing.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote yes. Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment which would transfer \$7 million to the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, also known as HIDTA.

HIDTA coordinates federal, state, and local drug task forces to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking operations.

So many individuals—and by extension, their families and friends—are suffering the effects of drug abuse.

The heroin and opioid epidemic is affecting all of northern Virginia.

But currently, only part of my district is HIDTA-designated.

Two counties—Clarke and Frederick—have not yet received a HIDTA designation.

But I will not rest until my constituents in the Shenandoah Valley are afforded the same resources to combat this scourge.

The funding increase proposed by my amendment will ultimately save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, those of us in this institution talk a lot about how America is a nation of laws.

But unfortunately, a recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that, while we are a nation of laws, we are not a nation of rules. At least not if you are a Federal worker.

My amendment would prohibit the use of funds made available in the underlying bill with respect to *Rainey v. Merit System Protection Board*.

Allow me to explain the case and why it's relevant to the bill before us today.

Dr. Timothy Rainey is a State Department employee who, while serving as a contracting officer in 2013, was ordered by his supervisor to violate the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Dr. Rainey refused, and in doing so he was removed from his duties.

When Dr. Rainey invoked the "right-to-disobey" provision of the Whistleblower Protection Act, the Merit Systems Protection Board ruled that the law only protects him from refusing to violate Federal laws, but not rules or regulations.

On June 7th, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit upheld this ruling.

So what does this mean, Mr. Speaker?

I chair the Financial Services Oversight Subcommittee where we frequently get valuable tips from Federal whistleblowers about questionable and illegal activities at Federal agencies.

This ruling will have the effect of taking away their protections to stand up to bad actors in the Federal workforce.

Let's not forget that our rules and regulations are supposed to be derived from law.

In effect, this ruling will give permission to political appointees and other supervisors in positions of authority to force Federal works to violate the rules and regulations that Congress, through law, directs the agencies to implement.

At the Treasury Department, one of the many agencies funded by this bill, this would mean that Federal workers could be forced to violate sanctions against Russia for its violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity.

Many of those sanctions are enforced through the Code of Federal Regulations pursuant to laws enacted by Congress.

Ultimately, Congress will need to fix the Whistleblower Protection Act.

I intend to work in a bipartisan fashion and with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to fix the Whistleblower Protection Act to address this ruling.

In the meantime, I ask adoption of my amendment to put the House on record that Federal workers should follow laws and rules and regulations.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO for including my amendment into the en bloc amendment to H.R. 5485, the FY2017 Financial Services Appropriations Act.

I offered this amendment to increase the funding provided to the Treasury Department's Office of Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) by \$3,300,000. By sharing financial intelligence with law enforcement, private industry, and its foreign counterparts, FinCEN supports financial crime investigations throughout the world. Terrorists' proven ability to move money through innovative means necessitates continued progress in this critical counterterrorism area. The \$3,300,000 is needed to enhance FinCEN's supervisory strategy of Money Services Businesses and to meet the growing demand for FinCEN's expanded national security response efforts.

The amendment would offset this necessary increase through corresponding decreases in the funding provided for the "Rental of Space" account within the General Services Administration.

Through my work as Ranking Member of the Financial Services Committee's Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing and the Co-Chair of the bipartisan Task Force on Anti-Terrorism & Proliferation Financing, I witnessed the vital work that FinCEN engages in to safeguard our financial system from evolving money laundering and national security threats. By analyzing financial intelligence and sharing it with law enforcement, private industry, and its foreign counterparts, FinCEN supports financial crime investigations throughout the world.

At this time, FinCEN needs additional funding to enhance its supervisory strategy of Money Services Businesses (MSBs) and to establish a specialized response team to focus on high priority threats. This is important because banks are increasingly derisking by exiting the MSB market due to the high risks associated with MSB customers. For example, this is making it nearly impossible for families, charities, and businesses to send remittances to people in Somalia. A specialized response team will encourage banks to more consistently service the financial needs of the MSB market that is seen as higher risk.

In addition, FinCEN could use these additional funds to meet the growing demand for its expanded national security response efforts. FinCEN continues to support the broader Department of Treasury efforts by identifying sources of revenue for organizations such as Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and their attempts to access the international financial system. However, without adequate funding FinCEN will be unable to meet the demand for expanded intelligence reporting and increased investigations into terrorism finance.

As evidenced by recent support to the Paris and Belgium terrorists attack investigations, FinCEN's expertise assisted in quickly identifying links between the two attacks. FinCEN

published 51 reports related to the Paris attacks and 2 reports related to the Brussels attack. Many of these reports were generated through engagement with financial institutions by FinCEN, which resulted in increased reports from U.S. financial institutions. Moreover, FinCEN's financial intelligence has played an important role in identifying potential foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs).

With today's increasingly complex and rapidly evolving terrorist networks, we cannot risk our national security by not adequately funding this important Department.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to propose, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any requirement that a solicitation of a proxy, consent, or authorization to vote a security of an issuer in an election of members of the board of directors of the issuer be made using a single ballot or card that lists both individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) the issuer and individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) other proponents and permits the person granting the proxy, consent, or authorization to select from among individuals in both groups.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on an amendment that would prohibit special interests from having their agendas advanced by Washington bureaucrats, and to refocus the Securities and Exchange Commission on its important threefold policy mission: to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and to facilitate capital formation.

Strong and efficient communication between the boards and management of public companies and their shareholders is foundational to healthy capital markets and to maintaining the ability of companies to innovate and to create jobs for everyone.

Fortunately, recent studies have shown that communication between the investors and the companies has actually improved over recent years, and shareholders are now increasingly able to effectuate change without all of the drastic measures, such as launching a proxy fight.

In fact, according to a 2015 report from Ernst & Young, the number of

companies disclosing engagement on government topics rose from a mere 6 percent of the S&P 500 companies all the way up to 50 percent in 2015. In many ways, this is a private market at work as investors demand that boards and management be more responsive to their request for how to improve the company and their long-term performance.

A number of regulatory hurdles still need to be overcome to improve the U.S. proxy system, which remains one of the primary ways in which public companies communicate between the two. Back in 2010, the SEC put forth a number of ideas, the so-called "Proxy Plumbing" concept release, which explored various ways to improve the transparency, if you will, of corporate government systems here in the United States.

Importantly, the Proxy Plumbing concept release also discussed at length the importance of getting retail investors more involved in the process. For a variety of reasons, retail investors have for years been disenfranchised by the current proxy system, and they rarely exercise the rights of shareholders to engage in improving the way that the companies work.

Unfortunately, for nearly 6 years, the SEC has, and maybe not surprisingly, allowed this Proxy Plumbing concept release to languish and has chosen not to act on it, even on some of the most basic and noncontroversial parts of it.

But then last year, out of the blue, SEC Chair Mary Jo White had directed the SEC staff to develop a rulemaking for what is known as "universal proxy ballots."

You ask: What are universal proxy ballots? Good question. Put simply, while they sound quite benign, actually, universal proxy ballots are a means for special interest groups to easily then nominate their preferred candidates to a company's board, and that would fundamentally change things. It would fundamentally change the way in which public company directors are elected here in the U.S.

This is an initiative that has been pushed for years by insiders and special interests. It has also been pushed by a number of activist pension funds, many of which have been horribly managed themselves and now find themselves with unfunded liabilities that threaten the retirement security of the public sector workers over which they were responsible.

The adoption of the universal proxy rule would only increase the likelihood of high profile proxy fights at public companies, which would then serve to distract the employees and management of these companies from carrying out their core mission.

More importantly, it would make the vast majority of public company shareholders, including the smaller retail investor, pay the price for the costs associated with these big fights.

Finally, it is unfair to those investors who do not wish to carry the water for these special interests.

Aside from these specific policy concerns, there are also issues of how the SEC has been prioritizing its finite resources. The SEC recently missed the rulemaking deadline for yet again another congressional mandate to simplify and modernize our current corporate disclosure regime.

This is an initiative that has bipartisan support and would help boost confidence by making quarterly and annual reports more effective for the small investor by reducing some of the unnecessary and the not material disclosures within them.

Unfortunately, once again, the SEC chose to ignore what Congress mandated and, instead, prioritized rulemakings over such things as that universal proxy I mentioned, which, again, would benefit simply a minority of insider special interests over the vast majority of public company shareholders.

This rulemaking should be nowhere on the SEC's agenda. My amendment would simply disallow the SEC from using its finite resources.

I urge all of my colleagues' support.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing the amendment before us. This is a very good amendment. It keeps the SEC on track, it gets them focused on their core dual mission—investor protection and capital formation.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said it more succinctly than I did in the last 4 minutes, and I thank him.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to hear the other side protecting the right of the SEC to do its work when the budget and the bill show just the opposite.

This amendment is yet another attack on the independence and efficacy of the Securities and Exchange Commission. It also represents an attack on shareholders.

When special interests cannot win ballot questions put to their shareholders, they seek protection from Congress to change the rules of the game.

Specifically, this amendment would prohibit the SEC from proposing, implementing, or enforcing any regulatory action on the issue of universal proxy ballots. These universal proxy ballots would let shareholders vote for whomever they wish to represent them on the corporate boards. This is a vital consideration in proxy contests since

board seats and, in some cases, board control are at stake. It would also make for a fairer, less cumbersome voting process.

Right now, there is a two-tiered system governing shareholder elections. Shareholders in attendance at meetings, particularly in proxy contests, have the ability to receive a legal ballot that allows them to pick and choose among all of the candidates who are duly nominated.

□ 1500

Shareholders who are not in attendance do not have that ability and, typically, can only choose from among nominees who appear on management's or a dissident's ballot, but not both. This limits shareholders' choice.

Many advocates and investors, including the Council of Institutional Investors, have written to the SEC and have asked them to address this issue. Indeed, the CII filed a rulemaking petition to this effect. Likewise, the SEC Investor Advisory Committee, which is the group of outside experts tasked with the responsibility under Dodd-Frank to advise the SEC on issues of investor protection, called upon the SEC to take action on this issue.

Corporate governance is only effective when boards are elected in a free and fair manner. The SEC should take steps to eliminate disenfranchisement in proxy contests in cases where shareholders have no ability to "split their ticket" and vote for a combination of shareholder and management nominees.

This amendment would curtail the SEC's existing authority in this regard, to the detriment of shareholders and corporate accountability.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) designate any nonbank financial company as "too big to fail";

(2) designate any nonbank financial company as a "systemically important financial institution"; or

(3) make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of such company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I rise to prevent government regulators from expanding the corrupt doctrine of "too big to fail" into even greater parts of our economy.

Under Dodd-Frank, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC, has the power now to designate companies as systemically important financial institutions, SIFIs. I have heard it said that the SIFI status does not necessarily mean "too big to fail," but that is a ridiculous claim that is on par with the reassurances that there was no implicit guarantee with Fannie and Freddie. In the real world, the Federal Government will never allow a SIFI to fail. The SIFI designation is nothing less than the government's stamp of approval and the enshrining of taxpayer bailouts. Simply put, a SIFI designation is the guarantee that the taxpayers will, once again, be on the hook for the bailouts of Wall Street.

First, megabanks were designated as "too big to fail." Now FSOC is claiming that nonbank firms, such as insurance companies and asset managers, should also be designated as SIFIs. FSOC's words and actions belie its true purpose, which is to grow its regulation of the economy so that every sector of the financial industry is propped up on the backs of taxpayers.

I am offering this amendment to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the SEC, who are both voting members of FSOC, from designating any additional nonbank companies as SIFIs. When companies become SIFIs, they cease to operate in the free market. Instead, they operate under a new system—a system that protects entities by sparing them from the costs and the consequences that other regular companies face in a competitive market. So, over time, the combination of this protected status and the Fed's risk-averse regulation will zap the energy and competitiveness of this company. Simply put, the government will corrupt the private sector, which, in turn, will corrupt the government.

"Too big to fail" must not take root in the nonbank financial sector. These companies serve as an important counterbalance to the megabanks. You see, Dodd-Frank was built on a foundation of sand—a foundation that mistakenly views the financial crisis as having been caused exclusively by the greed of large financial institutions and that in-

trusive government regulation would have prevented the crisis by keeping them from making risky investments. So it should come as no surprise that, instead of solving the problem, Dodd-Frank gave "too big to fail" the force of the law. FSOC is not working as intended because it is unworkable.

Finally, even with its absolute and unaccountable powers, its faulty premise dooms FSOC to failure. We must prevent FSOC from continuing to dig a deeper hole in free market capitalism and get Wall Street off the backs and out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment before us, and I urge everyone to support it.

Mr. Chair, FSOC is there to mitigate risk, not to just go around looking for people to designate. In our underlying bill, we say that, before you can designate a nonbank, you have to give it the right to cure whatever the problem is. This takes it one step further in asking: Why do we designate nonbanks as significantly important financial institutions?

We ought to focus on where the focus ought to be and just leave the nonbanks out of this.

I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Once again, the chairman said it more succinctly than I. I urge all Members to support the legislation.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, we finally found something we agree on again. This is becoming a habit. We want to keep Wall Street in its place. I wish the gentleman would help us with empowering the SEC to do so.

Dodd-Frank does not designate any entity as "too big to fail," as the Garrett amendment suggests. Instead, Dodd-Frank provides regulators with the tools to address the risks posed by large, complex, and interconnected financial institutions—both banks and nonbanks alike. This is crucial in addressing one of the main regulatory gaps we witnessed leading up to the 2008 crisis. Too many nonbanks were in the shadows, having had escaped critical regulation that could have prevented the crisis.

For example, regulators have already designed AIG as a nonbank systemically important financial institution, a SIFI. Recall that the London arm of AIG's was speculating in derivative products, such as credit default swaps, leading up to the 2008 crisis. By the fall of 2007, AIG Financial Products had already begun a tailspin that helped

spark the worst financial crisis in the U.S. since the Great Depression. By May 2009, various programs of support from the Federal Reserve and the Treasury amounted to more than \$180 billion in bailouts to the company.

Other nonbank broker dealers, like Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers, were at the center of the creation of toxic assets, which were central to the crisis and necessitated the need for a Wall Street bailout. The Garrett amendment would stop our banking regulators from subjecting the next Lehman Brothers from heightened regulation. Hedge funds were also key intermediaries in the distribution and structuring of toxic assets. Again, the Garrett amendment would stop our banking regulators from providing the heightened regulation of their operations.

