



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2017

No. 163

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, October 13, 2017, at 8:30 a.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2017

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 11, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN NEWHOUSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, next week is National Forest Products Week, which the Nation observes from October 15 through October 21. Each year since 1960, our Nation has celebrated the achievements of the forest product manufacturers and organizations throughout this country.

The forest products industry is an integral part of U.S. manufacturing competitiveness and is among the top 10 manufacturing sector employers in 45 States. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, this industry is home to 265 wood products, paper, and packaging manufacturing facilities that make more than \$16 billion in products, annually, and contribute nearly \$3 billion to State and local economies through wages and compensation. More than 53,600 hardworking men and women in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are employed by the forest products industry.

Forest products continue to meet the evolving needs of people across the country and around the world. The forest products industry directly employs about 900,000 people and supports 2.4 million jobs. It is 4 percent of the total U.S. manufacturing GDP. The industry meets a payroll of approximately \$50 billion, annually, and manufactures almost \$240 billion in products every year.

One-third of the United States is forested—751 million acres. Privately owned forests supply 91 percent of the wood harvested in the United States; State and Tribal forests supply approximately 6 percent; and Federal for-

ests supply only 2 percent of the wood used by the forest products industry. More than 56 percent of U.S. forests are privately owned, much of it by family forest owners who manage their lands to provide value to future generations.

The industry has tremendous impact on our environment, too. A single tree can absorb more than 10 pounds of CO₂ each year. In the United States, forests and forest products store enough carbon to offset approximately 12 percent of the Nation's CO₂ emissions.

Forest products play a valuable role in the life of every American every day. Two-thirds of the Nation's drinking water comes from forests. From paper and packaging to wood products, tissue and other personal care items, these products are at the heart of modern life and a modern economy.

Paper products allow us to communicate, teach, and learn. They provide safe packaging for goods and consumables, as well as personal hygiene and cleanliness. Wood products provide shelter and necessary components of daily life.

Mr. Speaker, because the industry plays such an important role in the life of everyday Americans, in 1960, Congress designated the third week in October as National Forest Products Week. Next week, the country celebrates with events and advocacy campaigns to mark that occasion. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join those across the Nation who applaud the forest products industry for its many contributions.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7921

CLEAN POWER PLAN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, the Obama administration took a very positive and important step towards curbing greenhouse gas emissions by initiating the Clean Power Plan, the first-ever national limit on carbon pollution from power plants. The plan was devised to give States the option to tailor how they would reduce carbon pollution, following benchmarks set by the Federal Government.

For years, States, local governments, businesses, and universities have been making progress towards a low-carbon future, both in anticipation of full implementation of the Clean Power Plan and spurred on by a variety of other forces. Now, the Trump administration has vowed to unravel the Clean Power Plan, but the momentum will not stop because of this reckless act.

Donald Trump and Scott Pruitt cannot repeal engineering, science, or economics. Their attempts would only harm the economy and our citizens, miring us in the past to serve the interests of Big Coal.

The case for action in reducing carbon pollution is compelling. The Clean Power Plan encourages steps to reduce the dangerous extent of accelerating climate disruption and attendant extreme weather events.

Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria are only the latest example of those events. Now, millions of acres in the West are exploding in wildfires. More frequent, more intense, and more dangerous forest fires are the reality now, spurred by climate disruption.

Out-of-control wildfire has touched Oregon's beloved Columbia River Gorge, and the latest instances are in California wine country, taking lives, destroying property, and damaging crops.

Regardless of your view on climate change, the Clean Power Plan is a very important step for the United States. It stands on firm legal ground. The Supreme Court has ruled on three separate occasions that the EPA has the authority and the responsibility to protect our families from carbon pollution.

Cleaner energy and a cleaner environment under the Clean Power Plan would improve the lives of working Americans. By 2030, it would prevent 90,000 asthma attacks, 300,000 days missed from work and school, and 3,600 premature deaths every year.

Instead of protecting human health, particularly those in communities most impacted by carbon pollution, Trump and Pruitt are seeking to tilt the energy playing field back in favor of Big Coal.

Make no mistake: without subsidies and regulatory favoritism, most old, dirty, coal plants would have been shut down years ago if they had been re-

quired to meet carbon pollution and air quality standards, as they should have been.

Trump and Pruitt are making a big mistake when they assault the Clean Air Act and the Clean Power Plan. They are on weak legal ground, and they are on the wrong side of science, economics, the environment, and common sense.

The Clean Power Plan will not be easily unraveled. There is a process to unwind it, similar to what it took to put it in place. It will take a lot of hard work—and evidence that Pruitt doesn't have—to repeal it and prevent the EPA from regulating carbon emissions.

The plan has powerful allies. I am proud to stand with the environmental community, my fellow Democrats in Congress, many government and trade groups, citizens who care, and a number of businesses. Mars is the latest company to announce that they are going to follow through on their carbon reduction plan.

We will continue this fight for a low-carbon, healthier, more economical future. We will protect alternative energy and honor the commitments we have made to the wind and solar industries. We will continue to reduce emissions from our transportation sector by not rolling back fuel efficiency standards.

We will work with the agriculture sector, which makes up 9 percent of the total greenhouse gas emissions. A strong farm bill can reduce emissions and enhance productivity through low-carbon protections.

Ultimately, Trump and Pruitt cannot repeal science, engineering, or economics. I am proud to be part of this effort to ensure that the United States moves forward to exercise leadership in a low-carbon future to fight climate change and global weather disruption.

PROTECTING OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues' support for the Senior Citizen Protection Act, which I introduced along with my friend, Congressman BRAD SCHNEIDER.

Seniors are valued members of our society, and we must do everything we can to ensure that they can live with dignity and without fear of being abused by those entrusted to care for them.

This bipartisan bill seeks to achieve that goal by creating a national registry for those convicted of elder abuse that will be accessible to senior care providers and families before they make a decision on whom they hire as a caregiver for their loved ones. This national database will bring together local and State registries in order to prevent abusers from continuing to in-

flict suffering on senior citizens by simply relocating from one community to another.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. SCHNEIDER and me in support of this measure that will help ensure that our parents, grandparents, and loved ones are looked after by professional caregivers who will give them the treatment and respect they deserve.

CARING FOR SENIORS DURING NATURAL DISASTERS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Protecting Seniors During Disasters Act, which I introduced with my colleague, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

The horrific deaths of 14 seniors in a Florida nursing home facility in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma made it abundantly clear that more must be done to protect seniors during and after natural disasters.

In times of emergency, many senior citizens find themselves disconnected from caregivers and without the treatments and resources that they so desperately need. Our bill seeks to reconnect seniors by requiring that Federal agencies assess how their emergency response efforts impact the elderly. It also calls for the implementation of standards to better protect and care for senior citizens and nursing home residents across our Nation during and after emergency situations.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan legislative initiative that aims to save the lives of many senior citizens and helps ensure that the tragedy that took place in south Florida will not happen again. I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this lifesaving measure.

BUILDING A NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN LATINO

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month and the many contributions of our vibrant community throughout our country, I would like to bring attention to a bill that I have sponsored that would permanently showcase the history and stories of American Latinos.

H.R. 2911, the National Museum of the American Latino Act, will establish a world-class educational institution on The National Mall for the millions of visitors who come to our Nation's capital every year eager to learn about American history.

Latinos have served our great country in every war dating back to before the Revolutionary War and continue to proudly serve in our military. They are small-business owners, job creators, TV stars, athletes, and public servants.

An initiative over 20 years in the making, this museum would be a visual representation of the difficulties that Latinos have overcome leaving their home countries, whether to flee an oppressive communist regime in my native homeland of Cuba, or Venezuela, or for the opportunity to partake in the American Dream, as well as the

story of Hispanics who have made the U.S. their home for many generations.

As the first Hispanic woman elected to the U.S. Congress, I am proud to invite my colleagues to join me in this endeavor and cosponsor H.R. 2911, the National Museum of the American Latino Act.

ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been 3 weeks since the eye of Hurricane Maria crossed over Puerto Rico. It has been 3 weeks, and there are still parts of the island that have not had contact with FEMA yet—3 weeks. For most people, that has meant no power, and most still don't have running water.

Hospitals and clinics were hit hard, as The New York Times reports. The daughter of one man who died because he couldn't receive oxygen treatment told the paper: "Because of the electricity situation, a lot of people died and are still dying."

Forty percent of the island still lacks running water because of the blackout, which still affects 85 percent of the island. As a result, many people are bathing in streams and receiving water from huge tanks, which is never a good idea.

This is after 3 weeks in the most powerful nation on Earth. This is unacceptable.

Our response to Hurricane Maria and the people of Puerto Rico is a national and international embarrassment and a tragedy. They are our own citizens in our own Caribbean colonies of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and we have not helped them all that we can.

I spoke to Chicago firefighters yesterday who have been in Puerto Rico for about a week, and they tell me it is worse than we are being told.

□ 1015

They told me yesterday that they are still making contact in towns where people come up to them and say, "Thank God, it is FEMA; you are finally here," only to be told, "No, we are not FEMA; we are from Chicago; we are firefighters," and they embrace and cry with gratitude.

Last week, a group of my colleagues and I got together. We represent large Puerto Rican communities here on the mainland in Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio, and Florida. All of us have been contacted by our constituents who are in desperate need to get their loved ones back and out of Puerto Rico.

After 3 weeks, they have run out of patience and are not interested in excuses in our congressional district. They want their parents, they want their Tia with cancer, and they want their cousins on dialysis off the island, period, now. They want a plane ticket to get the hell out.

Our communities are ready. Lorain, Ohio; Hartford; Boston; Orlando; New

York; Chicago; we are all ready, but the problem is transportation. If you have money, connections, or internet access, then you probably can find a flight out.

I know this because I was in Puerto Rico 2 weeks ago, and I saw the Land Rovers, the Jaguars, parked at the private airports in San Juan, because if you have the money, you have already put your loved ones on a flight out of Dodge.

The individuals from FEMA have been doing a great job, given the constraints, but I think now FEMA and the military resources should focus on the task of evacuating the elderly, the sick, and the vulnerable from the island.

Look, this is the way FEMA works. They say: Well, we only take on tasks that the Governor asks us to take on, and the Governor is not likely to go to FEMA to ask them to get thousands and thousands of his constituents off the island.

Number one, it is a difficult request for any local official to make. Captains of industry and leaders on the island want to make sure that there are Puerto Rican workers there to rebuild, and of course, to continue to buy their products. I get that. But at the same time, those same captains of industry and political leaders, guess what, I bet you most of them have already got their loved ones off the island.

Number two, we know the Governor has to be extremely careful how he asks for anything because we all know the President doesn't take criticism very well or even a hint of criticism. The Governor doesn't want to get blackballed by the President who might go off on a Twitter rant at any moment unless he is praised and stroked every step of the way.

But our Puerto Rican constituents don't vote for the Governor of Puerto Rico. They vote for us, for DELAURO, for CROWLEY, for MCGOVERN, for ESPAILLAT, for MARCY KAPTUR, and they want us to help them get their families out of danger's way. They are demanding help getting their family members out, and I think FEMA and the U.S. military can do the job. They just need the orders from the people in charge.

Let's be clear: if anyone wants to leave Puerto Rico, they should have our help in doing so. For thousands, it is a question of life and death and survival. That is what is needed to help Puerto Rico. We don't need the President tossing paper towels to storm victims like he was tossing a ball to a dog or maybe tossing peanuts to squirrels in the park. We need airplanes, ships, and helicopters to get the people the hell out; otherwise, it will be worse than let them eat cake; it is let them die.

CELEBRATING THE WORK OF TERESA LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the work of a very wonderful constituent of the Fifth District of North Carolina, Teresa Lewis.

Every September, we celebrate American Business Women's Day in order to recognize the many different backgrounds and diverse occupations of American businesswomen. However, it is my belief that we should celebrate American businesswomen like Teresa Lewis every day.

Teresa's success was born out of determination and the desire to provide a better life for her family. In 1986, Teresa founded WorkForce Carolina, a professional staffing service that includes recruitment, interview completion, and skills assessment.

As CEO of WorkForce Carolina, Teresa has employed thousands of people, and her company has served as a boon to the North Carolina economy.

Most importantly, Teresa serves as a role model to all women and men in our country. I commend Teresa Lewis on all of her many accomplishments and thank her for all she does for the community.

CRITICAL TIME OF LIFE AND DEATH FOR PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time of life and death for millions of U.S. citizens on the island of Puerto Rico and also in the Virgin Islands.

The efforts to rebuild will be great, and we each have a critical role to play to help these families recover following the aftermath of these catastrophic storms.

We have witnessed so much devastation this hurricane season, and the impact has been particularly destructive and wreaked havoc. It has left millions of U.S. families without shelter, electricity, and their lives in ruin.

We all have a part to play in the recovery efforts and must answer the calls to provide relief and aid in the immense rebuilding efforts that will take place to assist all of them who have been affected.

The amount of help and heart I have seen in my home State of New York, including a recent effort of Uptown United this weekend, and from constituents of mine like Lin-Manuel Miranda, and even from children willing to crack open their piggybanks has been overwhelming.

If the Federal Government could have matched that compassion, then Puerto Rico would be well on its way to recovery.

Last night, the House Appropriations Committee released a \$36.5 billion disaster relief package: \$5 billion of that will go directly to Puerto Rico; \$14 billion for FEMA's disaster fund; and \$16

billion for the National Flood Insurance Program. I see this as an initial downpayment. I hope this is just the beginning.

Nearly a month into this crisis, the status of Puerto Rico today is such:

The Jones Act. On Sunday, the White House let the 10-day shipping waiver for the Jones Act expire for Puerto Rico, meaning that foreign ships can no longer bring aid to the hurricane-ravaged island from U.S. ports. I have been pushing for at least a 1-year waiver and a permanent waiver for oil.

Electricity. To date, only 15 percent of Puerto Ricans have power and electricity, not being able to get in contact with their loved ones and the great impact the lack of electricity has on patients with dialysis.

Water. Access to clean drinking water lingers around 20 percent. It is reported that seaborne bacteria are contaminating the water supply. This may lead to bacterial infections such as cholera, dysentery, E. coli, and typhoid. That can be really disastrous. The typical treatments for these illnesses, like tetanus shots and powerful antibiotics, are not readily available on the island where medical supplies are quickly running out.

The damage estimates. It is calculated around \$95 billion. This is roughly 150 percent of the Puerto Rican annual gross national product. The downpayment really should be \$10 billion to \$15 billion.

The budget. The White House has reported that they have asked Congress to authorize approximately \$30 billion in new disaster-related funding.

Fatalities. Mr. Speaker, the official death toll has increased to 43 deaths directly or indirectly related to Hurricane Maria. The death toll, unfortunately, will continue to rise, and this is becoming more and more our Caribbean Katrina. I urge my colleagues to pass the Disaster Relief Fund for Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Caribbean.

THANKING TEAM RUBICON

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to talk about and thank Team Rubicon and all other volunteers who are helping assist victims of Hurricane Harvey with storm cleanup, not only in the district I represent but throughout the State of Texas.

Many of our cities still have piles and piles of debris. Initially, it was trees and brushes cleared, but now, as people are starting to survey and repair the damage to their home, there is insulation, there is sheetrock, there are personal belongings all out along the street waiting to be picked up and cleaned up.

This Monday, I spent time with the Governor of Texas, Greg Abbott, visiting some of our cities, and they are

telling me that the cleanup may not be complete in some cities, like Port Aransas and Rockport, until December or January. There is a big job ahead. It is going to take a lot of people.

Several weeks ago, Speaker RYAN and several members of the Texas delegation joined Team Rubicon in the Houston area aiding in demolition and cleanup in the flood-devastated areas. The group's positive attitude and commitment to service is inspiring.

Last week, Janice Dean of FOX News visited the district I represent and told the story about how Team Rubicon is helping with debris removal in Wharton, Texas. That is a city of about 9,000 south of Houston that was devastated by flood waters associated with the storm.

You know, Team Rubicon was founded in 2010, following the earthquakes in Haiti, by two marines, Jake Wood and William McNulty, who knew they could use their military experience and go out and help others.

Since then, Team Rubicon has drastically expanded across the Nation, uniting the skills and experiences of veterans and first responders to rapidly deploy emergency response teams.

I want to thank Team Rubicon for all the help they have provided the folks of Texas, especially Wharton, and the people around the world who have suffered disasters since 2010.

I also want to thank Janice Dean of FOX News for helping tell their story. Janice's commitment to Team Rubicon didn't stop with just telling the story.

In fact, once the story aired, she has donated \$15,000 from sales of her children's book, "Freddy the Frogcaster" to Team Rubicon and will continue to be donating all proceeds from this book to the group. Thank you, Janice.

Thank you, Team Rubicon, and thank you for everyone who is helping out those who are victims of Hurricane Harvey and the various other disasters that this Nation is facing right now.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF FIRST SERGEANT CHARLESTON HARTFIELD OF THE NEVADA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my constituent, First Sergeant Charleston Hartfield of the Nevada Army National Guard. Our community lost a true-blue American hero on the 1st of October. Since the age of 18, Officer Hartfield valiantly served our country and our community, spending 16 years in the Army both on Active Duty and in the Nevada National Guard and 11 years in our local law enforcement.

First Sergeant Hartfield spent a year deployed to Iraq with the 82nd Airborne Division as part of the initial invasion in 2003, where they were awarded the Combat Action Badge for having bravely engaged in combat operations.

Those who knew Officer Hartfield remember him for his kindness to others and for pouring his heart into our community as a husband, a father, a friend, and a youth football coach.

Officer Charleston Hartfield was taken from us far too soon by a senseless tragedy. Our valley and this Nation will mourn his loss, and we will carry forward his spirit of courage and selflessness.

□ 1030

REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to put into words the devastation and heartbreak my community suffered on October 1, 2017. This horrific violence has forever altered the lives of countless families in Las Vegas and across this country.

My heart breaks for those who lost a parent, a child, a sibling, and a friend. And while this was the deadliest mass shooting in modern American history, I know that we join a long list of communities: Sandy Hook, Aurora, Tucson, San Bernardino, and Orlando, all who have suffered way too much through similar heart-wrenching violence.

I have lived in southern Nevada for nearly 40 years, and I will tell you that I have been overwhelmed by the resilience of Las Vegas. We are not just "Sin City" or the glittering lights of the strip. We are also a tight-knit, compassionate community of hard-working families. The shooting on October 1 exemplified the worst of humanity, but our response represented the very best of people.

As we try to figure out how to move forward, I can tell you that we are finding strength and hope and courage in our brave first responders, in the heroic self-sacrifice of men and women who risked and gave their lives for others, and for the kindness of strangers who helped transport the wounded to the hospital, who stood in line for hours to donate blood, and who came together to support the survivors.

I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find that same courage to come to the table and have real conversations about commonsense solutions to address gun violence. There is no single policy solution, but I know we can support the Second Amendment while taking reasonable steps to reduce the carnage inflicted on our communities by gun violence and mass shootings.

Mr. Speaker, devices designed to cause mass casualties, like bump stocks and high-capacity magazines, have no practical purpose for hunting or self-defense. They only increase the threat for potential victims trying to find safety, like those at the Mandalay Bay, and they make it more challenging for law enforcement to confront and neutralize an active shooter.

I urge all of my colleagues to please join together in a bipartisan effort. We need to take commonsense steps in Congress to decrease the scope of widespread destruction and tragic mass shootings.

No community should ever be forced to experience the grief and trauma that my constituents are now confronting. It is more urgent than ever that we take meaningful action to reduce the toll of widespread gun violence. The time is now.

RECERTIFY IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the significance of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding Iran, more commonly referred to as the Iran nuclear agreement.

I have always been a vocal advocate for tough sanctions on Iran. While I was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in 2010, I was a member of the conference committee which drafted the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act. These sanctions, in 2010 and subsequently, did make a difference.

Unfortunately, Iran continues to support terrorist organizations, and its record on human rights is well known. But we should not withhold certification of the Iran nuclear agreement without credible evidence that Iran is not complying. Let's remember, this agreement has always been about Iran, not obtaining nuclear weapons.

Doing so would strip the United States of our credibility in future international agreements not just with Iran, but with our allies as well.

In addition to Iran, we negotiated the Iran nuclear agreement with the United Kingdom, Germany, European Union, China, and Russia, and we must keep our word. In other words, to remain credible, the United States cannot change positions on international agreements from one administration to another without serious justification and without the consent in working with our allies.

Especially now, as we are facing an increasing threat with North Korea, we must work with our allies and, together, make a safer world through a comprehensive strategy that involves diplomacy, sanctions, and, yes, deterrence, if we must use such force. We have methods for addressing Iran's nonnuclear behavior besides refusing to recertify the agreement, and I will continue to advocate for the use of these tools to take a strong stance against Iran for their support of terrorist state activities and their abuse of human rights.

But refusing to recertify the Iran nuclear agreement, without clear evidence that Iran has breached the agreement, will deeply damage our relationships with our allies, and it will weaken our credibility worldwide.

COMMEMORATING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to commemorate Hispanic Heritage Month, which is from September 15 to October 15 every year.

This month we honor and celebrate the history, culture, achievements, and

contributions of Hispanic leaders in communities throughout our great country. From serving in our Armed Forces, to starting businesses that further develop our economy and provide employment for Americans, Hispanics have contributed great advancements in science, medicine, literature, and education. The Hispanic community and its people have been critical in shaping our Nation and the valley that I have the honor to represent.

For example, in my home State of California alone, there are over 815,000 Hispanic- or Latino-owned companies, which, together, generate over \$98.9 billion in general receipts in our economy. In Fresno, Merced, and Madera counties, which I represent, there are nearly 27,000 Hispanic- or Latino-owned companies, which, together, generated, last year, over \$2 billion, \$700 million in our economy.

The story of our Hispanic friends, neighbors, and loved ones is the story of the American Dream, as they have the same hope and aspiration that all Americans have: to make a better life for themselves and their families through hard work, access to a better education, and equal treatment under the law.

Let us remember, after all, we are a nation of immigrants past and present.

For over 250 years, since the formation of the United States, immigrants have come from all over the world to America to have a better life for themselves and, in turn, have made us the greatest country in the world.

During Hispanic Heritage Month, I am honored to celebrate the community whose determination and achievements are an integral part of not only our Nation, but the San Joaquin Valley that I have the honor to represent.

SUPPORT FOR NFL FOOTBALL PLAYERS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise and stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I am always honored that I have this opportunity, and I see it as a pre-eminent privilege to be able to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

I love my country. I have said it many times right here at this podium. I salute the flag, Mr. Speaker. I say the Pledge of Allegiance. I sing the national anthem. I love my country.

And because I love my country, I can stand here in the well of the House of the United States of America and announce that I support the NFL men, who are professional football players. I can say I support them because I believe in what the flag stands for: liberty and justice for all. I believe in this. And if there is to be liberty and justice for all, the cause that they are part of has to be called to the attention of the American public. I support the NFL players, Mr. Speaker.

To those who say that "they are so lucky, they are making millions, why don't they just play football, they ought to be happy," first, let me comment in this way: They are earning millions. Their bodies are being torn apart, in many cases. They are earning millions. They get concussions. They are earning millions. They suffer after they leave football. They are earning millions. And they are also earning pain as they play a game that amuses many.

So those who say they are making plenty of money and they ought to just go away, I contend that they are not doing it for the money. They are doing it because they understand injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere, as Dr. King put it. They want to eliminate the injustice that they see, and, in so doing, they have decided to take a knee.