The Garrett amendment is an attempt to roll back the critical rules of the road we have passed in the wake of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression. Large financial institutions are fighting the SIFI designation because they know that being identified as one means being subjected to regulation that is above and beyond current requirements, including "living wills," which will help regulators plan how to wind down the firms in an orderly fashion in the event they become insolvent. The heightened regulation also includes the ability for regulators to "stress test" the entity to see if it can withstand financial distress, demand more capital, or to demand more stringent reporting.

Former FDIC Chairman Sheila Bair, a Republican appointee, noted in congressional testimony after the passage of Dodd-Frank: "Many institutions are vigorously lobbying against such a designation," and "being designated a SIFI will in no way confer a competitive advantage by anointing an institution as 'too big to fail.'"

The capacity to designate nonbanks as SIFIs is critical to the U.S. financial system for appropriate regulatory oversight. The designation process already has in place multiple procedural safeguards and opportunities for appeal via a lengthy process. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Garrett amendment as it does much more harm than we would think.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, the harm that has occurred is from the Dodd-Frank legislation, and the harm that has occurred by the FSOC designations is twofold.

One, the large one, is the fact that it has given a regulator the ability to put financial institutions and non-financial institutions and their problems on the backs of the American taxpayers, meaning that you and I and everybody who is listening to us may someday

have to reach into their pockets and bail out, once again, Wall Street for its bad decisions. That should end now.

Two, the even larger issue, is the failure of Dodd-Frank. In the legislation here, we are trying to fix the fact that it has had a debilitating effect on the overall economy. It has created disincentives in the marketplace, which is bad for the economy, and it is why we are having such a slow growth in the GDP, which translates into less job growth, fewer jobs for the American public, and fewer jobs for your neighbor and my neighbor as well. We need this legislation to fix it.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, the other side doesn't like ObamaCare; it doesn't like Dodd-Frank; it doesn't like the SEC. Maybe I am going to try an amendment on the bailout of the automobile industry to see if they like that one, because that helped a lot of folks.

This amendment is misguided. The gentleman is a good man who honestly believes in what he is saying and in what he is doing, but it is only going to hamper the SEC's ability to do its work. We do that enough in this bill, so it should be left alone. I urge a vote against the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any career appointee within the Senior Executive Service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment with the intent of prohibiting the use of funds in this act to pay a performance award to any senior executive employee within the IRS.

Under the direction of Commissioner John Koskinen, IRS officials have led a coordinated effort to hide the truth about this IRS' targeting of innocent Americans based on their political beliefs. Rather than cleaning up this rogue agency, Koskinen has doubled down on the agency's lawlessness and political culture.

On Koskinen's watch, the IRS intentionally destroyed nearly 24,000 emails from Lois Lerner and failed to comply with a congressional subpoena. To make matters worse, Commissioner Koskinen made a series of false and misleading statements under oath to Congress at multiple committee hearings on this matter.

Koskinen said in March of 2014 that the IRS had turned over all of Lerner's emails and all requested information; yet the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration uncovered more than 1,000 emails that the IRS tried to hide.

□ 1515

The recent transgressions perpetrated by this agency are not only disgraceful, they border on corrupt. The trust Americans once had has been utterly destroyed.

In July 2013, Danny Werfel, Acting Commissioner of the IRS, sought to eliminate bonuses for union employees and senior executives within the agency, sending an email to employees which stated: "I do not believe there should be performance awards this year for IRS employees, managers, or executives."

Unfortunately, Koskinen chose to ignore Werfel's attempts to restore trust within the agency. In February of 2014, Koskinen announced his decision to pay out bonuses to senior IRS bureaucrats in order to improve "employee morale."

In April 2014, the Treasury inspector general reported that more than 1,100 IRS employees with delinquent tax returns received bonuses of more than a million dollars. That same investigation found: "2,800 IRS employees facing disciplinary actions received more than \$2.8 million in monetary bonuses."

The Office of Personnel Management reported that in fiscal year 2014 alone, 61.5 percent of all senior executives within the Treasury Department received performance awards.

Lawlessness within this agency should not be rewarded. This amendment seeks to effectuate a policy of accountability and change the corrupt culture of this agency by prohibiting bonuses and performance awards for Senior Executives Service employees within the IRS.

It is unconscionable that Lois Lerner and other dishonest senior officials

within the IRS have received more than \$100,000 in bonuses in recent years. Committing perjury, purposely disposing of hard drives and more than 2,400 emails in order to stymie an investigation, and providing an extremely poor level of service to taxpayers doesn't warrant a bonus of even a penny, in my mind.

Fifty-seven Democrats joined every single Republican in seeking to prevent senior bureaucrats within the IRS from collecting these lavish bonuses in the fiscal year 2015 by voting in favor of my amendment that passed the House with strong bipartisan support.

The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste supports this amendment and FreedomWorks is key voting in favor of this amendment.

Once the IRS can prove that it will hold rogue employees accountable for their ineptitude, I will cease my efforts to prohibit these awards.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am going to start backwards here.

We are not going to call for a vote on this, and the reason for it is, when people read your amendment, they are going to realize someone didn't write it correctly. It doesn't speak to the IRS. It actually allows for this cut to be across the board on the whole bill, which should make our chairman not very happy, and I am interested in my chairman's happiness.

I rise to oppose the amendment. This amendment would prevent agencies under this bill from giving employees in the Senior Executive Service bonuses. This seems to be aimed at the IRS since the summary on the Rules Committee Web site emphasizes the IRS, but it would have the same effect across the board.

No one is saying that poor performance should be rewarded, but this takes one class of employees and punishes all of them regardless of their individual merits. It will cause us to lose good employees, which is not what we need.

I realize Members on the other side of the aisle are eager to get their kicks in against the IRS—they even put them in bills when they are not the only ones in the bill—but I argue that this amendment would have unintended consequences.

Rather than somehow making the IRS or any other agency better, this is likely to make it worse. This amendment is going to simply ensure that we have less accomplished employees at the IRS and at other government agencies. It would have a negative effect on recruitment and retention of highly talented senior executives necessary to ensure tax administration and other agency duties. It may also conflict

with statutory requirements for SES bonuses that are designed to award strong performance.

I oppose the amendment. It is not well targeted or well thought out.

I think we also should know that this is the one agency that has been reduced in its employee number by the largest in the last few years, so I really don't understand what this is trying to accomplish.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, let me now ask the gentleman from New York a question.

I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to respond.

If you disagree with my amendment and feel that it will have unintended consequences, name the agencies in the bill that you think should be allowed to dole out lavish bonuses to their senior executives.

Mr. SERRANO. I think that if an— Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I am asking the gentleman: Name me an agency here that should not be doling out—

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, with all due respect, and I am not answering the gentleman's question, my role is not to tell you what you should have put in the bill.

Mr. GOSAR. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman from New York can't give an answer—

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I am telling the gentleman from Arizona what he didn't write.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, I think most hardworking Americans would agree that the senior bureaucrats with the Customer Financial Protection Bureau, the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and the Federal Communications Commission should not be receiving lavish bonuses when we are \$19 trillion in the hole.

As I mentioned at the outset, the intent of this amendment is to prohibit the use of funds in this act to pay a performance award to any senior executive employee within the IRS. When the staff realized the actual language in the amendment could be more far reaching than intended, we attempted to work with the committee to correct this occurrence.

One thing that this House agrees on is that senior executives within IRS should not be collecting bonuses, and this amendment prohibits exactly that occurrence.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I will be brief.

I don't want to read into the gentleman from Arizona's statement, sir, that you were trying to get the chairman not to notice that you were writing the amendment that he dislikes the most across the board—that we both

dislike the most. I just think, you know, what you are talking about is something that, in many cases, has to be looked at. Also, in order to keep good employees, you have to find ways to reward them.

This agency, through the hits it takes, has lost—the one you intend, according to your comments, the IRS—has lost 18,000 employees in a couple of years since 2010, I believe, 18,000 employees. Now we go further here.

Secondly, I am glad to see that you spoke about other agencies, which means you must have read the amendment a little closer. But I still think it is not a good amendment. I still think it should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Members on both sides are reminded to direct their remarks directly to the Chair and not to each other.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment. The Gosar-Bridenstine-Duncan-Gohmert-Huelskamp-Jones-Barletta-Brat-Brooks-Black amendment prohibits funds within this act from being used in contravention of Federal immigration law for sanctuary city policies.

The concept of sanctuary city policies is in direct opposition to the rule of law and our Constitution. Article I, section 8, clause 4 gives Congress clear jurisdiction on immigration matters.

A nation of laws must enforce established law, not seek ways to skirt around it. Sanctuary cities defy Federal immigration statutes by harboring untold numbers of illegal immigrants and providing safe havens for criminals, many of whom are violent offenders.

Our amendment prohibits the use of funds which are appropriated by this act from being used in contravention of

section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. This Federal law prohibits sanctuary policies that prevent or obstruct government and law enforcement officials from sharing information regarding a person's immigration status with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Despite being the law of the land, more than 200 State and municipal jurisdictions across the country have established policies that directly violate the law and shield criminal illegal aliens from enforcement. The shocking case of Kate Steinle in San Francisco in 2015 revealed the danger sanctuary cities pose to our Republic.

Just over a year ago, on July 1, 2015, Steinle was shot and killed by Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez, an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times. San Francisco authorities were asked to detain Sanchez until he could be turned over to Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials. The city declined and held Sanchez in jail for less than a month on a 20-year-old drug charge before releasing him on April 15, 2015, less than 2 months before he killed Steinle.

Sadly, Kate's tragic murder is not alone. Between 2010 and 2014, criminal aliens who were released by DHS went on to commit 124 homicide-related offenses across the country.

Let's not forget the many others who have been killed by criminal aliens: Jerry Braswell, Sr., and Jerry Braswell, Jr., of North Carolina; Dani Countryman of Oregon; Chandra Levy of Washington, D.C.; the Gonzalez family of Texas; Kevin Will of Texas; Christopher "Buddy" Rowe of California; Jamiel Shaw of California; Alvert John Mike of Utah; and Grant Ronnebeck of Arizona and countless others.

These brutal murders have called attention to the dangers sanctuary city policies pose to the safety and security of the American people. The Federation for American Immigration Reform supports this amendment stating: "Gosar amendment 31 addresses a critical public safety problem and sends a clear message to sanctuary city jurisdictions that their dangerous policies are unacceptable."

NumbersUSA is key voting in support of this amendment and has stated: "The Gosar Amendment is a targeted approach to sanctuary policies."

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Gosar amendment to cut off the funding to sanctuary cities through the financial appropriations bill.

When I came to Congress in 2011, I quickly cosponsored the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act, and I have worked to hold these governments accountable ever since. Here is why.

We all know that, for years now, Congress has ceded more and more power to the executive branch. But less

talked about is the fact that, for just as long, Congress has allowed more than 200 State and municipal jurisdictions to do the same exact thing. And this is just plain wrong. Sanctuary cities thumb their nose at Congress; they ignore Federal law; and they endanger the lives of their citizens.

While I urge passage of this amendment, I also believe that we must act by passing my bill, the Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act, which takes a broad-based approach to defunding sanctuary city policies once and for all.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for his leadership on this issue. I support his amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, this is one of those moments where you realize that an amendment is put forth not to deal with an issue but, rather, to put it on the floor so you can discuss it.

First of all, this is not the place to discuss immigration policy. And I can tell you that we would both agree that our immigration policy, our program, is broken and it has to be fixed.

Here is the problem, one that I have been arguing for years, and a lot of other people have been doing the same thing for years and lately, and that is that law enforcement officials, for the most part, will tell you that, regardless of whether we deal with the immigration issue or not, they need to speak to the local people and get information so they can do their job.

If they are seen as agents of the immigration department, if you will, the people won't speak to them who are here undocumented. They won't speak to them. So they are faced with a very difficult situation. They are saying: You guys and ladies are supposed to handle immigration reform. Do it. Take care of it. Do it in the way you want. Take care of that. But in the meantime, let me do my job.

So a guy steals a car, and three people in the neighborhood know who stole it. They go up. If they think that that police officer is also enforcing immigration policy, they are not going to talk to him. That is just a fact of life.

So you may think you are doing a great thing, but you are actually hurting law enforcement in the job that it has to do. What we need to do is have an immigration policy that speaks about all the issues that are covered by immigration policy.

Secondly, we hear from the other side about local control, local control, local control. Well, some cities have decided that they are sanctuary cities, that they are going to deal with the immigration issue differently than other people deal in other places—less mean, less aggressive and being nasty, more understanding of a problem rather than just saying that people come here to rip us off.

We have to keep all those things in mind as we look at this amendment, and this amendment should be defeated.

□ 1530

Lastly, your amendment talks about cutting funds, and the gentlewoman talked about cutting funds. To our knowledge, there is nothing in here that funds anything having to do with sanctuary cities or, for that matter, having to do with immigration. So wrong bill, wrong place, wrong time, wrong idea.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to implement, administer, or enforce any guidance with respect to indirect auto lending.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. Chairman, in March of 2013, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau issued flawed and inaccurate guidance that would threaten to eliminate auto dealers' flexibility to discount the interest rate offered to consumers financing vehicle purchases.

Whether a person seeks to buy an automobile, an RV, or a motorcycle, consumers rely heavily on their neighborhood auto dealer to provide them the best possible rate. However, this faulty and unstudied guidance could increase the cost for consumers, ultimately making it more difficult to obtain an automobile.

Roughly 6 months ago, my good friend across the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and I, introduced H.R. 1737, which passed the House with an overwhelming bipartisan and veto-proof vote, 332-96. My bill, along with 13 bipartisan letters sent by Congress over



the last 3 years, gave the CFPB a chance to fix the faulty guidance and reissue it, but, unfortunately, they still insist on an anticonsumer policy and chose to keep their faulty bulletin in place.

In fact, the CFPB has refused to change course even with a solution modeled on the Department of Justice consent order that is supported by auto dealers and lenders and do not resort to eliminating dealer discounts. Congress has given the CFPB an opportunity to correct and reissue their guidance, and that would take into account consumers and bring clarity to the market.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will leave no doubt that either the CFPB will fix this problem they created or Congress will, and if we do it, we will do it in a bipartisan way.

I would like to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Chairman HENSARLING of the Committee on Financial Services for their support. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for bringing this before the body.

Here is another example of the CFPB overregulating, trying to find a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. I support this amendment, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the CFPB from implementing, administering, or enforcing any guidance related to indirect auto lending. This is meant as a shot across the bow to the CFPB, telling them not to bring fair lending cases against indirect automobile finance companies. But on a practical level, the amendment will only invite confusion into the industry.

After all, this amendment does nothing to address lenders' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. Instead, the amendment only strikes guidance the CFPB has provided to those lenders, providing clarity on how they can meet their obligations under the law.