I salute the flag. I support my country. I love my country. And I respect what they are doing in the form of peaceful protest to bring about change that ought to have been brought about decades or centuries ago; should have been, but has not been. Yes, we have come a long way, but we sure have a long way to go.

Now, to those who say "they have earned millions, why aren't they happy," well, it is not hush money.

Is that what you are saying, that when they get paid, that is hush money that says that they don't have freedom of speech? Does that check negate their freedom of speech?

I think not. Freedom of speech is something that you cherish, whether you live in a mansion or you live under a bridge. Freedom of speech belongs to you. It doesn't matter your station in life. It doesn't matter your ethnicity. It doesn't matter your religiosity. Freedom of speech belongs to you because you are a child of God and you live in the greatest country in the world.

So I stand in support of the NFL players. I want them to continue. I want them to stand their ground. I want this movement to continue. And I want those who were thwarted to know that you are trying to thwart injustice. When you try to change the subject and make it about something that it is not, you are trying to thwart injustice. Even if you don't do it with intentionality, that is the reality.

We cannot allow injustice to continue. And I thank God that there are those who are making millions, those who are having their bodies abused, who are willing to take a stand by taking a knee against injustice, and they still respect this country and its flag and this anthem.

If there is one among them who has other thoughts, then I don't support that. I support those who have a righteous cause and who are respectful of the country, who can love the flag and still protest. I support that.

I am an American. I was born in the United States of America. I am a patriotic American. I believe in this country. And if you believe in it, you ought to allow peaceful protest to continue, because John F. Kennedy was right when he was paraphrased by Dr. King:

Those who make peaceful protest impossible will make other forms of protest inevitable.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Molly Fraser, Gig Harbor United Methodist Church, Gig Harbor, Washington, offered the following prayer:

God of many names, we give thanks for the opportunity to serve. Remind us that we are servants of our country, our people, and the land. Let us not forget all the blessings You have given us so that we might use our power and influence to help order the country in ways that allow each and every person to find life and liberty and to pursue happiness.

We come, perhaps, already weary from an onslaught of emails, texts, tweets, phone calls, and meetings where people make demands on how we vote and assumptions about every decision that we put forward. Help us, O God, to do the right thing, not just for a few, but for the many. Help us work together diligently so we might see the fruit of our effort grow into good throughout our country, which can serve to make this world more livable for all.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BABIN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND MOLLY FRASER

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to welcome Pastor Molly Fraser from Gig Harbor United Methodist Church, my home church.

Our church isn't the biggest church, it isn't the oldest church, but it has left a large impact throughout Gig Harbor because it makes clear that all are welcome. Whether you are in pain and need somewhere to go or you are looking for fellowship, there is a welcome mat for you.

It makes clear to regular attendees and to newcomers that it is a place of open hearts, open minds, and open doors. It is a place that is committed to supporting the needs of those most in need throughout our community and around the world. It is a place to ask tough questions and to celebrate our faith.

Finally, it is a place that benefits from the tremendous leadership of Pastor Molly, who, during her brief tenure with the church, has brought incredible energy and heart and musical talent.

She is here in our Nation's capital today with her family. It is my honor to welcome them and, in spirit, the entire congregation of Gig Harbor United Methodist Church.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize the Army National Guard's 236th Engineering Company. Located in Stephenville, Texas, they were the first on the ground in Houston to assist with Hurricane Harvey relief efforts on August 27. Over the course of a week, they rescued approximately 2,300 civilians and 380 animals from flooded areas.

Mr. Speaker, these men and women who serve our country are true heroes, and I am honored to represent them in the 25th Congressional District of Texas. I had the opportunity to meet with these soldiers a few weeks ago and personally shake their hands to thank them for a job well done.

They stepped up in a moment of absolute crisis and when the people of Texas needed them most. They put their lives on the line in order to save

others. Without them, the number of deaths could have been significantly higher.

It is because of selfless people like these that America is able to remain the strongest country in the world. The Lone Star State cannot thank them enough for their swift and noble actions, and we will always remember their heroism.

Hurricane Harvey victims are still recovering, and all of America is behind them. We will rebuild together because we are all Texas strong.

God bless Texas, God bless the military, and God bless the United States of America.

In God we trust.

HONORING JAHEIR MOORE FOR SERVICE TO HIS COMMUNITY

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jaheir Moore, a seventh grade student from Jersey City, New Jersey, for his service to people in need.

This young man from my district takes the time nearly every day to crochet hats, scarves, blankets, and other items for people in homeless shelters and newborn babies in intensive care units. Over the past couple of years, he has donated dozens of bags full of his creations to make life a little better for others.

Jaheir is a straight A student who wants to become a fashion designer. In February, he was a guest on the "Rachael Ray Show." A week later, Jaheir had his first runway show in Jersey City. In April, I presented him with a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition for his charity work.

Mr. Speaker, Jaheir Moore's unselfish acts of kindness for people in need shows that our country's future is a bright one.

ALLEN COUNTY RIGHT TO LIFE

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, I had the privilege of attending the Allen County Right to Life's 20th annual Uniting Our City for Life Banquet.

The event was a wonderful time with fellow Hoosiers who share a common concern for the sanctity of innocent human life, from the moment of conception to the moment of natural death. It also was a celebration of the fact that our culture increasingly is recognizing the value of human life.

A poll released last year found that a majority of young Americans support increasing restrictions that protect the unborn. Another recent poll found that 61 percent of Americans oppose using tax dollars to fund abortions. This

growing recognition that life is a precious and sacred gift is due, in large part, to the tireless efforts of organizations like Allen County Right to Life.

I want to express special thanks to Allen County Right to Life Executive Director Cathie Humbarger and Operations Director Abigail Lorenzen for all they do in northeast Indiana to promote life and defend the unborn.

I also want to congratulate Pat Miller on receiving the Daniel Award for pro-life commitment during Monday night's dinner. Throughout his career, he has been a consistent and compassionate voice for the cause of life, and there is no one more deserving of this prestigious award.

BILLIONAIRES FIRST TAX PLAN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Republicans brought their extreme budget to the floor, a budget that forces the middle class to pay more in taxes just to give the wealthiest Americans a massive tax break.

This budget slashes investments in our future, such as rebuilding roads and bridges and education, just so it can provide huge tax breaks to the absolute wealthiest Americans. Billionaires would receive a massive tax cut under this plan.

Under this "billionaires first" tax plan, according to the nonprofit, nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, middle class families would pay an average of \$1,290 a year more in taxes, while 80 percent of the benefits would go to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans: the superwealthy. By repealing the estate tax, 5,400 families would receive a \$270 billion tax break.

Who pays for this? The middle class.

How? By passing the costs on to them and increasing our deficit at the same time. Trillions of dollars would be added to our deficit.

Giving billionaires a massive tax break is fiscally irresponsible and morally wrong. We ought to reject it.

PRAISING PENNSYLVANIA NATIONAL GUARD FOR HELPING WITH PUERTO RICO RELIEF EFFORTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend 42 members of the Pennsylvania National Guard who are currently in Puerto Rico assisting with hurricane relief efforts.

Thousands of National Guard members are working in both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to help our fellow Americans recover from devastating hurricanes.

Hurricane Maria, with its Category 5 winds, was the fifth strongest storm to

ever hit the U.S. and the strongest storm to hit Puerto Rico in 80 years. What it left behind was vast devastation and great damage to infrastructure and energy distribution systems.

Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously proud of our Pennsylvania Guardsmen who are on the ground assisting with this humanitarian disaster. They welcomed the call to action and are working to restore Puerto Rico's infrastructure, install additional telecommunications equipment to connect families and businesses, and deliver more than 300 generators to provide electricity to those who need it.

We are working on rebuilding, and the Pennsylvania National Guard is there to aid in the recovery effort. It is the American way to have all hands on deck, and I am grateful for their efforts.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence often hides behind closed doors and drawn curtains, but the problem is very staggering.

In my home State of Hawaii, 575 domestic violence survivors reach out to local organizations seeking help every single day. Their stories are heart-breaking and, too often, even if they are temporarily removed from the abusive environment, they are often returned to their abuser.

Survivors can seek legal protection from their abusers, but they aren't likely to do so or be successful unless they have a lawyer. Just 32 percent of victims successfully obtain a restraining order without legal representation.

I call on my colleagues to support the POWER Act, which requires every State's U.S. attorney to promote and expand pro bono legal services specifically for domestic violence survivors.

We all need to be more conscious of this problem because it is happening in our communities. As we observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month, let us have the courage to confront the pervasiveness of this crime and take action to help provide survivors with the safety and security they need.

MEDIA IGNORES DONATION TO ANTI-COP GROUP

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you may have heard of Colin Kaepernick, the football quarterback who started "the kneel" to protest the national anthem at NFL games. He was the originator of the resistance movement in the NFL against police officers. But you likely haven't heard that he donated \$25,000 to a group that was named after a convicted cop killer.

Neither national broadcast stations nor major daily newspapers reported

the donation to an organization honoring Assata Shakur, who escaped prison and fled to Cuba after being found guilty in the 1973 murder of police officer Werner Foerster. Assata is currently on the FBI's Most Wanted Terrorists list.

Why did the liberal national media think this story was not newsworthy? Do they agree with Kaepernick? Do they approve of contributions to organizations named after cop killers?

The liberal national media seems to have a grudge against law enforcement and patriotism, as well as religion and traditional values, based on their lack of fair coverage of those subjects. This might explain why the media's credibility is at a record low.

CONTRACEPTIVE COVERAGE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Trump administration rolled back contraceptive care for hundreds of thousands of women. They called it a victory for religious liberty. But let's be real. This is just one part of the White House's fight to strip women of their independence and healthcare.

First, they came for title X, scaling back the essential family planning centers that served low-income women. They attacked Planned Parenthood, pledging to block access for the millions of women who depend on it. They expanded the global gag rule, a policy that will limit the preventative healthcare options for women across the world.

Then, they turned their destructive sights on title IX, scaling back crucial guidances that protect sexual assault victims on our college campuses.

Now, they have opened the door for bosses to deny contraceptive coverage for their female employees.

Let's not pretend this is a victory for religious freedom. This is about taking away women's choices.

HONORING DR. DANIEL J. BRADLEY ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true champion for higher education, Dr. Daniel J. Bradley, the 11th president of Indiana State University.

During his 9-year tenure at Indiana State, Dr. Bradley has led ISU to achieve the highest enrollment in school history, added new degree programs to meet the demands of the 21st century workforce, and completed more than \$300 million in capital projects on the campus. Most importantly, Dr. Bradley has improved student success by increasing the student retention rate and increasing the student graduation rate.

From his service to our country in the U.S. Army to his service to the students of Indiana State University, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Bradley on his retirement at the end of this year.

□ 1215

CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS TO WORK TOGETHER TO PASS A DACA FIX

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, there are upwards of 800,000 DREAMers in our country—young, de facto Americans, people who grew up here, are as American as you or I, American in fact, albeit not in law. They are able to work legally under the deferred action, or DACA program, that President Obama has set up. That has been jeopardized by an announcement that President Trump will be terminating that program within 6 months.

Now we are down to about 4½ months, a challenge to this body, Democrats and Republicans, to work together to rectify the legal situation of 800,000 de facto Americans. This body must act. We can't leave these young Americans in limbo with regard to what their future prospects are to work.

Make no bones about it, if this body fails to act, over 800,000 aspiring Americans will no longer be able to go to work legally the very next day after deferred action expires. In the interest of unifying families, in the interest of these young people who are as American as you or I, in the interest of our economic growth and prosperity, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stop playing politics and finally pass a DACA fix, like the Dream Act, into law to make sure that they can give back to the country that has given so much to them.

IMPACT OF RECENT HURRICANES

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it was great to participate in this morning's board of delegation meeting, during which we discussed the impact of recent hurricanes on our State and unmet needs to require further attention.

With the onslaught of natural disasters that have plagued our country in recent months, we must provide appropriate levels of Federal support to all who are suffering. However, we must also ensure that Florida's ongoing needs are not overlooked as we seek to fully recover.

Our two largest industries, tourism and agriculture, have sustained significant losses, which will have a long-

term impact on our economy, unfortunately. We also learned valuable lessons during the hurricane as it relates to the care for our most vulnerable citizens, our seniors and the disabled. These lessons need to translate to action in order to prevent future tragedies.

I look forward to working with my colleagues as we evaluate the proposed natural disaster funding bill that will be voted on later this week and determine its impact on Florida.

HONORING DAVE DAVIS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend of mine, Dave Davis, who passed away recently. Dave was a giant Purdue fan, but we first met at a UCLA basketball game over 20 years ago.

We immediately struck up a friendship, and in 2000, when I announced I was running for Congress, Dave was all in and, despite the long odds, took vacation time to drive me all around Madison County. We didn't win that one, but that is the kind of guy Dave Davis was. He put others first, sharing in your successes and your struggles as if they were his own.

Dave had a great smile and a rare quality: he saw everyone for who they could be, not just what they were.

Dave spent his career in public service for our State and our Nation, but his most important priority was his family. He never passed up an opportunity to talk about his wife, Robyn; or his kids, Alex, Amy, and Eric.

Dave Davis was a good man and my friend. Congratulations on a life well lived. Godspeed.

REFORMING THE TAX CODE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our efforts here in the people's House to reform our Tax Code and reduce the burden of the Federal Government on every American. Right now, Americans know that our Tax Code is unfair, it is too long, and it is too complicated.

It has been 30 years since we have made meaningful reforms, and the time for that change is now. House and Senate Republicans have announced reforms that will make the Tax Code simpler, with more than 90 percent of filers being able to do their returns on a simple postcard.

We have asked to make the Tax Code fair for middle class Americans, lowering their rates and doubling their standard deduction. We have asked to give relief to low-income Americans by eliminating the lowest 10 percent bracket completely and cutting the 15

percent bracket to 12. We have asked to crack down on tax avoidance by ending the dozens and dozens of loopholes that only the wealthiest taxpayers and corporations can take advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, we have a unique opportunity to do so much for hardworking families across America. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us, offer solutions, and make this a bipartisan effort to give the American people the relief they deserve.

RIISING ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the many who have concluded that enough is enough. I rise today to speak on behalf of the many persons who believe that Article II, section 4 of the Constitution of the United States of America has meaning and that it is something that is appropriate for a time such as this, appropriate for a time when there is one among us who seems to incite hatred, bigotry, and invidious discrimination.

I rise to speak on their behalf today, Mr. Speaker, and I do so understanding that I am not doing it on behalf of Republicans, generally speaking, or Democrats, generally speaking. The people whom I reference are Americans, generally speaking.

So I rise to speak on their behalf.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I seek recognition to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Articles of Impeachment against Donald J. Trump, President of the United States of America, in the Congress of the United States of America.

Resolution.

Resolved, that Donald J. Trump, President of the United States of America, has undermined the integrity of his office with impunity and has brought disrepute on the Presidency with immunity, has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the American people and is unfit to be President, and is impeached pursuant to Article II, section IV of the Constitution of the United States of America, and that the following Articles of Impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of all of the people of the

United States of America against Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors of a nature which may, with peculiar propriety, be denominated as political, not requiring the commission of a crime, and exclusively the jurisdiction of the United States House of Representatives for impeachment purposes.

Article I: That Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, unmindful of his high duties of his office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and the harmony, respect, and courtesies, which ought to exhibit and be maintained in American society, has under the inane pretext of dispensing with political correctness, produced a demonstrable record of inciting white supremacy, sexism, bigotry, hatred, xenophobia, race-baiting, and racism by demeaning, defaming, disrespecting, and disparaging women and certain minorities.

In so doing, Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, has fueled and is fueling an alt-right hate machine and its worldwide covert sympathizers engendering racial antipathy, LGBTQ enmity, religious anxiety, stealthy sexism, and dreadful xenophobia, perfidiously causing immediate injury to American society, to wit:

On September 23, 2017, Donald John Trump incited race-baiting and racism, engendering stealthy sexism and racial antipathy, when he disrespected, disparaged, and demeaned mothers of professional football players by calling them dogs as he made the widely published statement:

Won't you love to see one of these NFL owners, when somebody disrespects our flag, say, Get that son-of-a-B-I-T-C-H off the field right now, out. He's fired. He's fired.

On September 23, 2017, Donald John Trump incited race-baiting and racism, engendering racial antipathy, when he disrespected and disparaged professional football players, approximately 70 percent of whom are reportedly African American, by calling them sons of dogs as he made the widely published statement:

Wouldn't you love to see one of these NFL owners, when somebody disrespects our flag, say, Get that son-of-a-B-I-T-C-H off the field right now, out. He's fired. He's fired.

On September 30, 2017, Donald John Trump incited bigotry and race-baiting, engendering racial antipathy, when he disrespected, disparaged, and demeaned Puerto Ricans, who are Americans, by implying Puerto Ricans want others to do for them what they won't do for themselves, as he made the widely published claim:

They want everything to be done for them when it should be a community effort.

Further, on October 3, 2017, while in Puerto Rico, as was widely shown on American television, Donald John Trump incited bigotry, engendering racial antipathy, when he disparaged Puerto Ricans by stating:

I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico, but you've thrown our budget a little out of whack because we spent a lot of money on Puerto Rico, and that's fine. But we've saved a lot of lives.

The President did not make similar widely published statements about Texas or Florida.

□ 1230

On January 27, 2017, Donald John Trump incited xenophobia and hate against Muslims in the United States of America, engendering religious anxiety, when he disrespected Islam by issuing Executive Order 13769, fulfilling a campaign promise to ban Muslims from entering the United States of America. This widely published campaign promise is dated December 7, 2015, and reads as follows:

Donald J. Trump Statement on Preventing Muslim Immigration, New York, New York, December 7, 2015. Donald J. Trump is calling for the total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on.

On March 4, 2017, Donald John Trump incited race-baiting and racism, engendering racial antipathy, when he defamed, disrespected, and disparaged President Barack Obama by making the widely published statement, which has since been disclaimed:

Terrible. Just found out that Obama had my "wires tapped" in Trump Tower just before the victory. Nothing found. This is McCarthyism.

On July 26, 2017, Donald John Trump incited bigotry, engendering LGBTQ enmity, when he disparaged and disrespected transgender Americans by indicating that the costs of their medical care outweighs the sacrifice they are willing to make for our country as he made the widely published statement:

After consultation with my generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, respect, and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained within American society, has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and, as a result is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

Article II: That Donald John Trump, President of the United States of

America, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained within American society, did betray his trust as President and bring shame and dishonor to the office of the Presidency by associating the majesty and dignity of the Presidency with causes rooted in White supremacy, bigotry, racism, anti-Semitism, White nationalism, and neo-Nazism when he, to wit:

On August 15, 2017, Donald John Trump made a widely published statement characterizing a group of anti-Semites, bigots, racists, White nationalists, and Klu Klux Klansmen who rallied in Charlottesville, Virginia, as "very fine people."

Thereafter, on August 23, 2017, the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination released a 2-page decision in which it was stated that they were "disturbed by the failure at the highest political level of the United States of America to unequivocally reject and condemn the racist violent events and demonstrations led by the aforementioned groups, thereby potentially fueling the proliferation of racist discourse and incidents throughout the State party, and deeply concerned by the example this failure could set for the rest of the world."

On October 7, 2017, hate groups were again back in Charlottesville, Virginia, at the statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general, chanting, "You will not replace us." Since this event on October 7, the President has made many widely published statements about many things including, but not limited to, the National Football League, but has not made one widely published statement condemning the hate groups for returning to the place where an innocent person lost her life at the hands of hate.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the integrity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, respect, and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained within American society, has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, and has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and the disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

Article III: Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, unmindful of his high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained in American society, did engage in perfidy by making the widely reported claim that 3 to 5

million people voted illegally in the 2016 Presidential election and, further, expending tax dollars to establish a commission to investigate his claim, to wit:

On November 27, 2016, Donald John Trump made the widely reported claim that:

In addition to winning the electoral college in a landslide, I won the popular vote if you deduct the millions of people who voted illegally . . . in Virginia, New Hampshire, and California. So why isn't the media reporting on this? Serious bias. Big problem.

On January 25, 2017, Donald John Trump made the widely reported claim that:

I will be asking for a major investigation into voter fraud, including those registered to vote in two States, and who are illegal and . . .

On July 1, 2017, Donald John Trump made the widely reported claim that:

Numerous States were refusing to give information to the very distinguished voter fraud panel. What are they trying to hide?

On June 28, 2017, according to highly reported news stories, the commission previously referenced by Donald John Trump requested detailed voter registration data from all 50 States, including names, addresses, and other sensitive data from every voter in the country. Several States refused to send the information, and some States have been prevented by courts from turning over the information.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, has undermined the integrity of his office and has brought disrepute on the Presidency and has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

Article IV: Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and of the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained in American society, while aware of the widely reported history of unlawful abuses and brutality perpetrated by many, not all, police officers against innocent persons in the United States of America, did betray his trust as President, bringing shame and dishonor to the office of the Presidency by encouraging law enforcement officials to violate the constitutional rights of suspects in their custody and control, to wit:

On July 28, 2017, Donald John Trump, in a speech in front of the Suffolk County Police Department in Long Island, New York, stated that:

And when you see these towns and when you see these thugs being thrown into the back of a paddy wagon, you just see them

thrown in—rough. I said, "Please don't be too nice." Like when you guys put somebody in the car and you're protecting their head, you know, the way you put their hand over? Like, don't hit their head, and they've just killed somebody—don't hit their head. I said, "You can take the hand away, okay?"

This statement is injurious not only to the rule of law, which presumes innocence until guilt is proven in a court of law, but also to the administration of justice, which requires that care is given to persons held in the custody of law enforcement. Our Nation is founded upon a social contract where the constitutional rights of the individual are not surrendered because he or she is accused of a crime. To speak to the contrary is a violation of the Presidential oath of office to which Donald John Trump is bound.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and the proprieties thereof, and of his oath of office, to "faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States of America, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of high honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 585, DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 16, 2017, THROUGH OCTOBER 20, 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 562

and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 562

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from October 16, 2017, through October 20, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of October 12, 2017, or October 13, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 562, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Yesterday, the Rules Committee heard testimony from our colleagues, Congressman PAUL MITCHELL, Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and Congresswoman ANN KUSTER.

This rule provides for the consideration of S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and provides for a motion to recommit.

S. 585 was authored by Senator JOHN-SON in the Senate, and the House companion was introduced by my friend, Congressman SEAN DUFFY. I want to thank my colleagues from Wisconsin for their leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses a problem that is, unfortunately, far too common. When Federal employees blow the whistle on questionable practices, they face risk of retaliation and intimidation from their own employers, even though the current Federal law is supposed to protect them. In fact, the underlying legislation provided for by this rule is named after an individual who ultimately took his own life after he became the victim of retaliation related to his whistleblowing.

Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick was a Department of Veterans Affairs doctor who raised concerns that the VA might be overmedicating patients. A later VA investigation found that Dr. Kirkpatrick's concerns were warranted, but it was too late. Dr. Kirkpatrick had already suffered retribution from within the VA and was eventually dismissed from the agency. On the day of his termination, Dr. Kirkpatrick took his own life.

Dr. Kirkpatrick's story is a tragedy, one that none of us ever wants to see repeated.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has become a de facto poster child for hostility toward whistleblowers. In fact, according to the Office of Special Counsel—the agency tasked with investigation and redressing whistleblower retaliation—the OSC has seen a sharp increase in the number of whistleblower cases from VA employees.