Discrimination in any finance market is unacceptable, and we know that discrimination is still alive and well in the indirect auto lending marketplace. In the three settlements to date against Ally Financial, Fifth Third Bank, Honda and Toyota Motor Credit, the CFPB secured nearly \$162 million in borrower relief and penalties, finding that minority borrowers paid more than \$200 over the life of a car loan than White borrowers, even when controlling for borrowers' creditworthiness.

Discretionary markups are the source of discrimination in auto lending, and the guidance that this amendment nullifies helps lenders monitor and respond to potentially discriminatory auto lending practices. It is something that we should not be allowing, and this amendment tries to undo a lot of work that we are doing and a lot of work that should be done in the future.

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that there is no place for discrimination. Based on information from the CFPB, CBO expects that the agency would not prepare a replacement bulletin if H.R. 1737 were enacted. That is because the bill would not affect the underlying statute or regulations to implement it. The Bureau can continue to enforce the Equal Credit Opportunity Act without the bulletin. I also remind the gentleman that the minority report also stated that this would not negatively impact the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank Mr. SERRANO for yielding.

You just described this as a shot across the bow to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and you are absolutely right. They are attempting to tell them not to bring fair lending cases against indirect automobile finance companies.

This amendment is about protecting wrongdoers who gouge racial and ethnic minorities with high markups on car loans even when their income, their credit scores, and their financial backgrounds are the same as Whites. The amendment is about protecting companies like Ally Financial, Fifth Third Bank, Honda and Toyota Motor Credit, all of whom have had to enter into settlements with the Bureau over their indirect auto loan practices.

All told, the CFPB, again, has secured nearly \$162 million in borrower relief and penalties to help these borrowers. In their investigations, the Bureau found that minority borrowers paid more than \$200 over the life of a car loan than White borrowers, even when controlling for borrowers' creditworthiness.

Studies have shown that minority borrowers are less likely to be aware of interest rate markups. According to the Center for Responsible Lending, 68 percent of all borrowers were unaware that dealers have the ability to mark up an interest rate above what a lender offers based on their creditworthiness and the car being sold, but nearly 75 percent of African American and Hispanic borrowers are unaware that the practice of dealer markups even exists.

The guidance that this amendment seeks to nullify clearly outlines steps that lenders can take to protect borrowers from potentially discriminatory lending practices that often occur without the borrower even being aware of it occurring. So we know what the intent of this amendment is, but on a practical level, the amendment will only invite confusion into the industry.

After all, this amendment does nothing to address lenders' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. Instead, the amendment only strikes guidance the CFPB has provided to those lenders providing clarity on how they can meet their obligations under the law. The issue has come up before in this Congress, but no matter where you stood on H.R. 1737, a bill we considered last year, you should be against this amendment.

To the Members on the opposite side of the aisle, you are supposed to have a poverty agenda, and you claim that you are taking on a new direction, that you want to have reduced poverty and deal with the problems of minorities and people in rural communities, et cetera.

This is what keeps poverty in these communities. We have these blue suede, slick dealers of all kinds—whether they are automobile lenders or payday loans or auto loans, all of this stuff—coming into these communities, taking advantage of the most vulnerable people who want to get out of poverty.

You say you want to help, but then you come in and you attack the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You hate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You want to do everything to undermine their authority.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members on both sides are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not each other.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau's guidance was issued without public notice or comment and without any study of its impact on consumers or small businesses.

I want to thank the ranking member for authoring the minority report that states: "H.R. 1737 does not alter regulated entities' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act or the CFPB's examination or enforcement activity pursuant to ECOA." This is nothing more than a continuation of H.R. 1737.

I also want to repeat my thanks to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for helping me with a successful 332-96 vote in favor of that bill. This amendment is almost identical to it, and I would appreciate the ongoing support on behalf of consumers not just in New Hampshire, but all across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would again thank the chair, Mr. CRENSHAW, as well as Mr. HENSARLING, those Members who voted in favor, 332-96, on H.R. 1737. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to propose or finalize a regulatory action until January 21, 2017.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment that prohibits future regulations from the Obama administration. This is a commonsense step to rein in our regulatory system and make it work for the American people and not the other way around.

Since my first days in office, one message I continue to hear is people are tired of an unaccountable government that oversteps its bounds. In April, I was successful in pushing the EPA to withdraw a harmful regulation that would have devastated the motor-sports industry. I recently had the opportunity to visit a national leader in custom auto-racing parts in my hometown of Concord, North Carolina. I spoke with one worker who told me that if this one regulation would have gone through, he would have lost his entire livelihood. That, Mr. Chairman, is unacceptable.

The problem is, agencies have moved beyond their constitutional authority, and Washington bureaucrats are accountable to no one. They show little regard for the real world damage of their new rules on working families, on people looking for jobs, on our economy in general.

From regulatory gut punches like ObamaCare and ever-expanding EPA rules, stacking one on top of the other often before the previous rule is even enacted, regulations under this President have woven a web so complex and large, it risks ensnaring every American. This means fewer job opportuni-

ties, it means lower wages, and more families struggling.

At its core, overregulation is a form of stealth taxation. Working families, working people are paying the price for every new rule that comes out of Washington.

Now, I recognize some regulations are necessary, but we need a regulatory system that is transparent, one that balances the needs of our environment and public safety with economic strength and jobs, one that benefits hardworking Americans, not big government, big labor, and big business. It is time for us to chart a new pro-growth course away from this administration's burdensome regulations so that Americans can get back to work, and this amendment is one solution.

□ 1545

It will prevent the President from unleashing a new hailstorm of regulations in an attempt to cement his legacy in the last months of his administration. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that there is a new bipartisanship here. I notice that this bill takes effect from now until January 21. So that means we will wait for Mrs. Clinton to become President before any new regulation would take effect.

Secondly, the other side is always complaining about regulations. But every so often, we should step back and, instead of knocking our country so much, kind of pay attention to what some of those regulations have done.

Sure, we have regulations. We have regulations about conditions in coal mines. Is that bad? We have regulations about the water we drink. Is that bad? We have regulations about the air we breathe.

Those regulations make us different from other countries where there is no respect for the population and no protection. There is a regulation that says you have to go to school up to a certain age. That is great. There is a regulation that says no children can be working in factories or in the garment industry in New York. That is wonderful.

So I am not afraid of regulations. Overregulating, okay, we can discuss that. But that side wants no regulation. It wants a computer to run the country. I keep claiming I want to see who is going to invent that computer. Here we go again, just talking about overregulating.

There are questions. This provision, for instance, would also be in direct conflict with other statutory requirements. For example, EPA is required to finalize annual renewal fuel standards regulations by November 30 of each year. I am sure there are others.

This is widely overbroad and can prevent significant regulatory actions in emergency situations, like disaster relief, where required by a court order, or when required by statute.

For another example, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Trade Bureau, or TTB, in Treasury would not be able to publish implementing regulations relating to taxation of cider and removal of bond requirements for small beverage alcohol producers, and numerous other rules, such as a final rule reducing formula burdens on industry for specially denatured spirits and completely denatured alcohol, and the modernization of beverage alcohol.

It is easy to say: no more regulations from October 1 to January 21. Let the next President deal with it. You are rolling the dice, assuming you think you know who is going to be President. But that is okay, I can roll along with you.

The problem is that this is not the way to go. The dislike of the Obama administration by the other side is so evident, especially in amendments like this, where it is directed. At least, to your credit, you had the honesty in you to say the Obama administration. You called it by name, and I respect for you that. Other than that, I don't have a lot of respect for your amendment.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank my colleague for his comments. I do agree that we don't need to eliminate all regulations. That is certainly not what we are saying here. We are saying that, from October 1 until January 21, we don't need new regulations.

With all due respect, I think we have had plenty. The amount of regulations that have come out of the Obama administration has been astounding. If you compare the amount of regulations to all other administrations combined, it is astounding, and they affect every aspect of people's lives.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned regulations in the past have been good. For example, regulating coal mines. I am sure that there were good regulations on coal mines, but we are at the point now where this administration is going to make coal mines illegal.

The gentleman also mentioned, Mr. Chairman, regulating water and air. We certainly all agree that we want clean air and clean water. But this administration issues a clean air regulation, or a new rule, and even before it goes into effect, they issue the next one to reduce the levels even lower—to levels that even experts agree aren't necessary.

In fact, members of the other party, in our hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, testified to the fact that the air today is so much cleaner

than it was before. And science proves that.

In North Carolina, we have got a 20 percent reduction in the coarse particulate matter in our air. We have made great progress, but to say we are going to continue to lower that level even before the science is to determine what the effect of the last regulation was is simply going too far.

What that means is, in places like Montgomery County, North Carolina, where we desperately need jobs, you can't have a new job. You can't have a new road. You can't have a new water-sewer line. You have can't add any new manufacturing jobs. That is ridiculous.

This administration has had 7½ years, and they have used that time wisely if their goal was to overregulate the American people. All I am saying is, in the last few months of this administration, let's put the brakes on.

As my colleague mentioned, we don't know who the next President is going to be. It may be someone from the other party. But that new President will have won a mandate, and that new President can then address the regulatory scheme. I look forward to having that debate. But as far as this administration, the votes are in. We have gotten our results. This administration has gone way too far with regulation.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to put on the brakes and say: 7½ years; enough is enough.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, you know, it is amazing. Many of us—and I am not suggesting you—get elected to Congress, and we are in awe of the fact that we come from where we come when we get to Congress. I am in that category. I am very blessed. There are others who come to Congress, and it seems that they come to Congress to undo Congress and undo the government.

We are the greatest nation on Earth. How did we get that?

Obviously, the fighting and the working spirit of the American people. But it was also the protections placed on the American people; the fact that children were told you have to go to school, the fact that we try to get the best water.

We spoke before about an immigration issue. I don't call it a problem.

Why does it exist?

Because people still know that we are the greatest country on Earth, and they want to come here.

So a lot of what you see as government intrusion, a lot of what you see as government being a pain could actually be some of the reasons that we became the great country we are. We just didn't let people go on their own and hurt each other, and so on.

We had people elected by the people to say: Hey, hold on. Why don't we do

this? Why don't we do that? Why don't we curtail this? Why don't we grow that?

And we continue to do that. So we disagree. I think we are great because we have certain rules to follow. And we follow them well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a rule issued pursuant to section 13(p) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue a rule mandating that public companies disclose whether the minerals they use benefit armed groups in the Democratic Republic of Congo, also known as the DRC, and its nine neighboring countries.

"Conflict materials" refer to tin, tungsten, tantalum, and gold, which have been used in a huge variety of products, from cell phones, cosmetics, jewelry, chemicals, footwear, and including auto parts made right in west Michigan.

Simply put, section 1502 produced a rule that has failed everyone, and my amendment would, therefore, suspend its implementation for 1 year. The people of central Africa don't want it. President Obama's own SEC chair doesn't want it. Parts of the rule have been judged by the courts to violate First Amendment rights, and businesses throughout America are burdened with a reporting task that even the Department of Commerce has admitted is impossible.

Recently, the European Union—apparently sobered by their own experience in the U.S.—rejected this approach to conflict minerals. It is easy to see why they did so.

As we debate this amendment, let's be clear on what this isn't about. It is

not about who cares more about the plight of the Congolese more, a population that continues to suffer violence at the hands of rebel groups. The question is whether a window dressing disclosure rule at the SEC is the way to address this problem. If we truly care about peace in central Africa, then good intentions aren't enough. We have to demand results, Mr. Chairman.

Sadly, we have gotten the wrong kind of results from section 1502. Recently, I spoke with some missionaries from my own denomination who confirmed this. However, let's start by highlighting the voices of those who too often go unheard in this debate—the voices of the Africans themselves.

I include in the RECORD an open letter from 70 Congolese leaders and other regional experts who wrote:

"But in demanding that companies prove the origin of minerals sourced in the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries before systems able to provide such proof have been put in place, conflict mineral activists and resultant legislation—in particular Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act—inadvertently incentivize buyers on the international market to pull out of the region altogether and source their minerals elsewhere.

"As a result, the conflict minerals movement has yet to lead to meaningful improvement on the ground, and has a number of unintended and damaging consequences."

According to a Washington Post article titled "How a well-intentioned U.S. law left Congolese miners jobless," section 1502 "set off a chain of events that has propelled millions of miners and their families deeper into poverty," with many miners forced to find other ways to survive, including by joining armed groups.

This article goes on to share the story of a Congolese teenager who actually joined a militia because mining could no longer put food on his table. "If we were earning money more from mining, I would not have entered the militia," he said.

I ask my colleagues to remember the Congolese, who aren't alone in their suffering. The SEC rule applies to nine other African nations as if they were all a single country. Section 1502 treats over 230 million people living in 10 distinct nations as one undifferentiated group.

Little wonder that Africans themselves take issue with Washington's one-size-fits-all mentality. In testimony to the Financial Services Committee last November, Rwanda's Minister of State for Mining, Evode Imena, noted that—despite Rwanda's actions to strengthen due diligence in its mining sector, and despite the fact that Rwanda has no armed groups in the first place—"the region is now suffering from an 'Africa-free' and not a 'conflict-free' minerals situation. Section 1502 has caused a de facto boycott by companies in the U.S. and much of Europe on most of our valuable resources." This disaster "has largely

impacted the livelihood of thousands of miners and their families . . .”

The words of Africans harmed by this rule should be enough for us to suspend it. But if we need more evidence of section 1502’s failures, let’s take a look at hard numbers.

A GAO study found last year that not a single company sampled could determine whether its minerals supported armed groups. Professor Jeff Schwartz of the University of Utah Law School has come to a similar conclusion, after reviewing 1,300 filings under section 1502.

Additionally, I wrote to SEC Chair White asking for a detailed description of the funds and hours expended to date on the SEC conflict minerals disclosure rule. In the SEC response letter, she stated that from July 2010 to March 16, 2015, the SEC spent over 21,000 hours and approximately \$2.7 million on this particular provision which the SEC has little to no experience with.

Given the lack of benefits from this rule, it is no wonder SEC Chair Mary Jo White has said:

“Seeking to improve safety in mines for workers or to end horrible human rights atrocities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are compelling objectives, which, as a citizen, I wholeheartedly share. But, as the Chair of the SEC, I must question, as a policy matter, using the federal securities laws and the SEC’s powers of mandatory disclosure to accomplish these goals.”

I agree with the SEC, and I appreciate support for this amendment.