OSC Special Counsel Carolyn Lerner went on to say that: “. . . it is clear that the workplace culture in many VA facilities is hostile to whistleblowers and actively discourages them from coming forward with what is often critical information.”

This disturbing trend may be most visible at the VA, but the problem of backlash against whistleblowers persists across the Federal Government.

Let me make something clear. There are good actors and bad actors within each agency. There are good actors who shine light on the legitimate concerns in order to help their colleagues and the American people. There are also good actors who listen to those concerns and address them with integrity, and treat whistleblowers with respect.

Unfortunately, there are also bad actors. These are the ones that this legislation seeks to address, and the problem they create is the one that the underlying bill works to solve.

The underlying legislation provides for better training for Federal employees so that they understand Federal whistleblower protections. It also sets minimum disciplinary standards across all agencies for retaliation against whistleblowers while increasing protections for people who have the courage to speak up when they discover a problem.

The bill specifically requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to determine a plan to restrict unauthorized employee access to medical files, which—and it disturbs me to say this—has been used as a method of retaliation against whistleblowers.

This legislation would make much-needed changes to ensure that those who come forward with information necessary to maintain and increase accountability within our government do not suffer backlash as well.

Importantly, the bill also helps these individuals to know their rights and what protections and recourse are available to them.

It is unfortunate that we need this legislation, but evidence has indicated that we do. The underlying legislation puts bullies who have made their nest in government agencies on notice that their behavior won't stand. It defends brave whistleblowers and puts the bad actor Federal employees on notice: hostile work environments that target whistleblowers are on the bureaucracy's endangered species list.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act also builds on the work the current administration is doing to address retribution levied against whistleblowers at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Importantly, I have colleagues on both sides of the aisle who agree that we need to address this problem and that the time to do so is now.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act passed the Senate by unanimous consent on May 25, 2017. We need to continue their good work here today.

On behalf of the whistleblowers who have risked their careers and safety to right wrongs in our government, we need to support this strong and timely legislation. Calling for attention and action to address improper behavior within the United States Government should not be considered a risky undertaking.

Many Federal employees work day in and day out on behalf of the American people, yet some feel threatened when they try in earnest to make things better.

We need to continue the Senate's work on behalf of these individuals and the Americans that they serve. Everyone deserves a government that is accountable for its own decisions and for the actions of its agents.

Today we have a chance to make strides towards a more accountable government. We have the opportunity to address the most pressing problems facing whistleblowers at the Depart-

ment of Veterans Affairs and across the Federal Government.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. As my colleague noted, Dr. Kirkpatrick was a psychologist at a VA medical center in Wisconsin. In 2009, he was fired from his job after allegedly questioning the overmedication of his patients, particularly related to opioids. Tragically, that very same day, Dr. Kirkpatrick committed suicide.

I think we can all agree that protecting whistleblowers helps to ensure that waste, fraud, and abuse in our government does not go unnoticed or ignored.

It is our responsibility to empower and encourage whistleblowers to come forward and speak out when something isn't right. No one should have to live in fear of retaliation for bringing the truth to light. No one should fear losing their job or career or their life simply for following the rules.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act increases accountability by enacting mandatory punishments for any manager or superior at an agency who has been found to have retaliated against a whistleblower.

The bill also contains VA-specific reforms to better protect the privacy of medical records. Employee medical records would now be prohibited from being accessed in the case of potential retaliation cases, which adds an additional level of accountability for supervisors; and protecting the whistleblower from attacks and threats based on their personal medical history, which would be completely inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, while there are strong and necessary reforms in this bill, I want to make sure that you know that legislation can always be improved through the amendment process or at least through conducting a hearing and markup of a bill.

Sadly, but unsurprisingly in this Congress, this bill didn't have a markup in committee; didn't have a hearing; is considered under a closed rule, where amendments that were brought forward aren't even allowed to be debated on the House floor.

This might be a surprise even to the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, who himself requested a structured rule that allowed for debate on amendments.

Much of my statement today echoes the sentiment of Oversight and Government Reform Ranking Member CUMMINGS and his testimony yesterday evening in the Rules Committee. Though this bill isn't perfect, it can be improved and strengthened by a few relatively straightforward amendments, which, unfortunately, were shut

down in the Rules Committee last night.

The first amendment, which was blocked today, would have addressed the bill's constitutional concerns first raised by the Office of Personnel Management by revising the mandatory disciplinary procedures to allow superiors their constitutional rights to due process in responding to accusations of retaliation. It would have improved the bill and made it more likely to stand up in court to challenge.

An amendment reaffirming the right to due process would have been something at least worth voting on, and, in fact, could have preserved the constitutionality of the core elements of this bill, ensuring that it stays in place to protect whistleblowers.

Another amendment blocked under this rule would have addressed privacy concerns contained in the bill. Specifically, the amendment would have protected the privacy of a whistleblower who commits suicide, by requiring the permission of the whistleblower's next of kin before an agency can share information regarding the suicide.

Again, it seems like a straightforward fix to protect the privacy of whistleblowers and their families. At the very least, even if Members of this body disagreed with it, why didn't we at least bring it forward for debate and a vote?

Another amendment that was blocked today contained the text of Mr. CUMMINGS' bill, H.R. 702, which was passed by the House of Representatives unanimously. As you know, this bill would expand protections for employees who face discrimination, and it solidifies our commitment to protecting whistleblowers and other employees from retaliation. It was a bipartisan bill. It passed the House unanimously. We simply should have allowed it under this bill to become part of a related effort.

Now, I know that my colleagues on the other side will say: Oh, the Senate is slow. They won't take up this bill on time. It is better for us to pass something now than have to wait for their approval.

But it only takes 10 minutes usually to debate an amendment. So we could have allowed three amendments and spent no more than 30 minutes debating them and still reported this bill out expeditiously.

Now, I happen to think that, while there are many on the other side of the aisle who would agree the House needs to return to regular order, it is time that Members actually started by voting according to what they are saying. By voting "no" on this rule and rejecting it, we can send the message to House leadership that we want an open, regular order process.

Bills should come out of committee through markups. Republicans and Democrats should have the opportunity to amend bills on the floor of the House. Perhaps if we did that more often, the Senate would not simply

cast aside many of the bills that have passed the House, knowing that they went through the process of deliberate consideration by our body, rather than a bill that appears fully formed where Members of this body simply get an up-or-down vote.

This bill will enjoy bipartisan support when it passes the House later today, as it should, but it also begs the question of: Why are we spending valuable time debating a noncontroversial bill, especially if it is considered under a closed rule? Why not have simply put it up on suspension in the first place?

To say things bluntly, we are actually running out of time this year. By my count, we only have 30 legislative days left in the first half of the 115th Congress, yet we are faced with so many important issues we need to move forward on.

Nine million children face losing their health insurance because Congress has not yet acted to reauthorize CHIP. Almost 1 million young, aspiring Americans have no idea what their lives will look like 6 months from now because of the President's decision to end DACA and Congress's continued inability to make it permanent law. The citizens of Puerto Rico, American citizens, still have not been granted a Federal aid package and are suffering from a lack of food, clean water, healthcare supplies, and electricity, jeopardizing many of their lives today.

Yet here we are debating a bill without even allowing an amendment process that we could have passed under suspension vote yesterday so we could move on to CHIP, to Puerto Rico, to DACA today, rather than spend one of our 30 remaining days of business this year avoiding the topics that the American people want us to take on.

Despite the important goals we have left to accomplish this year, it is misleading to assume that regular order isn't feasible. We have all seen how fast Congress can work when we are pushed right up to the edge. It is past time that we show that same urgency and commitment in considering legislation under regular order, even if it means we have to stay here on Thursdays and Fridays, even if it means we are working until 8 or 9 or 10 or midnight. The American people deserve no less.

Make no mistake, the Whistleblower Protection Act is an important piece of legislation that will help protect whistleblowers and hold Federal agencies accountable, but if we are going to devote this much time to legislation that protects employees, let's take it a step further and talk about expanding worker protections for an even greater number of Americans.

For example, my legislation, the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act—which I introduced last session and this session, and has yet to receive a hearing, no less a markup in the Education and Workforce Committee—would protect workers from wage theft, prevent taxpayer funds from going towards union busting, and establish first contract ar-

bitration to prevent companies from dragging on labor negotiations unnecessarily to the detriment of workers.

□ 1300

We don't have time to waste. If we are going to consider an issue, let's dive in. We can protect whistleblowers from retaliation and strengthen the rights of workers at the same time. Given the minimal amount of time we have left to work with, 30 days this year, we have an obligation to do both.

By the way, the fact that we only work 30 more days this year here in the United States Congress probably comes as a great surprise to many hard-working Americans who are accustomed to working 5 days a week. We have the rest of the month of October, November, December. Well, many Americans might get Christmas Day off, perhaps even Christmas Eve, but I don't think Americans realize that Congress is only going to work 30 days out of the next 78 days. That is less than a half-time job, Mr. Speaker.

I think the American people deserve more from us in this body, especially when so many issues like CHIP, like DACA, like Puerto Rico, and many others have gone unanswered by us in this body, the House of Representatives, or by colleagues across the way in the Senate.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill, S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

This bill strengthens penalties against those who retaliate against whistleblowers, adds protections and opportunities for whistleblowers placed on probation, and ensures Federal employees have a greater knowledge of whistleblower rights and protections.

Specifically, this bill forbids a supervisor from taking or threatening to take action against an employee because they refuse to obey an order that would violate a law, rule, or regulation.

I want to thank Senator RON JOHN-SON for his persistence in pushing this legislation even after the former Senator Harry Reid shut it down last Congress.

What a poignant and meaningful gesture to name this bill after Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick, a VA employee who took his own life after being subjected to cruel retaliation from VA officials. I hope it puts in perspective the immense emotional burdens that victims of retaliation face.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is personal for me. Unfortunately, I have seen exactly what retaliation against whistleblowers looks like, how easy it is to get

away with it, and why we have to put a stop to it.

Last week marked the 3-year anniversary since the director of the central Alabama VA became the first senior manager in the country fired as a result of the wait-list scandal. That was a major step towards turning around one of the Nation's worst VA systems and restoring trust with the veteran population it serves.

Mr. Speaker, I can say, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that it would have never happened without brave whistleblowers inside the VA telling me the truth.

Two brave individuals in particular, Sheila Meuse and Rich Tremaine, told me the truth about major instances of misconduct and mismanagement when no one else would. Seeing no other way to achieve change, they finally told their story to the media, at great personal risk to their careers.

The stories that emerged from these exposures were almost unbelievable:

More than 1,000 X-ray cancer screenings were lost and unread for years, even though some showed malignancies. When alerted to the problem, top administrators tried to cover this up.

A pulmonologist manipulated more than 1,200 patient records but, even after being caught twice, was still given a satisfactory review.

A central Alabama VA employee took a recovering veteran to a crack house and bought him drugs and prostitutes in order to extort his VA payments. Even when caught, this employee was not fired until a year and a half later when we exposed it in the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, this behavior is egregious, and, trust me, there is a lot more where it came from.

However, had it not been for the courage of those on the inside to expose this wrongdoing, the world might not have ever known. To me and to the veterans whose lives they might have saved, they are heroes. But that is not how they were treated by VA officials. They were treated as enemies and outcasts, all because they tried to do the right thing.

Rich Tremaine actually testified here before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, detailing the systemic way that some VA officials attempted to silence and marginalize him. The effects of him blowing the whistle on wrongdoing follow him to this day, far away from Montgomery, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, my experience working to clean house at the VA taught me a fascinating and frustrating truth about the culture in some parts of the VA. The system routinely goes out of its way to protect those who don't do their jobs or even harm veterans, but then goes after those who try to stop that misbehavior.

For years, because of poorly written civil service laws and powerful unions, too many VA employees got the message that misconduct, negligence, and

poor performance would be tolerated, but blowing the whistle on that kind of behavior would not be.