#### AN OPEN LETTER

Dear governments, companies, non-governmental organisations, and other stakeholders implicated in efforts of various kinds related to the issue of ‘conflict minerals’: In early 2014, two international industry giants—Intel and Apple—issued refined corporate social responsibility policies for minerals sourced in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). The announcements followed an unprecedented wave of guidelines, law-making, and initiatives over the past few years to ‘clean up’ the eastern DRC’s mining sector, and were met with widespread praise.

Perhaps the most widely publicised of these efforts is US legislation known as Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act, which asks all companies registered on the US stock market to reveal their supply chains to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) when sourcing minerals from the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries. Canada is in the advanced stages of developing similar legislation, and many other countries are looking closely at the issue. The European Union has introduced a voluntary conflict minerals regulation scheme for all member states, and the United Nations (UN) and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have developed guidelines on sourcing natural resources in high-risk areas such as the eastern DRC.

These efforts primarily target artisanal (or ‘informal’) mining in the eastern DRC, due to widespread international recognition that so-called conflict minerals (most notably tin, tantalum, tungsten, and gold) produced by artisanal mining in this part of the world have helped conflict actors generate revenue to finance their operations in the DRC over the past two decades.

#### THE SITUATION

Despite successes of activists in shaping policy, the conflict minerals campaign fundamentally misunderstands the relationship between minerals and conflict in the eastern DRC. First, while the minerals help perpetuate the conflict, they are not its cause. National and regional political struggles over power and influence as well as issues such as access to land and questions of citizenship and identity are just some of the more structural drivers of conflict. The ability to exploit and profit from minerals is often a means to finance military operations to address these issues, rather than an end in itself. Internal UN assessments, for instance, show that only 8% of the DRC’s conflicts are linked to minerals, and specific motivations vary greatly across the vast array of different armed groups.

Second, armed groups are not dependent on mineral revenue for their existence. The eastern DRC is a fully militarised economy, in which minerals are just one resource among many that armed groups—and the national army FARDC—can levy financing from. The M23, until recently the most powerful non-state armed group in DRC, never sought physical control over mining activity.

Moreover, few local stakeholders have been included in on-going international policy-making, and as a result realities on the ground have not always been taken into account. Setting up the required systems and procedures to regularly access and audit thousands of artisanal mining sites in isolated and hard-to-reach locations spread across an area almost twice the size of France would be a challenge for any government. In the eastern DRC, where road infrastructure is poor to non-existent and state capacity desperately low, the enormity of the task is hard to overstate. But in demanding that companies prove the origin of minerals sourced in the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries before systems able to provide such proof have been put in place, conflict minerals activists and resultant legislation—in particular Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act—inadvertently incentivize buyers on the international market to pull out of the region altogether and source their minerals elsewhere.

#### THE RESULT

As a result, the conflict minerals movement has yet to lead to meaningful improvement on the ground, and has had a number of unintended and damaging consequences. Nearly four years after the passing of the Dodd-Frank Act, only a small fraction of the hundreds of mining sites in the eastern DRC have been reached by traceability or certification efforts. The rest remain beyond the pale, forced into either illegality or collapse as certain international buyers have responded to the legislation by going ‘Congo-free’.

This in turn has driven many miners into the margins of legality (for instance, feeding into smuggling rackets), where armed actors return through the loopholes of transnational regulation. Others have simply lost their jobs, and in areas where mining has ceased, local economies have suffered. To put this in context, an estimated eight to ten million people across the country are dependent on artisanal mining for their livelihood. Some former miners have returned to subsistence agriculture, but persisting insecurity levels leave them in abject poverty facing dire living conditions, in fear of missing harvests due to displacement. Others have been prompted to join militias as a means to quick cash in the absence of other opportunities; a particularly perverse impact, when one considers the intentions of the movement.

Alongside the impact on mining communities and local economies, several armed groups have responded by turning to different businesses such as trading in charcoal, marijuana, palm oil, soap, or consumer goods. Those remaining in the mining sector have largely traded mineral exploitation on site for mineral taxation a few steps down the supply chain, operating numerous roadblocks that can bring in millions of dollars a year. Others are reported to have sent in family members or civilian allies to run business for them on site, while they remain safely at a distance.

For the few mining sites fortunate enough to be reached by Joint Assessment Teams responsible for determining their ‘conflict-free’ status, these teams have been unable to provide the regular, three-month validation visits envisaged in legislation. There is an additional delay of several months following these visits before the Congolese Ministry of Mines reviews and approves the assessment at the national level. Given the speed at which situations can change in volatile environments, infrequent assessments and lengthy delays raise concerns over the accuracy of certification and the credibility of the system.

More worrying still, multinational corporations such as Apple and Intel are auditing smelters to determine the conflict-free status of the minerals they source, and not the mines themselves. As smelters are located outside of the DRC and audits are not always conducted by third parties, these processes raise further concerns over whether conflict-free certifications reflect production realities.

By far the most advanced site in terms of producing ‘conflict-free’ minerals for sale to the international market is Kalimbi, a tin mining area home to externally-financed initiatives running an industry-led bagging-and-tagging scheme called iTSCI. Yet even here, despite the establishment of a ‘closed pipeline’ from mine to exportation, the mine still suffers from the sporadic influence of armed actors, and miners are made to bear the additional costs of ‘conflict-free’ schemes. This raises further concerns over the credibility of the system in place, and its suitability for the scale-up and expansion to other, more remote mine sites currently underway. Coupled with slow progress in implementation, the trend towards the monopolisation of ‘conflict-free’ supply chain initiatives, in particular traceability by iTSCI, is economically damaging to local populations since it currently excludes and isolates the overwhelming majority of mining communities from legal access to international markets.

#### THE ALTERNATIVE

There is broad consensus for the need to clean up the eastern Congo’s minerals sector, yet much disagreement about the international community’s current model for achieving this goal. As such, efforts to improve transparency in the eastern DRC’s mineral supply chains should continue. Yet a more nuanced and holistic approach that takes into account the realities of the eastern DRC’s mining sector and the complexity of the conflict is needed. To this end, we make the following five recommendations:

Improve consultation with government and communities: Congolese government and civil society were poorly consulted on Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act prior to its passing, and as a result many were unaware of its implications. The few who were consulted were unanimously pro-Dodd-Frank, creating additional conflicts on local levels where endorsement and dissent compete. More Congolese voices must be listened to, and the local context and power structures

taken into account. This would ensure greater understanding of the local context and better harmonisation with existing national and regional initiatives, such as the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region's (ICGLR) Regional Initiative against the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources.

Work towards meaningful reform: The audit process should be designed to improve policies and practices rather than to just provide window-dressing. The dominant belief that static oversight and validation processes ensure 'conflict-free' mineral trade is misplaced given the volatile security situation in most of the eastern DRC. Both mines and smelters should be regularly inspected and the time period between inspection and certification minimized. Where this is not feasible, additional waivers or similar measures should not be ruled out.

Create incentives towards better practice: Legal frameworks must be supported by real projects on the ground that can meet their requirements. If this is not possible—which is clearly still the case today, nearly four years after the passing of Dodd-Frank—then transition periods must be extended and the lowering of excessively high standards for 'conflict-free' minerals should be considered. Similarly, former conflict actors should be incentivised where appropriate to join new 'conflict-free' schemes. This may help avoid the eventual subversion or infiltration of the 'clean' system put in place, as has been seen to date.

Promote fair competition: Regulation must be based on competition that allows not only international businesses but also Congolese producers to influence (i.e. increase) local price schemes. This in turn would encourage a regime that ensures minimum wages which mining cooperatives can guarantee to their members based on their increased leverage on the price fluctuation.

Widen the lens: Root causes of conflict such as land, identity, and political contest in the context of a militarized economy, rather than a single focus on minerals, must be considered by advocates seeking to reduce conflict violence. Furthermore, efforts to eradicate conflict minerals should not overlook the fact that artisanal mining is a key livelihood in the eastern DRC that holds as much potential to help steer the region away from conflict as it does to contribute towards it. More supportive measures are needed—such as those found in the earlier 2009 draft of the US Conflict Minerals Act—that can help capture the economic potential of artisanal mining. Finally, other critical challenges such as access to credit, technical knowledge, hazardous working conditions, and environmental degradation should not be ignored by multinational corporations if they seek to improve business practices and increase transparency in their supply chains.

So far, progress has been made in producing more ethical products for consumers, but stakeholders have not yet proceeded to improve the lives of Congolese people, nor address the negative impact current 'conflict-free' initiatives are having. If the conflict minerals agenda is to lead to positive change on the ground, legislation passed by national governments and steps such as those outlined by Apple or Intel need to be grounded in a more holistic approach that is better tailored to local realities. Failure to do so will continue to seriously limit the ability of conflict minerals initiatives to improve the daily lives of the eastern Congolese and their neighbours. Worse, these initiatives will risk contributing to, rather than alleviating, the very conflicts they set out to address.

#### LIST OF SIGNATORIES

1. Aloys Tegera (Director, POLE Institute Goma)

2. Ann Laudati (Lecturer at the School for Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol)

3. Ashley Leinweber (Assistant Professor of Political Science, Missouri State University)

4. Ben Radley (Researcher, International Institute of Social Studies & 'Obama's Law' Producer)

5. Bonnie Campbell (Professor of Political Science, Université du Québec à Montréal)

6. Christiane Kayser (Independent Analyst & Civil Peace Service-Bread for the World mobile team)

7. Christoph Vogel (Researcher, University of Zurich & Independent analyst/writer)

8. Cyprien Birhingwa (Executive Secretary, COSOC-GL & Coordinator of CENADEP Kivu)

9. Daniel Rothenberg (Professor of Practice, School of Politics and Global Studies, Arizona State University)

10. David Rieff (Independent Author and Commentator)

11. Deo Buuma (Executive Secretary, Action pour la Paix et la Concorde—APC, Bukavu)

12. Didier de Failly s.j., (Directeur, Maison de Mines du Kivu, Bukavu)

13. Dominic Johnson (Africa Editor and Deputy Foreign Editor, die tageszeitung)

14. Dorothea Hilhorst (Professor of Humanitarian Aid and Reconstruction, Wageningen University)

15. Emmanuel Shamavu (Director, APRODEPED, Bukavu)

16. Eric Kajemba (Coordinator, Observatoire Gouvernance et Paix, Bukavu)

17. Esther Marijnen (Researcher, Institute for European Studies/Vrije Universiteit Brussel)

18. Evariste Mfaume (Executive Director, "Solidarité des Volontaires pour l'Humanité")

19. Gabriel Kamundala (Researcher, CEGEMI & Université Catholique de Bukavu)

20. Ganza Buroko (Cultural Operator & Coordinator of Yolé!Africa, Goma)

21. Godefroid Kā Mana (Professor, ULPGL Goma & UEA Bukavu & Université Kasavubu Boma)

22. Godefroid Muzalia (Professor, Institut Supérieur Pédagogique de Bukavu)

23. Henning Tamm (Postdoctoral Prize Research Fellow, Nuffield College, University of Oxford)

24. Herbert Weiss (Emeritus Professor of Political Science, City University of New York)

25. James Smith (Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of California/Davis)

26. Jean Ziegler (Former UN Special Rapporteur for the Right to Food and Professor at University of Geneva)

27. Jeroen Cuvelier (Postdoctoral Researcher, Wageningen University and Ghent University)

28. John Kanyoni (Independent Consultant and Vice-President of the Congolese Chamber of Mines)

29. Josaphat Musamba (Assistant Professor, Université Simon Kimbangu of Bukavu)

30. Joschka Havenith (Independent Researcher and Consultant, Cologne)

31. Jose Diemel (Researcher, Special Chair for Humanitarian Aid & Reconstruction, Wageningen University)

32. Joshua Walker (Postdoctoral Research Fellow, University of the Witwatersrand)

33. Josue Mukulumanya (President of the South Kivu mining cooperatives board GECOMISKI)

34. Justine Brabant (Independent Researcher and Journalist)

35. Juvénal Munubo (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)

36. Juvénal Twaibu (Director, Centre Indépendant de Recherches et d'Etudes Stratégiques au Kivu)

37. Ken Matthyssen (Researcher on artisanal mining in eastern Congo, Antwerp)

38. Kizito Mushiizi (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)

39. Koen Vlassenroot (Director, Conflict Research Group & Professor, Ghent University)

40. Kris Berwouts (Independent Consultant and Author)

41. Kristof Titeca (Assistant Professor, University of Antwerp)

42. Laura Seay (Assistant Professor of Government, Colby College)

43. Ley Uwera (Independent Journalist and Author, Goma)

44. Loochi Muzaliwa (Programme Coordinator, Life and Peace Institute DRC)

45. Micheline Mwendike (Activist, on behalf of LUCHA—Lutte pour le Changement/Struggle for Change)

46. Manuel Wollschläger (Conseiller Technique, ZFD-AGEH in Bukavu)

47. Milli Lake (Assistant Professor, Arizona State University)

48. Nicole Eggers (Assistant Professor of African History, Loyola University New Orleans)

49. Odile Bulabula (Deputy Coordinator, RIO—Network for Organisational Innovation, Bukavu)

50. Pádraic MacOireachtaigh (Regional Advocacy and Communications Officer, Jesuit Refugee Service)

51. Pamela Faber (Researcher, St. Catherine's College, University of Oxford)

52. Passy Mubalama (Independent Journalist and Author, Goma)

53. Paul Muhindo Mulemberi (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)

54. Paul-Romain Namegabe (Professor of Law, Director of CEGEMI, Université Catholique de Bukavu)

55. Paulin Bishakabalya (Director of Humanitarian Assistance and Development Committee, Bukavu)

56. Peer Schouten (Postdoctoral Researcher, University of Gothenburg)

57. Phil Clark (Reader in Comparative and International Politics, SOAS/University of London)

58. Rachel Niehuus (Postdoctoral Researcher at University of California, San Francisco)

59. Rachel Strohm (Researcher in Political Science, University of Berkeley)

60. Raf Custers (Independent Journalist and Author on Mining)

61. Rémy Kasindi (Director, Centre for Research and Strategic Studies in Central Africa, Bukavu)

62. Rodrigue Rukumbuzi (Coordinator, AGAPE-Hauts Plateaux, Uvira)

63. Rosebell Kagumire (Independent Consultant and Blogger, Kampala/Addis Ababa)

64. Salambo Mulonda Bulambo (Director, PIAP, Bukavu)

65. Sara Geenen (Postdoctoral Researcher, Institute of Development Policy, Antwerp University)

66. Sekombi Katondolo (Director, Radio Mutaani, Goma)

67. Severine Autesserre (Assistant Professor, Barnard College, Columbia University)

68. Thomas Idolwa Tchomba (Consultant and Mining Expert, Goma)

69. Timothy Makori (Researcher, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto)

70. Timothy Raeymaekers (Lecturer in Political Geography, University of Zurich)

71. Yvette Mwanza (President of the Mining Committee, Fédération des Entreprises Congolaises North Kivu)

72. Zacharie Bulakali (Independent Researcher on mining in eastern Congo)

All the signatories listed express their support to the open letter in its above form but

not necessarily approve of accompanying opinion pieces and/or explanatory notes, which remain their respective authors' views.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

□ 1600

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is just another devious Republican attempt to undermine efforts to end the decade-long scourge of rape and murder in Congo.