I have seen it too many times. All too frequently, VA employees caught for doing the wrong thing are reprimanded, shuffled around to different jobs, or allowed to quietly retire, but those who try to do the right thing by our veterans by shining a light on misconduct are persecuted, intimidated, or worse.

While I am proud of the work that we have done for the last 3 years to put an end to this unacceptable culture at the VA, there is much work left to be done.

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why Federal employees face retaliation for speaking up. It is not because people are just naturally mean or because there is some kind of misunderstanding. The reason whistleblowers face systemic retaliation is because it works. When a brave whistleblower faces intimidation or persecution for their action, every other employee sees it, and they know what will happen to them if they tell the truth. It has a powerful, chilling effect—one we saw firsthand in Montgomery.

They retaliate because it works. That is just wrong, and it is time to punish those who do it with harsher penalties. We need to rethink our civil service laws in this country to make sure public servants live up to the honor and responsibility of the public trust, and I believe that this bill is another positive step in that direction. Mr. Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to bring it to the floor by supporting this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump has been relentless on his attack on immigrant Americans, generally, and, in particular, DREAMers since he took office. Yet 82 percent of American voters, including about 70 percent of Republicans, believe DREAMers should be allowed to stay in the U.S. and apply for citizenship. Yet President Trump has continued to turn his back on these innocent young people.

Mr. Speaker, here is our chance to rectify President Trump's decision and restore the American people's faith in us and our faith in our aspiring Americans.

When we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are de facto Americans in every way except for on paper.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, by defeating the previous question today, we can

bring forward the Dream Act, which I am confident would pass on the floor of the House probably by a good margin.

What the Dream Act does is it allows young people who grew up in our country, who know no other country, a pathway to become citizens. They have gone to our schools, they have been on the football team or cheerleaders like your own kids or grandkids, Mr. Speaker.

They are able to work legally in our country because of the deferred action program, which is scheduled by President Trump to be canceled in 4½ months. We need to act now to give these young people the certainty they need to live their lives as Americans, the only country they know, and the only country that they are loyal to.

We simply don't have time to waste. We need to give these young de facto Americans the certainty they need to continue with their lives to be able to contribute to our country, join our military, pay taxes, and all of the other responsibilities that Americans have.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, protecting whistleblowers is important. It is critical to ensure that our democracy functions honestly and with accountability and government is truly working in the best interests of the people that it serves. But we could get there a better way, by having an open process that allows Democrats and Republicans to suggest further improvements to whistleblower protection rather than having a bill that was never marked up in committee, that simply appeared fully formed for the full House to consider without the opportunity for Democrats or Republicans to make it any better.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act will strengthen the rights of whistleblowers and reaffirm their value and importance to our country. But once again, this bill should have gone through a regular process that allowed us to amend it.

The fact that this bill passed the Senate with bipartisan support shouldn't stop us from making changes in this body, the House of Representatives, to improve the bill and make it work even better. We have an obligation to our constituents to thoughtfully consider every piece of legislation in front of us and to amend where we see fit.

As we move forward on addressing the pressing issues in front of us, such as finding a path forward on deferred action, which we will present if we can defeat the previous question, reauthorizing CHIP, or making improvements in our healthcare system, let's do it through a regular process that allows Democrats and Republicans, the 435 of us who serve here, to bring forward our ideas, not just the ideas of leadership in making the country a better place.

We have good, smart, deliberate Members on both sides of the aisle who want to work, want to legislate. It is ridiculous that we only have 30 days out of the next 78 in which Congress

will even be working, and I suspect for most of the 30 days, like today, Democrats and Republicans won't even be able to offer their ideas and have them considered. The American people deserve better.

We as an institution, as the United States Congress, can do better, and we can begin by defeating the previous question and defeating the rule.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, especially for the piece of legislation that is before us. I think it is a step forward and things that we should be doing and things that are the oversight role of this Congress, especially when we are dealing with the issue of whistleblowers and the value that they bring, and also the culture that seems to have pervaded.

I so appreciate the gentlewoman from Alabama and her stories. We, in Georgia, have had similar issues. We had that in the Augusta medical center. We also had it in others.

I think the issue here today, though, and I want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, many times when we come to the floor, there is this discussion and it gets circulated that we are actually against all Federal employees, or that every Federal employee is bad, and that none of the Federal employees are worth their payment or whatever. That is just not true. The work of the vast majority of the VA employees, the workers of the vast majority of the agencies, although we may have philosophical differences on how big some of our agencies should be or if they should be in the role of Federal Government, at the end of the day, the value and the worth of the Federal employee is never questioned, at least by this Member.

But when we find bad actors, when we find bad policies, when we find bad procedures, when we find things that inherently are wrong and they are kept wrong, as the gentlewoman from Alabama so well pointed out, that when the culture becomes protecting the bad and punishing the good, then we have an issue that has developed far beyond the scope of what it should be.

These are some of the things that we are discussing today, and I think it is worth the time on this floor, it is worth the time on the Senate floor, as they have already passed this bill, and I think the concerns raised are the discussion of which has been addressed in this.

I think what we look at today is today's bill is a necessary step, but I believe toward integrity, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I owe it to our neighbors and to Federal employees who serve to increase whistleblower protections. We need a clear path for public servants to serve Americans with the knowledge that we will honor their good character and courage. They

should not feel alone in their resolve to improve the VA or any other agency. Yet too often, we have seen the current law leave them at the mercy of bad actors. We must strengthen the existing statutes to address the litany of retaliations aimed at whistleblowers.

The bill today will deter agency officials from targeting whistleblowers for shining a light on dark flaws in their organization. Bad actors are even today evading discipline while whistleblowers who strive to do what is right too often endure punishment for their brave actions.

The whistleblowers are on the losing end of a system that often favors mischief, which means that the American public also suffers. This bill will bring relief to Federal truth tellers and the everyday Americans who depend on their services.

We best serve the American people by protecting whistleblowers, addressing their concerns properly, and investigating their claims with transparency.

□ 1315

The Federal Government exists to protect its citizens by holding wrongdoers accountable. It is designed to support those who work to root out wrongs in the system.

The underlying legislation brings us closer to a Federal system run by the people and for the benefit of the people, not for the benefit of a few bad actors who exploit its structure. It delivers justice to both victims and bad actors, protects whistleblowers who act in good faith, and ensures that the American Government better serves the American people.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, is that not what it is all about? At the end of the day, is it not what we as a Congress and as a House and a Senate should be about, and that is assuring that the people who we are elected to serve are best served by their own tax dollars through the agencies and processes of the Federal Government to provide basic services to our veterans, who serve in our other agencies, who, at the core of this, actually comes down—to me, this is a protection of whistleblowers. But in a bigger role, it is actually a protection of the currency that is the best that can be used in our Federal agencies, and that is the trust of the American people.

When we are in the discussion of trust in the American people, right now, many times, if you look around, the Federal Government may not be in that trusted role because many times they see the actions of the bad actors as opposed to many times the very shining lights of the good actors. Those good actors who are willing to participate and to step forward and to be a part of the solution and not a part of the problem need that protection.

We cannot continue to perpetuate and turn a blind eye when this is so relevant in our government. When we do this, we stand for those whom we serve.

We stand, not only for the districts in which we are elected, but the American people who have taken to this institution to say: I expect my trust to be exemplified in the employees of the Federal Government and through the stewardship of their tax dollars.

The question for us today is not do we continue to protect the system that is broken, but the question for us is to vote "yes" on this previous question, to move this rule, and to move this bill, because this is saying we value that integrity currency, we value those who are willing to step forward at risk of themselves, in courage, to say: This is wrong, we need to fix it, and let the chips fall where they may.

We protect the right. We punish the wrong. That is what this bill does.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 562 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, the

Speaker designates this as the time for the offering of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

The resolution has not been offered.

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 562, and

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 585, DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 16, 2017, THROUGH OCTOBER 20, 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 562) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from October 16, 2017, through October 20, 2017; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 190, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

YEAS—227

Abraham	Blackburn	Cheney
Aderholt	Blum	Coffman
Allen	Bost	Cole
Amash	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Amodei	Brat	Collins (NY)
Arrington	Brooks (AL)	Comer
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Comstock
Bacon	Buchanan	Conaway
Banks (IN)	Buck	Cook
Barr	Bucshon	Costello (PA)
Barton	Budd	Cramer
Bergman	Burgess	Crawford
Biggs	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Chabot	Denham

Dent	Joyce (OH)	Rohrabacher
DeSantis	Katko	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Francis
Donovan	King (IA)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Duffy	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger	Roskam
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Ross
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Rothfus
Emmer	Labrador	Rouzer
Estes (KS)	LaHood	Royce (CA)
Farenthold	LaMalfa	Russell
Faso	Lamborn	Rutherford
Ferguson	Lance	Sanford
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Scalise
Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)	Schweikert
Flores	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Foxx	Love	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Gaetz	MacArthur	Simpson
Gallagher	Marshall	Smith (MO)
Garrett	Massie	Smith (NE)
Gianforte	Mast	Smith (NJ)
Gibbs	McCarthy	Smith (TX)
Gohmert	McClintock	Stefanik
Goodlatte	McHenry	Stewart
Gosar	McKinley	Stivers
Gowdy	McMorris	Taylor
Granger	Rodgers	Tenney
Graves (GA)	McSally	Thompson (PA)
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	Messer	Tiberi
Griffith	Mitchell	Tipton
Grothman	Moolenaar	Trott
Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Turner
Handel	Mullin	Upton
Harper	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Harris	Newhouse	Wagner
Hartzler	Noem	Walberg
Hensarling	Norman	Walden
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Walker
Hice, Jody B.	Olson	Walorski
Higgins (LA)	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
Hill	Palmer	Weber (TX)
Holding	Paulsen	Wenstrup
Hollingsworth	Pearce	Westerman
Hudson	Pittenger	Williams
Huizenga	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Hultgren	Poliquin	Wittman
Hunter	Posey	Womack
Hurd	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Issa	Reed	Yoder
Jenkins (KS)	Reichert	Yoho
Jenkins (WV)	Renacci	Young (AK)
Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)	Young (IA)
Johnson (OH)	Roby	Zeldin
Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)	
Jones	Rogers (AL)	
Jordan	Rogers (KY)	

NAYS—190

Adams	Courtney	Gutiérrez
Aguilar	Crist	Hastings
Barragán	Crowley	Heck
Bass	Cuellar	Higgins (NY)
Beatty	Cummings	Himes
Bera	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Jayapal
Blumenauer	DeGette	Jeffries
Blunt Rochester	Delaney	Johnson (GA)
Bonamici	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Boyle, Brendan F.	DelBene	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Demings	Keating
Brown (MD)	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Brownley (CA)	Deutch	Kennedy
Bustos	Dingell	Khanna
Butterfield	Doggett	Kihuen
Capuano	Doyle, Michael F.	Kildee
Carbajal	Ellison	Kilmer
Cárdenas	Engel	Kind
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Cartwright	Espallat	Kuster (NH)
Castor (FL)	Esty (CT)	Langevin
Castro (TX)	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Chu, Judy	Foster	Larson (CT)
Cicilline	Frankel (FL)	Lawrence
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Lee
Clay	Gallego	Levin
Cleaver	Garamendi	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Gomez	Lieu, Ted
Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)	Lipinski
Conyers	Gottheimer	Loeb
Cooper	Green, Al	Loeb
Correa	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Costa	Grijalva	Lowey

Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
Bridenstine
Connolly
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Huffman

□ 1344

Messrs. ELLISON and LYNCH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. JONES and BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 185, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

AYES—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess

Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman

Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette

Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Connolly
DesJarlais

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

NIST SMALL BUSINESS CYBERSECURITY ACT

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2105) to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to disseminate guidance to help reduce small business cybersecurity risks, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2105

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act”.

SEC. 2. IMPROVING CYBERSECURITY OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(2) RESOURCES.—The term “resources” means guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, methodologies, and other ways of providing information.

(3) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term “small business concern” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(b) SMALL BUSINESS CYBERSECURITY.—Section 2(e)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (ix); and

(3) by inserting after clause (vii) the following:

“(viii) consider small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)); and”.

(c) DISSEMINATION OF RESOURCES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in carrying out section 2(e)(1)(A)(viii) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, as added by subsection (b) of this Act, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall disseminate clear and concise resources to help small business concerns identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) are generally applicable and usable by a wide range of small business concerns;

(B) vary with the nature and size of the implementing small business concern, and the nature and sensitivity of the data collected or stored on the information systems or devices of the implementing small business concern;

(C) include elements, that promote awareness of simple, basic controls, a workplace, cybersecurity culture, and third-party stakeholder relationships, to assist small business concerns in mitigating common cybersecurity risks;

(D) include case studies of practical application;

(E) are technology-neutral and can be implemented using technologies that are commercial and off-the-shelf; and

(F) are based on international standards to the extent possible, and are consistent with the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(3) NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) are consistent with the efforts of the Director under section 401 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7451).

(4) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Director, to the extent practicable, shall consider any methods included in the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 1841(a)(3)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328).

(5) VOLUNTARY RESOURCES.—The use of the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) shall be considered voluntary.

(6) UPDATES.—The Director shall review and, if necessary, update the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) in accordance with the requirements under paragraph (2).

(7) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director and the head of each Federal agency that so elects shall make prominently available on the respective agency’s public Internet website information about the resources and updates to the resources disseminated under paragraph (1). The Director and the heads shall each ensure that the information they respectively make prominently available is consistent, clear, and concise.

(d) OTHER FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to supersede, alter, or otherwise affect any cybersecurity requirements applicable to Federal agencies.

(e) FUNDING.—This Act shall be carried out using funds otherwise authorized to be ap-

propriated or made available to the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 2105.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership for giving us this time to debate this important bill. It is especially timely as October is National Cyber Security Awareness Month, so taking up this bill at this time is a perfect time. We must come together to protect all businesses—large, small, and medium—from the constant threat of cyber attacks.

America’s small businesses are the backbone of our economy, accounting for 54 percent of all American sales and 55 percent of American jobs. Unfortunately, small businesses are especially vulnerable, with some reports noting that 43 percent of cyber attacks specifically target them. These small businesses are more susceptible to attacks due to the limited access to the tools they need to prepare for such an event. Implementation of the NIST Framework into these small businesses will protect small business owners, their employees, and their customer base all while contributing positively to the economy.

H.R. 2105, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act, will help small businesses better address their cybersecurity risks to help them survive and thrive in the face of such adversity.

As an owner of a multigenerational family air-conditioning and heating business, I understand firsthand the importance of equipping and empowering small businesses to tackle these challenges so that they can grow and prosper.

About 10 months ago, my sons called me and said that there was a message on the screen of one of our computers that said: “Your data has been frozen. You have been attacked.” It had a little clock on there ticking down. “If you don’t pay a ransom by a certain time, then we will destroy your data. It is inaccessible.”

Well, there was something we had done, fortunately—not that we do every day, but we had done several days before—which protected us from that. We were able to fix our problem and wipe it clean and get started all

over. But most small businesses may or may not—including ourselves—have done that just a few days before.

Thus, I introduced H.R. 2105 with the support and cosponsorship of many of my colleagues on the committee, including Chairman SMITH, Chairwoman COMSTOCK, and Ranking Member LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2105 would provide small businesses in my district, State, and across the country with the tools they need to meet the threats and challenges of the modern world.

This bill describes the vital role played by small businesses in the U.S. economy, the devastating impact of cyber attacks on a majority of small businesses and large businesses and what they need to develop to specifically help themselves.

It directs the NIST Director—within a year of the act’s enactment—to disseminate clear and concise resources, which are defined as guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, methodologies, and other ways of providing this information.

Dissemination would be in consultation with heads of other Federal agencies. These resources—based on the NIST Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity—will help small businesses identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks.

□ 1400

H.R. 2105 also clarifies that use of the resources by small businesses is voluntary, directs the NIST Director and heads of Federal agencies that so elect to make the resources available on their government websites, and specifies that no new funds are authorized to carry out this act.

This bill is very similar to S. 770, the MAIN STREET Cybersecurity Act, which is supported by the National Small Business Association, National Restaurant Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the International TechneGroup. The Chamber and International TechneGroup have also come out in support H.R. 2105.

On September 28, 2017, the Senate passed S. 770 by unanimous consent, and I ask my colleagues to similarly support H.R. 2105.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2105, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act of 2017, a bipartisan effort to help small businesses implement the NIST Cybersecurity Framework for Critical Infrastructure.

I thank Mr. WEBSTER for his work on the bill and all of my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for their support of the bill.

I would also like to thank Senator SCHATZ and my colleagues in the Senate for working to pass the companion version over there, which I hope that we can follow suit on here today.

The NIST cybersecurity framework provides valuable guidance on cybersecurity best practices for organizations of all sizes, but small businesses often don't have the time or resources to figure out how to adapt it to their needs and implement it. This bill directs NIST to create clear guidelines, tools, and best practices specifically for small businesses so that they can protect their networked resources.

Most small businesses do not have significant IT departments. Some do not even have any dedicated information security personnel. Thus, they may be more at risk of cyber attack than large enterprises.

According to data released last month, 53 percent of American businesses of all sizes suffered a cyber attack in the past year. Of those, 72 percent spent more than \$5,000 to investigate and recover. A 2016 report found that 42 percent of businesses suffered a cyber attack of some kind.

Incidents like these do not only hurt individual small-business owners, employees, and customers, they hurt American competitiveness.

In my district in the southwest suburbs of Chicago, there is a fourth-generation family manufacturing business that has suffered multiple sophisticated phishing attacks. The few times they have fallen victim to these attacks, the costs have been significant. The owners have told me that they would welcome guidance on affordable, off-the-shelf resources to strengthen their cyber defenses and let them get back to focusing on their business.

This is a story repeated across the country. That is why we must act, and we must pass this bill for our small businesses. The guidelines created under this bill, like the NIST framework, will be voluntary, so we won't be adding to the regulatory burden on small businesses. Instead, we will be offering them an opportunity to secure their networks so that they can compete on a level playing field.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2105, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act. This bipartisan legislation instructs the Director of NIST, in consultation with other Federal agencies, to disseminate guidance to help small businesses identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks. As a small-business owner, I am honored to be a cosponsor of this bill.

We know the importance of keeping all records safe and secure from outside threats. With the recent hacking of Equifax and many others, there is clearly a growing risk of online hacking and cyber warfare in the world today. It is imperative that we ensure that the backbone of our economy, our

small- and medium-size businesses, have the resources they need to stay safe.

I strongly believe that the businesses in Florida's Second District would benefit from this vital information, which will help them keep their data safe and secure. By increasing cybersecurity efforts, we are protecting both small businesses and their millions of customers across the country.

This bill doesn't cost the taxpayers anything, but it could potentially save small-business owners and consumers both their privacy and livelihoods.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2105, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act of 2017, which directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology to provide more guidance, resources, and tools to small businesses to improve their cybersecurity and protect the personal information of their customers.

According to the Small Business Administration, the 28 million small businesses in America account for 54 percent of all U.S. sales and 55 percent of all U.S. jobs. Small businesses play a central role in our economy.

Unfortunately, the information systems and networks of small businesses are especially vulnerable to an increasing volume and sophistication of cyber attacks. Small businesses rarely have employees or leadership with education or training in cybersecurity. Further, small businesses typically have limited resources to invest in cybersecurity.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, is a leader in developing standards and guidelines for cybersecurity in both the public and private sectors. In 2009, NIST developed a guidance document called, "Small Business Information Security: The Fundamentals." The document described the fundamentals of an effective small-business information security program in nontechnical language.

In 2014, in response to an executive order from President Obama, NIST published the Cybersecurity Framework for Critical Infrastructure. The cybersecurity framework, as written, is most useful for larger businesses with at least some cybersecurity expertise. Therefore, in November 2016, NIST published an update of their small-business guidance document using the framework as a template.

These are just two examples of how NIST has long privatized supporting small-business efforts to strengthen cybersecurity. The requirements of H.R. 2105 are consistent with these ongoing efforts and help ensure that they will continue.

Ideally, H.R. 2105 would have also provided resources for NIST to expand these activities because the need is

very clear. We cannot effectively support small business in this country unless we provide the relevant government agencies the resources to help protect those businesses from cyber threats.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2105, and I thank the sponsors, including Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. ROSEN, for their strong support for small businesses and NIST's important role in cybersecurity. However, I am concerned that the House bill contains an explicit unfunded mandate clause and that the Senate passed a version that is silent in funding. I hope Congress will provide NIST the adequate resources to fulfill the mandates in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) for yielding me time and for introducing H.R. 2105, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act.

This important and timely bipartisan bill, cosponsored by 17 Members of Congress and approved by the Science Committee by voice vote, directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology to provide small businesses with cybersecurity guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, and methodologies necessary to better protect themselves from cyber attacks.

Small businesses help produce a thriving economy that benefits our entire country. They bring innovative ideas, cutting-edge products and services, and jobs to the marketplace. In my home State, for example, there are more than 2.4 million small businesses that employ almost 4.5 million Texans.

Major cyber attacks dominate news coverage, such as the Equifax or Yahoo hacks that impacted millions and billions of people. But small businesses, which often do not have sufficient information to adequately monitor and protect their computer systems, are frequently the target of cyber attacks, as well.

A 2016 Symantec report notes that cyber attacks against businesses with fewer than 250 employees have grown from 18 percent in 2011 to 43 percent in 2015. This bill can help those businesses.

October is National Cybersecurity Awareness Month, so it is appropriate that we consider a bill designed to help protect small businesses from cybersecurity attacks. Today's legislation provides small businesses with NIST expertise to reduce their cybersecurity risk.

NIST experts developed a cybersecurity framework through collaboration between the government and the private sector. This framework is accepted and used by many private organizations to address and manage their information technology vulnerabilities in a cost-effective way.

The guidance described in this bill to help small businesses is based on the NIST cybersecurity framework. H.R. 2105 prioritizes dissemination of this guidance by NIST within its almost \$1 billion budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to show their support for small business by approving Mr. WEBSTER's fiscally responsible, innovation protection bill today.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2105.

When I travel around my district, which is rich with technology workers, the thing that I hear repeated concern about is the increasing need for individuals with the skill set, education, training, and knowledge of cybersecurity matters.

With the recent events with Equifax, WannaCry, and OPM breaches, it is clear that our cybersecurity infrastructure needs to be strengthened.

In December 2016, the Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity specifically recommended that the administration should "develop concrete efforts to support and strengthen the cybersecurity of small- and medium-sized businesses."

With small businesses accounting for most of the U.S. economy's jobs and sales, it is imperative that we provide guidance to help them identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks. By making these resources readily available to small businesses across the country, this commonsense legislation will help them protect their sensitive data and business from cyber threats so they can grow our economy and provide more jobs instead.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this measure, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) for his leadership on this legislation.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

□ 1415

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2105, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act. This bill directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology to issue guidance for small businesses to use voluntarily to assist them in identifying and assessing, managing, and reducing the cybersecurity risk.

As has been said, small businesses in the U.S. account for 54 percent of sales

and 55 percent of U.S. jobs. However, a 2016 Symantec Internet Security Threat Report indicated that businesses with less than 250 employees are facing increased cybersecurity threats, up from 18 percent in 2011 to 43 percent in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I recently passed our real estate small business to my son Warren, so I understand the importance of equipping small businesses with the tools that will enable them to meet the emerging challenges.

I urge passage of H.R. 2105, which will help prepare small businesses in the future, and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act, a bill that I am proud to cosponsor. This legislation will help promote stronger cybersecurity practices amongst our Nation's small businesses, and it is fiscally responsible.