I have been in Congo many times. I served in the State Department in Kinshasa. I know the area. And the gentleman's statement that there is no company that is able to do this is absolutely incorrect. There is a company in Coral Gables, Florida, Kemet Corporation. They certify every bit of their metal is conflict-free. It is possible to do.

Now, why is this important? Well, all the 5 million people that have died in eastern Congo since Rwanda in 1992–93 have been from armed militias that are getting their money by taking minerals out of the ground and selling them abroad using slave labor.

The way you enslave a man is to rape his wife in front of him, and then bring him down and chain him and make him dig up the minerals. That is what has been going on there, and it has been going on for a long time, and everyone in this room is benefiting from that.

Everybody who has a cell phone has tin, tungsten, tantalum in it. And what this amendment is about is companies that will not go through the process. They do not want to do it. They want to get it from wherever it comes from. They don't care who it is.

Now, you can't tell me, and I know enough about Boeing and a lot of other companies, that they know their supply chain right down to where it starts in the ground somewhere. Everything that is in a plane, they know where it came from. And for them to say they don't know where it comes from or I can't know is simply that they want to get it on the cheap and don't care about human value in central Africa.

Now, the gentleman has given me the opening, which I didn't know if I would have, but his own church, the Christian Reformed Church in North America, their coordinator of office of social justice says defunding section 1502 and amendment No. 34 is immoral. It will result in violations and will undo work to our conflict-free mining in Africa.

This is a long-time battle, and we have had no one come up with any other way to deal with this except to

cut off the money to the militias. To say there is not armed conflict in eastern Congo is somebody who has got their head buried in the sand; because if you go over there, you know that there is conflict from Rwanda and Uganda and all the countries in that area, because this stuff is valuable and people want it, and they want it on the cheap.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I maybe, possibly like yourself, have occasional differences with my own church denomination. I have challenged them to talk to their own missionaries that are in the surrounding areas, whom I have talked to, who are also out on the coast, who are now seeing minerals exported.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Reclaiming my time, I get your point. You are saying that your church in wherever they are located, in Michigan or wherever, they are out of touch with what is going on on the ground.

I am in touch with the people on the ground. There are groups like HEAL Africa, which have been operating a hospital in Goma, which has been filled with people that come from this whole process. And when you go over there and talk to them, they say the only way you are ever going to do it here is cut off the money, and that means saying to people you have got to know where that tin or tungsten or tantalum came from and was it gotten by using slave labor.

If you are unwilling to do that, as a company, in the United States, you have no moral fiber. If you are not willing to say you will not use slave labor for the material that is in your product, in your cell phone—and believe me, it wouldn't be hard to get a boycott going in this country against some folks who want to, but nobody wants to come out in the open.

This amendment gets slid in at the last minute every year. Senator DURBIN, Senator COONS, Barney Frank, all of us worked on this. We have heard it all.

And of course the SEC doesn't want to do it. They don't want to do anything that doesn't have to do with paper shuffling and letting the derivatives run through the economy. They simply have been given this because they handle the money.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce pay ratio disclosure rules, including the final rule titled “Pay Ratio Disclosure”, published Aug. 18, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 50103).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit any funds from being used by the SEC to implement, administer, or enforce the ineffective pay ratio disclosure mandate in section 953(b) of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Under Dodd-Frank, section 953(b) requires all publicly traded companies to calculate and disclose, for each filing with the SEC, the median annual total compensation of all employees of the company, excluding the CEO, disclose the annual total compensation of the CEO, and calculate and disclose a ratio comparing those two numbers.

In adopting the final rule, the SEC admitted that the pay ratio disclosure provides “no quantifiable benefit to public shareholders, yet it will cost public companies billions of dollars in initial and ongoing compliance expenses that could otherwise be used for investment in equipment and in job creation.”

While the SEC provided modest flexibility in the final rule as compared to its initial proposal, the final rule did not mitigate the most significant burdens that the public companies will face as they collect and calculate the compensation information necessary to comply.

Companies must still all include all employees—including temporary, part-time, seasonal employees—and non-U.S. employees into their pay ratio calculation. The rule's 5 percent exclusion for non-U.S. employees, which includes any foreign employee whose salary data is protected by their home country privacy laws, will not defray the significant compliance costs, which the SEC estimates at \$1.3 billion in initial compliance costs and \$526 million on an ongoing annual cost basis.

Even the former Financial Services chairman, Barney Frank, acknowledged that burden before a September 24, 2010, hearing, stating: "I would note, again, that it was a Senate provision, and I think our inclination is to see to what extent it can be lessened as a burden, and, if not, we would be able to work and try to change that next year."

That was almost 6 years ago, Mr. Chairman. During that same hearing, the Democratic witness, Mr. Martin Baily of the Squam Lake Group, stated: "I am quite concerned about the level of poverty in the United States. I am quite concerned about the fact that ordinary workers have not done very well in the last few years. I don't see how publishing that ratio helps anybody very much, so I am not a big fan of that."

Amen. I could not agree more, Mr. Baily.

In his dissent, SEC Commissioner Gallagher stated: "Addressing perceived income inequality is not the province of the securities laws or the Commission."

Additionally, SEC Chair Mary Jo White has expressed similar concerns about the provision of the Dodd-Frank Act, noting that several provisions "appear more directed at exerting societal pressure on companies to change behavior rather than to disclose financial information that primarily informs investments decisions."

Again, I could not agree more, Mr. Chairman.

This useless disclosure requirement creates a number of lengthy and burdensome reporting obligations whose costs far outweighs any perceived benefits. This includes failing to provide shareholders with useful information or facilitate a better understanding of pay practices, which some falsely trumpet this provision would do.

Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about creating more jobs in our various congressional districts, and instead of companies being forced to spend millions of dollars trying to comply with a regulatory mandate for which the SEC has been unable to quantify any benefits to the public, shouldn't these burdensome costs, instead, be converted and used by manufacturers, retailers, and other public companies for much-needed investment and job creation? I think so. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would repeal a requirement that companies show just how much more the CEO is paid compared to the company's median worker.

Why are Republicans so scared about reporting this number?

I imagine my Republican colleagues will describe the alleged costs to industry. Indeed, industry has offered wildly exaggerated estimates of the SEC's initial proposal, 10 times what the SEC economists estimated. However, none of these estimates are credible. There is no indication that industry has yet to come up with any credible estimate for the cost of the final rule. In fact, no one has, as the House Financial Services Committee has failed to convene a hearing on the final rule and the flexibility provided by the SEC. Worse, the committee has failed to hold a hearing on the bill, itself, this Congress. Rather, the Republicans are rushing this bill through the House and once again seek to repeal outright this provision in Dodd-Frank.

In the past, and before the SEC finalized its flexible rule, Democrats offered amendments to ease burdens on businesses, but Republicans weren't interested then and are apparently worried that the American public and investors will finally see that not all public companies pay their employees the same. In fact, some companies pay their CEO 400 times the median employee.

My Republican colleagues aren't concerned that CEOs and the rest of the 1 percent continue to take most of the income and wealth of this country. My colleagues aren't concerned that minorities and low-income Americans haven't seen a raise in decades.

The SEC has provided industry with as much flexibility as it could while still being consistent with the congressional mandate. I will also note that the requirement doesn't affect small businesses or emerging growth companies, but it is targeted to companies that retail investors overwhelmingly choose to invest in.

I know that industry, especially the global manufacturers, oppose the SEC rule, but I think that the information provided by this number matters. It will go a long way to identify the disparity between the top 1 percent and the everyday worker. It will go a long way towards enabling everyday investors to fund companies that properly compensate their employees, or punish those that inappropriately compensate their CEO.

I urge my colleagues to think seriously about this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the remaining time on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. And I believe I have the right to close; correct?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to point out to my colleague from New

York that he is actually wrong. We marked this bill up in committee in April of this year.

And the interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is they want it both ways. We have to follow the SEC until they don't want to do it, and then they disagree with it. They disagree with the statement that the SEC apparently has come up with that this is going to cost \$1.7 billion in this initial year.

They want to say that the Obama economy is great—until it isn't and it doesn't work in their favor.

I, too, am very concerned and join my colleagues of all stripes to say that this economy has not responded the way it needs to and we need to have those wages up. And here we are robbing Peter to pay Paul, because we are going to take that money that could go into investing in equipment and productivity and actual workers, and we are going to do meaningless reports to this that tell us nothing. And the words of the SEC Chair—not my words, the SEC Chair—says that this brings no meaningful information to people in the economy.

□ 1615

So I don't understand why, other than window dressing, once again, and trying to set up a straw man argument, for why the businesses are doing what they are doing, why they would move ahead.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a corporation tell you that studying their business practices is well-spent money. Everybody wants to keep everybody in the dark as to what is going on.

The American people have a sense of what is going on. We have heard enough, especially during this last campaign, about the 1 percent and the 99 percent. We have heard enough about how on Wall Street, in my city of New York, part of the problem was the lack of supervision by the FCC and by the SEC. And part of the problem—a large part—was the bonuses that these folks were getting. A \$50 million bonus in some cases and a \$25 million bonus in some cases was not something unheard of.

So I think that every so often the American people need to know and get information that may seem like a waste of money to some people, but actually can get at a problem.

We need to know in this capitalist society that we have—and we are not about to change that. We all like it. I like it. I want to keep it. But I think we have to try to look for ways to balance so that 99 percent of the people are not in danger of hurting while 1 percent of the folks are in great shape.

To find out that CEOs sometimes get 400 times the salary of one of their workers is totally outrageous, and the American people should know that and

should know—especially in the cases of stockholders too, there are a lot of stockholders who are small stockholders—and they want to know what company they are investing in.

So I think that this rule or this approach is good, and I think your amendment just tries to—I am not saying you do—but your amendment, the final result will be to try to cover up the truth, and that is not a good thing.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that Amendment No. 36 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by the Act may be used in contravention of, or to implement changes to, section 560.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on June 22, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I rise today to offer an amendment to eliminate the potential of Iran's gaining access to the U.S. dollar.

As Iran continues to violate international law with illicit ballistic missile tests, as it undermines U.S. foreign policy, and as it destabilizes the Middle East, the Obama administration may be willing to ease restrictions on Iran's access to the dollar and potentially reward Iran's international provocations with coveted access to world financial markets.

We cannot allow this to happen.

Since agreeing to the Iranian deal last year, the Obama administration has seemingly gone out of its way to appease Iran. Sanctions were lifted with little to show in the way of nuclear disarmament. The rogue regime is now selling oil on the international market, and Iran has received access to tens of billions of dollars held abroad

and has signed deals worth over \$100 billion in foreign investment.

Allowing Iran to have access to the dollar would mark an unprecedented additional concession to the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Access to the dollar would be an undeserved reward to a country that tortures its own people, denies human rights to women, and has the blood of Americans and our allies on its hands.

But in an effort to advance the nuclear agreement, I worry that the President may act unilaterally—as he has done so often in the past—and permit the Treasury Department and other Federal entities to proceed with granting Iran the access to the dollar it so desperately wants. A vote for this amendment will eliminate that possibility.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, let me say that this does not change what is currently the situation in this country. Last summer, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew testified that Iranian banks will not be able to clear U.S. dollars through New York, hold correspondent account relationships with U.S. financial institutions, or enter into financing agreements with U.S. banks.

As the Secretary made clear, Iran, in other words, will continue to be denied access to the world's largest financial and commercial market.

This amendment simply puts that promise into statutory law, and that is why I have proposed it. The Lance amendment will eliminate any possibility that we might move in the other direction.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

I don't, as you can see, have much to say on this because it is really an interesting situation. It is an amendment looking for a problem that doesn't exist. It is an amendment looking for the possibility that the President—there we go again, the gentleman in the White House—that the President may do something he hasn't said anything about doing.

The Treasury Department says that there are no current plans to amend the regulation and that flexibility is not at issue at this point because no one is discussing this.

The second part to this amendment is the underlying feeling by some Members still that the deal with Iran was a bad deal, that that deal won't work, and that somehow we will be left holding the bag. Well, giving peace a chance, as the song says, is never a bad thing to do.

I would hope that in the future we deal only with amendments that speak to an existing problem and not to an amendment that simply speaks about: What if? We have too many what-ifs in amendments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I oppose the amendment and would hope that our colleagues would vote against it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that this is not designed against any one President. This would be put into statutory law, and it would proceed after this President leaves office.

I believe that it is important that this fundamental principle—that Iran not have access to the U.S. dollar—should be in statutory law and not merely a matter of executive action. That is why I have proposed the amendment.

I hope that all Members will consider the amendment.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I would just like to note that we speak about it, and it is not directed at any one President. But we have a unique system. We only have one President at a time. So it is directed at one President.

I suspect that if we were going to stay in session—which we are not—for every week from now until the end of the year, we would see more and more and more bills—up to December 31—bills that would try to limit the power of the office of the Presidency because of who occupies it right now and the disdain that the other side, so many Members, have for our President.

I see it differently. I see the Iran deal as a possibility for peace. Maybe history will say that I was naive. But I know the alternative, and the alternative is war. So any time that I can take a chance on evading and not having war, let's go for it.

Secondly, to legislate by suggesting that something could happen and therefore we have to head it off at the pass is not the way to legislate.

I would hope that we could vote against this amendment. I urge opposition to it.

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that the Iranian agreement is, of course, extremely controversial. It was voted down by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, there was never any vote in the other House because cloture was not achieved.

The President submitted the Iranian agreement as an agreement, not as a treaty, based upon the fact that legislation has been passed to make it an agreement. I think it is important that as a matter of statutory law we make sure that Iran not have access to the U.S. dollar, and that is why I propose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

The amendment was agreed to.



AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Number 38.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce Executive Order 13166 (August 16, 2000; 65 Fed. Reg. 50121).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is an amendment that I offered before in the past. It simply says: "None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce Executive Order 13166."

That is an executive order that was filed by then-President Clinton on August 16 in the year 2000, in the last months of his Presidency, that directs all Federal fund recipients—and that would include Federal contractors, State and local governments, as well as the Federal Government—to facilitate language interpretation with anyone who seeks to engage with them.

That has been an executive order that has been highly costly not only to the taxpayers, but to the consumers in this country, in time and in money. It was one of the initial things that began to slow down this process of assimilation in America.

We know that a common language is the most powerful unifying force known throughout all of history, whether it is English or whether it is some other language in some other country, and that we have a strong effort to establish English as the official language of the United States.

I happen to be the author of that accomplishment in the State of Iowa. Thirty other States have English as the official language, and some 83 percent of Americans support this policy. Yet President Clinton's executive order subverts this and works to fracture us rather than unify us.

So it will save us billions of dollars. I didn't bring that figure to the floor with me, but we know it has been very expensive over time. We are 16 years into this. It has been destructive to the unity of the American people. I want to see us united as a people, and this is one of the steps that we can take.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I won't speak in Spanish. I will only speak in English. The gentleman is a person that we all know well. He can't pass up the opportunity to say something about immigrants and say something about English as the official language.

Let me start off by saying this: I don't speak for any community, and I certainly don't know what other communities go through. But I can tell you that in the Hispanic/Latino community, when people sit around the dinner table and the issue of language comes up, it is not a plot against the English language. It is usually a conversation about how the children and the grandchildren no longer speak Spanish; they speak only English. That is just a fact.

Number two, this assimilation issue, do you really think that someone would leave all their small belongings behind, leave in many cases their wife and their children to come into this country undocumented—assuming we are talking about undocumented people—before they can find a way to bring the rest of the family, to not learn English, to purposely keep themselves away from immigrating into the American society?

On the contrary, some of the jokes are that some of the better—not better, but stronger-feeling Americans, the ones who want to vote, the ones who want to wave the flag strongly and proudly, are people who came from other countries.

□ 1630

Just about everybody has somebody that came from another country, either now or a long time ago.

The reason that President Clinton and so many of us have supported the issue—and I am speaking about the first President Clinton, not the next one—the fact that we support the issue of giving service is because in many ways this could be a constitutional question.

I will give you an example. I am not a lawyer, but it says life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that is what we are promised. Well, life could be a paramedic being able to speak to you in a language that you understand. Liberty could be you in a trial getting an interpreter so what you have to say to that judge and to that jury can be understood. And the pursuit of happiness, of course, is a separate issue, but it allows you to grow two cultures at the same time.

I speak Spanish, I speak English, and I am a Member of the U.S. Congress. I don't think the fact that I speak Spanish has made me a worse Congressman or a worse American. I was born in an American territory that speaks a lot of Spanish. I grew up speaking Spanish and English at the same time. I am still working on both to be better at them every day, but I am a living example that there is nothing wrong with speaking more than one language.

We in this country have a couple of fears that set us apart from the rest of the world and make us less than the rest of the world, and that is the fear of languages. In some other countries, in Europe and so on, children at the age of 10 speak two, three, or four languages; grownups speak a couple of languages. It doesn't hurt them in any way.

What is wrong if you speak another language?

But here we are talking about services, going to the Department of Motor Vehicles and getting someone who can understand what you are saying until you learn to speak English. But trust me, the big line here is "until you speak English," because no one wants to come here and remain only speaking Spanish or their own country's language and forgetting English.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say first in response to the gentleman, and I respect his position and his background, but I would say if he had a development in the Greek language, he might think of that pursuit of happiness as what our Founding Fathers did. They called it eudaimonia, E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A, the Greek word. That means developing the whole human being—the body, the mind, the spirit, and the soul—all together.

That pursuit of happiness wasn't about a tailgate party. It was about becoming the best human being that you could. That is a little difference in the translation of the language that got lost. It is an example of how we are divided by language rather than unified by a common language.

Another example would be Israel. It became a country in 1948. In 1954, they adopted Hebrew as their official language. I asked them why, and they said: Because we saw the example of the United States, that you have embraced English as your common language. It has unified the people. We needed to have a language to unify the Israelis.

And it has been successful, and I could give you examples. One day I got in a taxicab and there was a gentleman there. He spoke perfect English and he didn't seem to fit what a normal taxicab driver was. I said: Where were you raised?

He said: Bosnia.

How long have you been here?

Seven years.

Did you learn English before you came?

Not a word.

How can you speak perfect English in 7 years?

He said: It helps when you have to.

So I am not about discouraging the utilization of other languages, and this amendment does not do that. What it says is I am dispatched by the taxpayer dollars that are contributing to the division of America rather than let us have an encouragement to pull together in the same language. That is what this is about. It is a fiscally responsible amendment that addresses an

83 percent majority in 31 States that have already taken this act.

I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that the gentleman picked the wrong example—Israel—because they have more than one official language, but that is okay. The more the merrier.

The fact of life is that the gentleman picked the example of someone who learned English. Well, everybody wants to learn to speak English. If you go to my community in the South Bronx, you see small-business owners. Those are the best examples. Some of them speak what we would call broken English. Some of them speak perfect English. Their children, half of them no longer speak Spanish; they speak English. Their children are attending Fordham University or a university down South. They are not going to be bodega owners when they grow up, or cab drivers. They most likely will go work on Wall Street or somewhere else or teach.

In other words, we have a pattern in this country that hasn't been broken. What made us great is the fact that people come here, they adapt, they become part of this country, and then they defend this country with everything they have got, including their blood. That happens all the time, it happens all the time, and it is not going to stop happening.

So if you have a worry—and I have heard you for years—that somehow speaking Spanish is going to wreck this country, on the contrary. Just learn to speak Spanish and you will feel much better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say in response to the gentleman, I give some thought to the story of the Tower of Babel. We know that the construction manager there was Nimrod. He was building a tower to the heavens. They had the arrogance to believe that they could bypass God and get to heaven without Him. The Lord looked down on the Tower of Babel and He said:

Behold, they are one people, they speak all one language, and nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them.

He scrambled their languages and scattered them to the four winds. Humanity on the planet has been at each other's throats ever since. That is the message of the Tower of Babel.

My message is unify us as one people. It is not discouraging the utilization of other languages, but it is discouraging the idea that we should establish ethnic

enclaves in America, that we should isolate ourselves somehow in these neighborhoods and not be assimilating into a broader neighborhood.

I will give an example to the gentleman. When Bush was President and we had a representative from the Department of Labor who came to testify before the Small Business Committee, she said: We have a problem. We don't have enough workers in the factories to run our punch presses and our lathes. Simple industrial work.

Why is that?

She said: Well, the applicants are not literate in the English language, and we have great difficulty in teaching them how to operate these machines.

I said: I can understand that if they are first-generation immigrants. In fact, I can understand it if some of them are second generation.

She cut me off and said: Even third generation.

So the pick-up of the language and the transition into the next generation is not happening at the speed it did because our enclaves are getting larger and more populated and people are more isolated into that.

I want to encourage people to be successful, to go out and get an education and to assimilate more broadly. I want to be able to look across this country and know that I can walk into a city council meeting anywhere and know that it is being conducted in English. I want people to be able to talk and communicate with each other. When I go to a foreign country and they speak their language, I get the sense of that, too.

We gravitate towards common kind, and the more common we can be, the more things we can have in common with each other, the more likely we are to be bonded together. That is what this amendment is about.

I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out Operation Choke Point.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, how does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it doesn't like?

Simple. It cuts that industry off from the financial services sector—the lifeblood of every business in this country.

It sounds impossible, doesn't it?

However, that is exactly what the FDIC is doing in conjunction with the Department of Justice. By this point, we are all familiar with Operation Choke Point. It is the program designed to force legally operating and licensed entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need.

What started with nondepository lenders has spread to many other industries. Reports indicate that the FDIC and DOJ continue to pressure financial institutions that service the gun, ammunition, and tobacco industries. These are legal industries, and it is my belief that no joint FDIC and DOJ operation should broadly target lawful commerce.

I want to be very clear. I strongly support the FDIC and other Federal banking regulators' authority to monitor financial institutions and identify risky behavior. But what cannot be tolerated is the Federal Government abusing its authority to target entire industries, including those that obey the laws and live within the rules.

This isn't a Republican issue; this isn't a Democratic issue; it isn't a liberal or a conservative issue. This is an issue of the DOJ, FDIC, and potentially other banking regulators stepping outside the law.

We worked on a bipartisan basis to inform the DOJ, FDIC, and others of the consequences of Operation Choke Point, but those concerns have fallen on deaf ears. Operation Choke Point is still happening. In the last few months, I have heard from a debt buyer in California, a tobacco shop in Florida, and, just this week, a veteran-owned shooting sports company in Virginia.

I am now concerned that Operation Choke Point-like tactics have spread beyond the FDIC to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Despite Comptroller Curry's remarks on the dangers of de-risking, we continue to hear from financial institutions that OCC examiners are applying pressure in an effort to force banks to drop longstanding customers and correspondent banking relationships for no valid reason.

I would like to remind my colleagues that similar amendments to prohibit the use of funds for Operation Choke Point were attached without opposition to appropriations bills in fiscal years 2015 and 2016. In February, the House passed a bipartisan vote of 250-169 H.R. 766, the Financial Institution

Customer Protection Act. That legislation included measures that would prohibit Operation Choke Point through increased transparency and responsible governance.

This amendment is an important step in ensuring that the FDIC and other Federal banking regulators continue their job, but do so without abuse of power.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this amendment which, again, has generated no opposition and has been adopted by voice vote in previous years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, at the behest of the House Republicans' inquiry, the Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility investigated whether there was misconduct or targeting of legal businesses by Operation Choke Point. The DOJ's OPR, in their report from last year, found that absolutely no wrongdoing had occurred.

The DOJ's Office of Professional Responsibility "concluded that the Department of Justice attorneys involved in Operation Choke Point did not engage in professional misconduct," and that, "OPR's inquiry further determined that Civil Division employees did not improperly target lawful participants."

Moreover, a follow-on report from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation inspector general found that the FDIC's involvement in Operation Choke Point was inconsequential to the direction and outcome of the initiative.

Operation Choke Point is an enforcement action by the Department of Justice, whose funding is not addressed by this particular appropriations bill. In fact, that is part of the large problem with this amendment—that it really speaks to issues that belong in another bill.

What this provision really does is tell the banking regulators not to cooperate with law enforcement when the Department of Justice has identified mass market fraud and other abuses of the payments system.

The Department of Justice has made it a priority to hold the perpetrators of consumer fraud accountable. Recently, for example, they prosecuted the operators of lottery scams, the promoters of fake business opportunities, and the criminals behind a telemarketing fraud targeting Spanish-speaking customers.

Preventing banking regulators from cooperating with legitimate law enforcement requests would restrict the ability of the Civil Division's Consumer Protection Branch in enforcing consumer protection statutes throughout the United States.

Operation Choke Point is just one of the Consumer Protection Branch's ef-

forts that require cooperation with banking regulators and which have produced significant results.

□ 1645

For example, the Branch, together with U.S. Attorneys across the country, obtained over 150 criminal convictions and more than \$7 billion in criminal fines, forfeitures, and restitution ordered to victims. Limiting the funding it receives would be a serious blow to consumers who need the protection of the government from the financial predators.

This is something that we should not be doing at this point. We, certainly, shouldn't be doing it in this bill, but we shouldn't be doing it at all. I urge its opposition.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, as somebody who has been on both sides of the table with regard to financial services—as a regulator and on the other side of the table as a businessperson—I think I have a unique perspective on what is going on here.

We also have a couple of reports from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee that took the emails of both of these agencies—their own emails—and showed them to be engaged in Operation Choke Point activities with the intent not to go after somebody who is doing something illegal, but to go after people who are doing something legal. That is the difference.

I support, as the gentleman indicated a minute ago, some of the activities of the regulators in going after bad actors. I support that 110 percent. As a former regulator, I am with the gentleman all the way. My problem is what is going on with Operation Choke Point as we are going after legal businesses that are doing legal business. That is a big difference because their own emails indicate their own, internal attorneys—the legal authorities in their own agencies—questioned their own ability to be doing what they are doing.

This should send a chill down the spine of every single American when you have the Department of Justice's own attorneys telling them we shouldn't be doing this because this is not legal. Yet this is the legal entity that is supposed to be leading our country and providing us protection with the law, itself.

It is interesting because the FDIC has already implemented a lot of these changes that we requested in our bill. In committee—and to me, personally—they admitted what was going on and said: We are going to fix our problems. They admitted Operation Choke Point was going on and that they were targeting legal businesses that were doing legal business. They said: We can't have that. We are going to stop it. The problem is it is continuing to go on, as I indicated in my testimony.

Just this week, there was another one. I have an email address that takes

information from individuals who have been wronged by Operation Choke Point activities. They are in legal businesses, doing legal business. And we got another hit just this week. Over the last several months, we have had numerous hits from different businesses across the country. Yet we have continued to see this happen.

I ask for the support of the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-639 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 22 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. BUCK of Colorado.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GUINTA of New Hampshire.

Amendment No. 34 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—182

Abraham	Barton	Blackburn
Allen	Bilirakis	Blum
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Boustany
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Barr	Black	Brat

Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Buchson  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Carter (GA)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Collins (GA)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding

NOES—241

Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Barletta  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (NY)

Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly (MS)  
King (IA)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry

Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Schalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shuster  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

King (NY)  
Kirzinger (IL)  
Kuster  
LaHood  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McKinley  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Newhouse

NOT VOTING—10

Bost  
Brown (FL)  
Delaney  
Hastings

Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David

NOT VOTING—10

Lieu, Ted  
Nader  
Nugent  
Rooney (FL)

Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Womack  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Takai  
Turner

Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (IN)  
Buck  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler

NOT VOTING—10

Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
King (IA)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Messer  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pitts

Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Schalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Graham  
Granger  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Harper  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind

NOES—224

Messrs. WOMACK, HIMES, MEEKS, MS. BASS, Messrs. REED, ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. MULLIN, TROTT, and ROYCE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK  
The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE  
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 224, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—197

Abraham  
Allen  
Amash  
Babin  
Barr  
Barton

Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers (NC)  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Graham  
Granger  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hardy  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda

Hoyer	McCullum	Rush	Brat	Heck (NV)	Perry	Huffman	McGovern	Sánchez, Linda
Huffman	McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Bridenstine	Hensarling	Pittenger	Israel	McNerney	T.
Huizenga (MI)	McGovern	Sánchez, Linda	Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Pitts	Jackson Lee	McSally	Sánchez, Loretta
Israel	McNerney	T.	Brooks (IN)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)	Jeffries	Meehan	Sanford
Jackson Lee	Meehan	Sánchez, Loretta	Buchanan	Hill	Pompeo	Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Sarbanes
Jeffries	Meeks	Sarbanes	Buck	Holding	Posey	Johnson, E. B.	Meng	Schakowsky
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Schakowsky	Bucshon	Hudson	Price, Tom	Jolly	Moore	Schiff
Johnson, E. B.	Mica	Schiff	Burgess	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe	Kaptur	Moulton	Schrader
Jolly	Moore	Schrader	Byrne	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert	Katko	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Joyce	Moulton	Scott (VA)	Calvert	Hultgren	Renacci	Keating	Napolitano	Scott, David
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David	Carter (GA)	Hunter	Rice (SC)	Kelly (IL)	Neal	Serrano
Keating	Napolitano	Serrano	Carter (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)	Kennedy	Noem	Sewell (AL)
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Sewell (AL)	Chabot	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)	Kildee	Nolan	Sherman
Kelly (PA)	Newhouse	Sherman	Chaffetz	Issa	Rogers (KY)	Kilmer	Norcross	Shimkus
Kennedy	Noem	Simpson	Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher	Kind	O'Rourke	Sinema
Kildee	Nolan	Sinema	Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam	Kinzinger (IL)	Pallone	Sires
Kilmer	Norcross	Sires	Cole	Johnson (OH)	Ross	Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Slaughter
Kind	O'Rourke	Slaughter	Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus	Kuster	Payne	Smith (WA)
King (NY)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Comstock	Jones	Rouzer	Langevin	Pelosi	Speier
Kingzinger (IL)	Pascrell	Speier	Conaway	Jordan	Royce	Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Swalwell (CA)	Cook	Joyce	Russell	Larson (CT)	Peters	Takano
Kuster	Pelosi	Takano	Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Salmon	Lawrence	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Scalise	Lee	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Thompson (MS)	Crawford	King (IA)	Schweikert	Levin	Pocan	Titus
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Tiberi	Cuellar	King (NY)	Scott, Austin	Lewis	Poliquin	Tonko
Lawrence	Pingree	Titus	Culberson	Kline	Loeb sack	Loeb sack	Polis	Torres
Lee	Pittenger	Tonko	Davidson	Knight	Lofgren	Lofgren	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Levin	Pocan	Torres	Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Lowenthal	Lowenthal	Quigley	Van Hollen
Lewis	Polis	Tsongas	DeSantis	LaHood	Lowe y	Lowe y	Rangel	Vargas
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Van Hollen	DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Lujan Grisham	Lujan Grisham	Reed	Veasey
Loeb sack	Quigley	Vargas	Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	(NM)	(NM)	Ribble	Vela
Lofgren	Rangel	Veasey	Dold	Lance	Luján, Ben Ray	Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Lowenthal	Reichert	Vela	Donovan	Latta	(NM)	(NM)	Richmond	Visclosky
Lowe y	Renacci	Velázquez	Duffy	Lipinski	Lummis	Lummis	Rigell	Walz
Lujan Grisham	Ribble	Visclosky	Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Lynch	Lynch	Roby	Wasserman
(NM)	Rice (NY)	Walz	Duncan (TN)	Long	Maloney,	Maloney,	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (SC)	Wasserman	Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Carolyn	Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
(NM)	Richmond	Schultz	Emmer (MN)	Love	Maloney, Sean	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Lynch	Rigell	Waters, Maxine	Farenthold	Lucas	Matsui	Matsui	Ruppersberger	Welch
MacArthur	Roby	Watson Coleman	Fincher	Luetkemeyer	McCollum	McCollum	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Roskam	Welch	Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	McDermott	McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)	Fleischmann	Marchant				
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Yarmuth	Fleming	Trott				
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Young (IN)	Flores	Upton				

NOT VOTING—12

Bost	Hastings	Nugent
Brown (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)
Delaney	Marchant	Takai
Guinta	Nadler	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1715

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

AYES—217

Abraham	Barr	Black
Aderholt	Barton	Blackburn
Allen	Bilirakis	Blum
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Boustany
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)

Adams	Cicilline	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	F.
Amodei	Clarke (NY)	Duckworth
Ashford	Clay	Edwards
Barietta	Cleaver	Ellison
Bass	Clyburn	Engel
Beatty	Cohen	Eshoo
Becerra	Collins (NY)	Esty
Benishek	Connolly	Farr
Bera	Conyers	Foster
Beyer	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Fudge
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gabbard
Bonamici	Crenshaw	Gallego
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Garamendi
F.	Cummings	Graham
Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Grayson
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Butterfield	DeFazio	Grijalva
Capps	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Capuano	DeLauro	Hahn
Cárdenas	DelBene	Hanna
Carney	Denham	Heck (WA)
Carson (IN)	Dent	Higgins
Cartwright	DeSaunier	Himes
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Honda
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Hoyer

NOES—203

Bost	Murphy (PA)	Takai
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Turner
Delaney	Nugent	Williams
Hastings	Rokita	
Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)	

NOT VOTING—13

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

□ 1718

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

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 379, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—243

Abraham	Amash	Babin
Aderholt	Amodei	Barletta
Allen	Ashford	Barr



Heck (WA)	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe	Kuster	Napolitano	Schiff
Higgins	Maloney,	T.	Cramer	Jolly	Reed	Langevin	Neal	Schrader
Himes	Carolyne	Sanchez, Loretta	Crawford	Jones	Renacci	Larsen (WA)	Nolan	Scott (VA)
Hinojosa	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes	Crenshaw	Jordan	Ribble	Larson (CT)	Norcross	Scott, David
Honda	Matsui	Schakowsky	Cuellar	Joyce	Rice (SC)	Lawrence	O'Rourke	Serrano
Hoyer	McCollum	Schiff	Culberson	Katko	Rigell	Lee	Pallone	Sewell (AL)
Huffman	McDermott	Schrader	Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Rohy	Levin	Pascrell	Sherman
Israel	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)	Lewis	Payne	Sires
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Scott, David	Denham	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Slaughter
Jeffries	Meeks	Serrano	Dent	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Lipinski	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Sewell (AL)	DeSantis	Kinzing (IL)	Rohrabacher	Loeb sack	Peters	Speier
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Sherman	DesJarlais	Kline	Rokita	Lofgren	Peterson	Swalwell (CA)
Jones	Moulton	Sinema	Donovan	Knight	Roskam	Lowenthal	Pingree	Takano
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Sires	Duffy	Labrador	Ross	Lowe y	Pocan	Thompson (CA)
Keating	Napolitano	Slaughter	Duncan (SC)	LaHood	Rothfus	Lujan Grisham	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Smith (WA)	Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Rouzer	(NM)	Price (NC)	Titus
Kennedy	Nolan	Speier	Ellmers (NC)	Lamborn	Royce	Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Tonko
Kildee	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)	Emmer (MN)	Lance	Russell	(NM)	Rangel	Torres
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Takano	Farenthold	Latta	Salmon	Lynch	Reichert	Tsongas
Kind	Pallone	Thompson (CA)	Fincher	LoBiondo	Sanford	Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Valadao
Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)	Fitzpatrick	Long	Scalise	Carolyn	Richmond	Van Hollen
Kuster	Payne	Titus	Fleischmann	Loudermillk	Schweikert	Maloney, Sean	Ros-Lehtinen	Vargas
Langevin	Pelosi	Tonko	Fleming	Love	Scott, Austin	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Torres	Flores	Lucas	Sensenbrenner	McCollum	Ruiz	Vela
Larson (CT)	Peters	Tsongas	Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Sessions	McDermott	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Lawrence	Peterson	Van Hollen	Fortenberry	Lummis	Shimkus	McGovern	Rush	Visclosky
Lee	Pingree	Vargas	Fox	MacArthur	Shuster	McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Levin	Pocan	Veasey	Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Simpson	Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Lewis	Polis	Vela	Frelinghuysen	Marino	Smith (MO)	Meng	T.	Watson Coleman
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Velázquez	Garrett	Massie	Smith (NE)	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
Lipinski	Quigley	Visclosky	Gibbs	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)	Moulton	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
Loeb sack	Rangel	Walz	Gibson	McCaul	Smith (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Wasserman	Gohmert	McClintock	Stefanik			
Lowenthal	Richmond	Schultz	Goodlatte	McHenry	Stewart			
Lowe y	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine	Gosar	McKinley	Stivers	Bost	Farr	Sinema
Lujan Grisham	Ruiz	Watson Coleman	Gowdy	McMorris	Stutzman	Brat	Hastings	Takai
(NM)	Ruppersberger	Welch	Granger	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)	Brown (FL)	Nadler	Turner
Luján, Ben Ray	Rush	Wilson (FL)	Graves (GA)	McSally	Thornberry	Delaney	Nugent	Walz
(NM)	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth	Graves (LA)	Meadows	Tiberi	Eshoo	Rooney (FL)	Waters, Maxine
			Graves (MO)	Meehan	Tipton			
			Griffith	Messer	Trott			
			Grothman	Mica	Upton			
			Guinta	Miller (FL)	Wagner			
			Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Walberg			
			Hanna	Moolenaar	Walden			
			Hardy	Mooney (WV)	Walker			
			Harper	Mullin	Walorski			
			Harris	Mulvaney	Walters, Mimi			
			Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)			
			Heck (NV)	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)			
			Hensarling	Newhouse	Wenstrup			
			Herrera Beutler	Noem	Westerman			
			Hice, Jody B.	Nunes	Westmoreland			
			Hill	Olson	Whitfield			
			Holding	Palazzo	Williams			
			Hudson	Palmer	Wilson (SC)			
			Huelskamp	Paulsen	Wittman			
			Huizenga (MI)	Pearce	Womack			
			Hultgren	Perry	Woodall			
			Hunter	Pittenger	Yoder			
			Hurd (TX)	Pitts	Yoho			
			Hurt (VA)	Poe (TX)	Young (AK)			
			Issa	Poliquin	Young (IA)			
			Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo	Young (IN)			
			Jenkins (WV)	Posey	Zeldin			
			Johnson (OH)	Price, Tom	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—12

Bost	Duncan (SC)	Nugent
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
Delaney	Jordan	Takai
DeSaulnier	Nadler	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1724

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

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—236

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

NOES—182

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bost	Farr	Sinema
Brat	Hastings	Takai
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Turner
Delaney	Nugent	Walz
Eshoo	Rooney (FL)	Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1727

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

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 162, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—260

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

Cuellar	Katko	Rigell	Kildee	Meeks	Sarbanes	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Culberson	Keating	Roby	Kilmer	Meng	Schakowsky	Dold	King (IA)	Ribble
Curbeo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Roe (TN)	Kind	Moore	Schiff	Donovan	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Kirkpatrick	Moulton	Scott (VA)	Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	Kuster	Murphy (FL)	Serrano	Duncan (SC)	Kline	Roby
Denham	King (NY)	Rohrabacher	Langevin	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)	Duncan (TN)	Knight	Roe (TN)
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita	Larsen (WA)	Neal	Sherman	Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
DeSantis	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen	Larson (CT)	Nolan	Slaughter	Emmer (MN)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
DesJarlais	Knight	Roskam	Lawrence	Norcross	Smith (WA)	Farenthold	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Ross	Lee	O'Rourke	Speier	Fincher	Lamborn	Rokita
Dold	LaHood	Rothfus	Levin	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Donovan	LaMalfa	Rouzer	Lewis	Payne	Takano	Fleischmann	Latta	Ross
Duffy	Lamborn	Royce	Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	Fleming	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Ruppersberger	Loeb	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)	Flores	Long	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Russell	Lofgren	Peters	Titus	Forbes	Loudermilk	Russell
Ellmers (NC)	Lipinski	Salmon	Lowenthal	Pingree	Tonko	Fortenberry	Love	Salmon
Emmer (MN)	LoBiondo	Sanford	Pocan	Lowe	Torres	Fox	Lucas	Sanford
Farenthold	Long	Scalise	Lujan Grisham	Polis	Tsongas	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Fincher	Loudermilk	Schradler	(NM)	Price (NC)	Van Hollen	Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Love	Schweikert	Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Vargas	Gibbs	Marino	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lucas	Scott, Austin	(NM)	Rangel	Velazquez	Gibbs	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David	Lynch	Rice (NY)	Visclosky	Gibson	Massie	Sessions
Flores	Lummis	Sensenbrenner	Maloney,	Richmond	Walz	Gohmert	McCarthy	Shimkus
Forbes	MacArthur	Sessions	Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman	Goodlatte	McCaul	Shuster
Fortenberry	Marchant	Shimkus	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Schultz	Gosar	McClintock	Simpson
Fox	Marino	Shuster	Matsui	Rush	Waters, Maxine	McHenry	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Franks (AZ)	Massie	Simpson	McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman	Granger	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Sires	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Welch	Graves (GA)	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Garrett	McCaul	Smith (MO)	McGovern	T.	Wilson (FL)	Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Stefanik
Gibbs	McClintock	Smith (NE)	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth	Graves (MO)	McSally	Stewart
Gibson	McHenry	Smith (NJ)				Griffith	Meadows	Stivers
Gohmert	McKinley	Smith (TX)				Grothman	Meehan	Stutzman
Goodlatte	McMorris	Stefanik				Guinta	Messer	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	Rodgers	Stewart				Guthrie	Mica	Thornberry
Gowdy	McSally	Stivers				Hardy	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Granger	Meadows	Stutzman				Harper	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Thompson (PA)				Harris	Moolenaar	Trott
Graves (LA)	Messer	Thornberry				Hartzler	Mooney (WV)	Upton
Graves (MO)	Mica	Tiberi				Heck (NV)	Mullin	Valadao
Green, Gene	Miller (FL)	Tipton				Hensarling	Mulvaney	Wagner
Griffith	Miller (MI)	Trott				Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Grothman	Moolenaar	Upton				Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer	Walden
Guinta	Mooney (WV)	Valadao				Hill	Newhouse	Walker
Guthrie	Mullin	Veasey				Holding	Noem	Walorski
Hanna	Mulvaney	Vela				Hudson	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Hardy	Murphy (PA)	Wagner				Huelskamp	Olson	Webster (FL)
Harper	Neugebauer	Walberg				Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Harris	Newhouse	Walden				Hultgren	Palmer	Westerman
Hartzler	Noem	Walker				Hunter	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Heck (NV)	Nunes	Walorski				Hurd (TX)	Pearce	Whitfield
Hensarling	Olson	Walters, Mimi				Hurt (VA)	Perry	Williams
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Weber (TX)				Issa	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Hice, Jody B.	Palmer	Webster (FL)				Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger	Wittman
Hill	Pascrell	Wenstrup				Jenkins (WV)	Pitts	Womack
Holding	Paulsen	Westerman				Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Hudson	Pearce	Westmoreland				Johnson, Sam	Poliquin	Yoder
Huelskamp	Perry	Whitfield				Jolly	Pompeo	Yoho
Huizenga (MI)	Peterson	Williams				Jones	Posey	Young (AK)
Hultgren	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)				Jordan	Price, Tom	Young (IA)
Hunter	Pitts	Wittman				Joyce	Ratchliffe	Young (IN)
Hurd (TX)	Poe (TX)	Womack				Katko	Reed	Zeldin
Hurt (VA)	Poliquin	Woodall				Kelly (MS)	Reichert	Zinke
Issa	Pompeo	Yoder						
Jenkins (KS)	Posey	Yoho						
Jenkins (WV)	Price, Tom	Young (AK)						
Johnson (OH)	Ratchliffe	Young (IA)						
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Young (IN)						
Jolly	Reichert	Zeldin						
Jones	Renacci	Zinke						
Jordan	Ribble							
Joyce	Rice (SC)							

## NOES—162

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

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Buchanan

## NOT VOTING—10

Bost	Nadler	Takai
Brown (FL)	Nugent	Turner
Delaney	Rooney (FL)	
Hastings	Sinema	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1730

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

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA  
OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Michigan (Mr.  
HUIZENGA) on which further pro-  
ceedings 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 236, noes 188,  
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—236

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Cole
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (GA)
Allen	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Babin	Buchanan	Cook
Barletta	Buck	Cramer
Barr	Bucshon	Crawford
Barton	Burgess	Crenshaw
Benishiek	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Curbeo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Chabot	Denham
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Dent
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Boustany	Coffman	DesJarlais

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

## NOES—188



Lewis	Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Fincher	LaHood	Rogers (KY)	Maloney,	Poliquin	Slaughter
Lieu, Ted	Pascrell	Sherman	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher	Carolyn	Polis	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Payne	Sinema	Fleischmann	Lamborn	Rokita	Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Speier
Loebsack	Pelosi	Sires	Fleming	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen	Matsui	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Slaughter	Flores	Lahta	Roskam	McCollum	Rangel	Takano
Lowenthal	Peters	Smith (NJ)	Forbes	LoBiondo	Ross	McDermott	Reed	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Pingree	Smith (WA)	Fortenberry	Long	Rothfus	McGovern	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham	Pocan	Speier	Fox	Loudermilk	Rouzer	McNerney	Richmond	Titus
(NM)	Polis	Swalwell (CA)	Franks (AZ)	Love	Royce	Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Luján, Ben Ray	Price (NC)	Takano	Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Russell	Meng	Ruiz	Torres
(NM)	Quigley	Thompson (CA)	Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Salmon	Moore	Ruppersberger	Tsongas
Lynch	Rangel	Thompson (MS)	Gibbs	Lummis	Sanford	Moulton	Rush	Watson Coleman
MacArthur	Rice (NY)	Titus	Gohmert	MacArthur	Scalise	Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Maloney,	Richmond	Tonko	Goodlatte	Marchant	Schweikert	Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
Carolyn	Riskam	Torres	Gosar	Marino	Scott, Austin	Neal	T.	Yarmuth
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas	Gowdy	Massie	Sensenbrenner	Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela
Matsui	Royce	Van Hollen	Granger	McCarthy	Sessions	Norcross	Sarbanes	Velázquez
McCollum	Ruiz	Vargas	Graves (GA)	McCaul	Shimkus	O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Visclosky
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Veasey	Graves (LA)	McClintock	Shuster	Pallone	Schiff	Walz
McGovern	Rush	Vela	Graves (MO)	McHenry	Simpson	Pascrell	Schrader	Wasserman
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez	Griffith	McKinley	Smith (MO)	Payne	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Visclosky	Grothman	McMorris	Smith (NE)	Pelosi	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine
Meng	T.	Walters, Mimi	Guinta	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)	Perlmutter	Serrano	Watson Coleman
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz	Guthrie	McSally	Smith (TX)	Peters	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Moulton	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Hanna	Meadows	Stefanik	Peterson	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Schultz	Hardy	Meehan	Stewart	Pingree	Sinema	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Schiff	Waters, Maxine	Harper	Messer	Stivers	Pocan	Sires	
Neal	Schrader	Watson Coleman	Harris	Miller (FL)	Stutzman			
Nolan	Scott (VA)	Welch	Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)			
Norcross	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)	Heck (NV)	Moolenaar	Thornberry	Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Nugent
O'Rourke	Serrano	Yarmuth	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Tiberi	Bost	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
			Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Tipton	Brown (FL)	Mica	Takai
			Hice, Jody B.	Mulvaney	Trott	Curbelo (FL)	Nadler	Turner
			Hill	Murphy (PA)	Upton			
			Holding	Neugebauer	Valadao			
			Hudson	Newhouse	Wagner			
			Huelskamp	Noem	Walberg			
			Huizenga (MI)	Nunes	Walden			
			Hultgren	Olson	Walker			
			Hunter	Palazzo	Walorski			
			Hurd (TX)	Palmer	Walters, Mimi			
			Hurt (VA)	Paulsen	Weber (TX)			
			Issa	Pearce	Webster (FL)			
			Jenkins (KS)	Perry	Wenstrup			
			Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Westerman			
			Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Westmoreland			
			Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Whitfield			
			Jolly	Pompeo	Williams			
			Jones	Posey	Wilson (SC)			
			Jordan	Price, Tom	Wittman			
			Joyce	Ratcliffe	Womack			
			Kelly (MS)	Reichert	Woodall			
			Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Yoder			
			King (IA)	Ribble	Yoho			
			King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)			
			Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell	Young (IA)			
			Kline	Roby	Young (IN)			
			Knight	Roe (TN)	Zeldin			
			Labrador	Rogers (AL)	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Nugent
Bost	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
Brown (FL)	Mica	Takai
Curbelo (FL)	Nadler	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1737

Ms. FOXF changed her vote from  
“no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on  
which further proceedings were post-  
poned 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 192, noes 232,  
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—192

NOT VOTING—9

Bost	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Takai
Delaney	Nugent	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1734

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

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Michigan (Mr.  
HUIZENGA) on which further pro-  
ceedings 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 236, noes 185,  
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—236

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

NOES—185

Adams	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Aguilar	Cummings	Honda
Ashford	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Bass	Davis, Danny	Huffman
Beatty	DeFazio	Israel
Becerra	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Bera	DeLauro	Jeffries
Beyer	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	DeSaunier	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	Deutch	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan	Dingell	Katko
F.	Doggett	Keating
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael	Kelly (IL)
Brownley (CA)	F.	Kennedy
Bustos	Duckworth	Kildee
Butterfield	Edwards	Kilmer
Capps	Engel	Kind
Capuano	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Cardenas	Esty	Kuster
Carney	Farr	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Poster	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lee
Chu, Judy	Galego	Levin
Ciulline	Garamendi	Lewis
Clark (MA)	Gibson	Lieu, Ted
Clarke (NY)	Graham	Lipinski
Clay	Grayson	Loebsack
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lofgren
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Cohen	Grijalva	Lowe
Connolly	Gutiérrez	Lujan Grisham
Conyers	Hahn	(NM)
Cooper	Heck (WA)	Luján, Ben Ray
Costa	Higgins	(NM)
Courtney	Himes	Lynch
Crowley		

Abraham	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Byrne	Farenthold
Allen	Calvert	Fincher
Amash	Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Babin	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Barletta	Chabot	Fleming
Barr	Chaffetz	Flores
Benishek	Cole	Forbes
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Fox
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Cook	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Cramer	Garrett
Blum	Crawford	Gibbs
Boustany	Culberson	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Davidson	Goodlatte
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Granger
Buchanan	Duffy	Graves (GA)
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)      Massie  
 Griffith          McCarthy  
 Grothman        McCaul  
 Guinta          McClintock  
 Guthrie         McHenry  
 Harper          McKinley  
 Harris          McMorris  
 Hartzler         Rodgers  
 Hensarling      Meehan  
 Hice, Jody B.   Mica  
 Hill             Miller (FL)  
 Holding         Miller (MI)  
 Hudson         Moolenaar  
 Huelskamp      Mooney (WV)  
 Hultgren        Mullin  
 Hunter          Mulvaney  
 Hurt (VA)        Murphy (PA)  
 Issa             Neugebauer  
 Jenkins (KS)    Noem  
 Jenkins (WV)    Olson  
 Johnson (OH)   Palazzo  
 Johnson, Sam    Palmer  
 Jones          Perry  
 Jordan          Pittenger  
 Joyce          Pitts  
 Kelly (MS)      Poliquin  
 Kelly (PA)      Pompeo  
 King (IA)        Posey  
 King (NY)       Price, Tom  
 Kline           Ratcliffe  
 Knight          Reed  
 Labrador        Renacci  
 LaHood          Rice (SC)  
 LaMalfa         Rigell  
 Lamborn        Roby  
 Latta           Roe (TN)  
 Long            Rogers (AL)  
 Loudermilk     Rogers (KY)  
 Love            Rohrabacher  
 Lucas           Rokita  
 Luetkemeyer    Roskam  
 Lummis         Ross  
 Marchant        Rothfus  
 Marino          Rouzer

## NOES—232

Adams            DeFazio  
 Aguilar          DeGette  
 Amodei          DeLauro  
 Ashford         DelBene  
 Barton          Denham  
 Bass            Dent  
 Beatty          DeSaulnier  
 Becerra         Deutch  
 Bera            Diaz-Balart  
 Beyer           Dingell  
 Bishop (GA)    Doggett  
 Blumenauer     Dold  
 Bonamici        Donovan  
 Boyle, Brendan F.    Doyle, Michael F.  
 Brady (PA)      Duckworth  
 Brooks (IN)     Edwards  
 Brownley (CA)    Ellison  
 Bucshon         Ellmers (NC)  
 Bustos          Emmer (MN)  
 Butterfield     Engel  
 Capps           Eshoo  
 Capuano         Esty  
 Cárdenas        Farr  
 Carney          Foster  
 Carson (IN)     Frankel (FL)  
 Cartwright      Fudge  
 Castor (FL)     Gabbard  
 Castro (TX)     Gallego  
 Chu, Judy        Garamendi  
 Cicilline        Gibson  
 Clark (MA)      Graham  
 Clarke (NY)     Grayson  
 Clawson (FL)    Green, Al  
 Clay            Green, Gene  
 Cleaver         Grijalva  
 Clyburn         Gutiérrez  
 Coffman         Hahn  
 Cohen           Hanna  
 Comstock       Hardy  
 Connolly        Heck (NV)  
 Conyers         Heck (WA)  
 Cooper          Herrera Beutler  
 Costa           Higgins  
 Costello (PA)   Himes  
 Courtney        Hinojosa  
 Crenshaw        Honda  
 Crowley         Hoyer  
 Cuellar         Huffman  
 Cummings      Huizenga (MI)  
 Curbelo (FL)   Hurd (TX)  
 Davis (CA)      Israel  
 Davis, Danny    Jackson Lee

Russell          Neal  
 Salmon          Newhouse  
 Sanford         Nolan  
 Scalise          Norcross  
 Schweikert      Nunes  
 Scott, Austin    O'Rourke  
 Sensenbrenner   Pallone  
 Sessions        Pascrell  
 Shimkus         Paulsen  
 Shuster         Sarbanes  
 Simpson         Schakowsky  
 Smith (MO)      Pelosi  
 Smith (NE)      Perlmutter  
 Smith (NJ)      Peters  
 Smith (TX)      Peterson  
 Stivers          Pingree  
 Stutzman        Pocan  
 Thornberry       Poe (TX)  
 Tiberi           Polis  
 Trott            Price (NC)  
 Trott            Quigley  
 Wagner          Rangel  
 Walberg         Reichert  
 Walden          Ribble  
 Walker          Rice (NY)  
 Walorski        Richmond  
 Weber (TX)      Ros-Lehtinen  
 Webster (FL)    Bost  
 Wenstrup      Brown (FL)  
 Westerman     Delaney  
 Westmoreland    Hastings  
 Whitfield      Nadler  
 Williams        Nugent  
 Wilson (SC)    Price (NC)  
 Wittman         Quigley  
 Womack         Rangel  
 Woodall         Speier  
 Yoder           Stefanik  
 Yoho            Swalwell (CA)  
 Young (AK)     Takano  
 Zeldin          Thompson (CA)

## NOT VOTING—9

□ 1741

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 809; and

Adoption of House Resolution 809, if ordered.

All electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 809) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 524) to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of

prescription opioid abuse and heroin abuse; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 179, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—244

Abraham	Graves (LA)	Noem
Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Nunes
Allen	Griffith	Olson
Amash	Grothman	Palazzo
Amodei	Guinta	Palmer
Babin	Guthrie	Paulsen
Barletta	Hanna	Pearce
Barr	Hardy	Perry
Barton	Harper	Peterson
Benishek	Harris	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Pitts
Bishop (MI)	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Poliquin
Black	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Blum	Hill	Price, Tom
Boustany	Holding	Ratcliffe
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Reed
Brat	Huelskamp	Reichert
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rokita
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Roskam
Buck	Hurt (VA)	Ross
Bucshon	Issa	Rothfus
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Royce
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Russell
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Carter (TX)	Jolly	Sanford
Chabot	Jones	Scalise
Chaffetz	Jordan	Schweikert
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Katko	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Shuster
Comstock	King (NY)	Simpson
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Smith (MO)
Cook	Kirkpatrick	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Kline	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Knight	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Labrador	Stefanik
Crenshaw	LaHood	Stewart
Culberson	LaMalfa	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Lamborn	Stutzman
Davidson	Lance	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Thornberry
Denham	LoBiondo	Tiberi
Dent	Long	Tipton
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Titus
DesJarlais	Love	Tonko
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Torres
Dold	Luetkemeyer	Tsongas
Donovan	Lummis	Upton
Duffy	MacArthur	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Van Hollen
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Vargas
Ellmers (NC)	Massie	Veasey
Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Vela
Farenthold	McCaul	Velázquez
Fincher	McClintock	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walz
Fleming	McMorris	Wasserman
Flores	Rodgers	Schultz
Forbes	McSally	Waters, Maxine
Fortenberry	Meadows	Watson Coleman
Fox	Meehan	Welch
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Wilson (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Yarmuth
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Young (IA)
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Young (IN)
Gibson	Moolenaar	Zinke
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	
Goodlatte	Mullin	
Gosar	Mulvaney	
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	
Granger	Neugebauer	
Graves (GA)	Newhouse	