The well-being of our small businesses is important to the overall health of our economy. According to the Small Business Administration, small businesses account for 55 percent of total jobs in the United States. In my home State of Nebraska, small businesses employed 390,000 people in 2016.

Some small businesses are not able to prioritize cybersecurity efforts over other aspects of their business or they lack the resources to secure their networks and systems. We must promote greater preparedness to protect small businesses from cyber attacks.

H.R. 2105 directs NIST to disseminate guidance to help small businesses identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cyber risks based off NIST's extensive expertise. This is a big step towards promoting better cybersecurity practices amongst our Nation's small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2105.

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

Mr. Speaker, we all have come down here and talked about the importance of small business. We know how important small businesses are to our country, the real engine of our economic growth.

We also know that, in most small businesses today, they don't have the capabilities to have an IT department or the expertise that they need to protect themselves from the continual cyber attacks, the theft of data that we hear about. But those attacks and that theft of data does not only happen for large companies; it is also a threat to small businesses. Therefore, we need to do all that we can to make sure that they are capable of protecting them-

selves so that our small businesses can continue to thrive and be the economic engine that they are.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. We get something good done for our small businesses. I urge them to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank those from both sides—Ranking Member LIPINSKI, Chairman SMITH, and others—who have supported this bill. It is a great idea. It is an opportunity to not only have available for us, it has bipartisan support and also bicameral support. This is a good opportunity to help all small businesses.

I know personally from my business and I know others who have small businesses who know that there is, in a sense, very little help right now for small businesses in this area of cybersecurity. The larger businesses certainly have their own IT people; we don't. So I am excited about the fact that this could happen, and I move passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2105, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH AND SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2763) to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2763

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as "The Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title, table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Requiring insertion incentives.
- Sec. 3. Additional SBIR and STTR technology insertion reporting requirement.
- Sec. 4. Encouraging innovation in United States manufacturing.
- Sec. 5. Encouraging innovation in cybersecurity.
- Sec. 6. Compliance of Phase III awards with competitive procedures.

- Sec. 7. Improvements to technical and business assistance in the SBIR and STTR programs.
- Sec. 8. Procurement center representatives and other acquisition personnel in the SBIR and STTR programs.
- Sec. 9. Increased outreach requirements.
- Sec. 10. Annual meeting.
- Sec. 11. Establishing the Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program.
- Sec. 12. Commercialization assistance pilot programs.
- Sec. 13. Phase 0 Proof of Concept Partnership Pilot Program.
- Sec. 14. Reporting requirements.
- Sec. 15. SBIR Phase flexibility.
- Sec. 16. Extension of deadline for assistance for administrative, oversight, and contract processing costs.

SEC. 2. REQUIRING INSERTION INCENTIVES.

Section 9(y)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(5)) is amended by striking “is authorized to” and inserting, “shall”.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL SBIR AND STTR TECHNOLOGY INSERTION REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)) is amended—

- (1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;
- (2) in subparagraph (C)(iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and
- (3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, and not later than December 31 of each year thereafter, submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, a report describing the goals set under subparagraph (A) and the incentives used or created under subparagraph (B).”

SEC. 4. ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(tt) ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) ensure that, in selecting small business concerns to participate in SBIR or STTR programs under this section, Federal agencies give high priority to small manufacturing companies and other small business concerns engaged in or planning to engage in manufacturing research and development for the purpose of developing and producing new products and technologies in the United States; and”

“(2) include in the annual report to Congress under subsection (b)(7) a determination of whether the priority described in paragraph (1) is being carried out.”

SEC. 5. ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN CYBERSECURITY.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 4, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection.

“(uu) ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN CYBERSECURITY.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) ensure that, in selecting small business concerns to participate in SBIR or STTR programs under this section, Federal agencies engaged in cybersecurity research give high priority to small business concerns that are engaged in cybersecurity research and development, for the purpose of developing and implementing technology services and products to strengthen the security of

United States Government and private computer systems, including software, hardware, and portable devices; and

“(2) include in the annual report to Congress under subsection (b)(7) a determination of whether the priority described in paragraph (1) is being carried out.”

SEC. 6. COMPLIANCE OF PHASE III AWARDS WITH COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES.

Section 9(r)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(r)(4)) is amended by inserting “as direct follow-on awards issued without further competition” after “developed the technology”

SEC. 7. IMPROVEMENTS TO TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS ASSISTANCE IN THE SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

Section 9(q) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(q)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND BUSINESS” after “TECHNICAL”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

- (A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a vendor selected under paragraph (2)” and inserting “1 or more vendors selected under paragraph (2)(A)”;

(ii) by inserting “and business” before “assistance services”; and

(iii) by inserting “assistance with product sales, intellectual property protections, market research, market validation, and development of regulatory plans and manufacturing plans,” after “technologies.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “, including intellectual property protections” before the period at the end;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “Each agency may select a vendor to assist small business concerns to meet” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each agency may select 1 or more vendors from which small business concerns may obtain assistance in meeting”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

(B) SELECTION BY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—A small business concern may, by contract or otherwise, select 1 or more vendors to assist the small business concern in meeting the goals listed in paragraph (1).”; and

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting “(A)” after “paragraph (2)” each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$6,500 per project”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$35,000 per project”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “which shall be in addition to the amount of the recipient’s award” and inserting “which may, as determined appropriate by the head of the agency, be included as part of the recipient’s award or be in addition to the amount of the recipient’s award”;

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “or business” after “technical”;

(ii) by striking “the vendor” and inserting “a vendor”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “Business-related services aimed at improving the commercialization success of a small business concern may be obtained from an entity, such as a public or private organization or an agency of or other entity established or funded by a State that facilitates or accelerates the commercialization of technologies or assists in the creation and growth of private enterprises that are commercializing technology.”;

(E) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting “or business” after “technical” each place it appears; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “the vendor” and inserting “1 or more vendors”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

(E) MULTIPLE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—The Administrator shall establish a limit on the amount of technical and business assistance services that may be received or purchased under subparagraph (B) by a small business concern that has received multiple Phase II SBIR or STTR awards for a fiscal year.”.

SEC. 8. PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER ACQUISITION PERSONNEL IN THE SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE.—Section 9(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(14) the term ‘senior procurement executive’ means an official designated under section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code, as the senior procurement executive of a Federal agency participating in a SBIR or STTR program.”.

(b) INCLUSION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVES IN SBIR AND STTR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) to coordinate, where appropriate, with the senior procurement executive of the relevant Federal agency to assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program with commercializing research developed under such a program before such small business concern is awarded a contract from such Federal agency.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 9(b)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(3)) is amended by striking “and” at the end.

(c) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER ACQUISITION PERSONNEL.—

(1) SBIR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.—Upon the enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives issued pursuant to this subsection to require procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(1)) to coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer or SBIR program officer, and the appropriate Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract, to assist small business concerns participating in the SBIR program, particularly in Phase III. The procurement center representatives shall coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract.”.

(2) STTR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(p)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) procedures to ensure that procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(l))—

“(i) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer or STTR program officer, and the appropriate Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract, to assist small business concerns participating in the STTR program, particularly in Phase III; and

“(ii) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the Federal agency letting the contract in providing the assistance described in clause (i); and”.

(d) AMENDMENT TO DUTIES OF PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.—Section 15(l)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(l)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (L); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraphs:

“(J) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer or SBIR or STTR program officer, and the appropriate Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract, to assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with Phase III;

“(K) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to subsection (k) for the agency letting the contract; and”.

(e) AMENDMENT TO THE DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (19), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(21) shall coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer of SBIR or STTR program officer to assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement (as defined under section 9) with the concern) to market the research developed by such concern under such SBIR or STTR program; and

“(22) shall provide technical assistance to small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract, including coordination with procurement center representatives and the appropriate senior procurement executive for the agency letting the contract.”.

SEC. 9. INCREASED OUTREACH REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) SBIR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)), as amended by section 8, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) INCREASED OUTREACH REQUIREMENTS.—Upon the enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives issued pursuant to this subsection to require outreach efforts to increase the participation in technological innovation under the SBIR programs among individuals con-

ducting research at minority institutions (as defined in section 365(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) and Hispanic-serving institutions (as defined in section 502(a)(5) of such Act).”.

(2) STTR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(p)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)(2)), as amended by section 8, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(H) procedures for outreach efforts to increase the participation in technological innovation under the SBIR programs among individuals conducting research at minority institutions (as defined in section 365(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) and Hispanic-serving institutions (as defined in section 502(a)(5) of such Act).”.

(b) FUNDING FOR OUTREACH.—Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking the “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) the outreach efforts described under subsections (j)(4) and (p)(2)(G); and”.

SEC. 10. ANNUAL MEETING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 5, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(vv) ANNUAL MEETING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency required to have a program under this section (or a designee) and the Administrator (or a designee) shall meet annually to discuss methods—

“(A) to improve the collection of data under this section;

“(B) to improve the reporting of data to the Administrator under this section;

“(C) to make the application processes for programs under this section more efficient; and

“(D) to increase participation in the programs established under this section.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an annual meeting required under paragraph (1) is held, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, a report on the findings of such meeting and recommendations on how to implement changes to programs under this section.”.

(b) FUNDING FOR ANNUAL MEETING.—Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) as amended by section 9, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(L) the annual meeting required under subsection (vv).”.

SEC. 11. ESTABLISHING THE CIVILIAN AGENCY COMMERCIALIZATION READINESS PROGRAM.

Section 9(gg) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(gg)) is amended—

(1) by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: “CIVILIAN AGENCY COMMERCIALIZATION READINESS PROGRAM”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “to establish a Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program for civilian agencies” after “the covered Federal agency”;

(3) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) by striking “establish a pilot program” and inserting “establish a Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program under this subsection”; and

(B) by striking “the pilot program” and inserting “such Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program”;

(4) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by striking “a pilot program” each place such term appears and inserting “a Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program”;

(5) in paragraph (6), by striking “the pilot program” and inserting “a Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program”;

(6) by striking paragraph (7) and redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (7); and

(7) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) the term ‘Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program’ means each program established under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 12. COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAMS.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 10, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ww) COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAMS.—

“(1) PILOT PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, a covered agency shall implement a commercialization assistance pilot program, under which an eligible entity may receive a subsequent Phase II SBIR award.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—If the Administrator determines that a covered agency has a program that is sufficiently similar to the commercialization assistance pilot program established under this subsection, such covered agency shall not be required to implement a commercialization assistance pilot program under this subsection.

“(2) PERCENT OF AGENCY FUNDS.—The head of each covered agency may allocate not more than 5 percent of the funds allocated to the SBIR program of the covered agency for the purpose of making a subsequent Phase II SBIR award under the commercialization assistance pilot program.

“(3) TERMINATION.—A commercialization assistance pilot program established under this subsection shall terminate on September 30, 2022.

“(4) APPLICATION.—To be selected to receive a subsequent Phase II SBIR award under a commercialization assistance pilot program, an eligible entity shall submit to the covered agency implementing such pilot program an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the covered agency may require, including—

“(A) an updated Phase II commercialization plan; and

“(B) the source and amount of the matching funding required under paragraph (5).

“(5) MATCHING FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall require, as a condition of any subsequent Phase II SBIR award made to an eligible entity under this subsection, that a matching amount (excluding any fees collected by the eligible entity receiving such award) equal to the amount of such award be provided from an eligible third-party investor.

“(B) INELIGIBLE SOURCES.—An eligible entity may not use funding from ineligible sources to meet the matching requirement of subparagraph (A).

“(6) AWARD.—A subsequent Phase II SBIR award made to an eligible entity under this subsection—

“(A) may not exceed the limitation described under subsection (aa)(1); and

“(B) shall be disbursed during Phase II.

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—The funds awarded to an eligible entity under this subsection may only be used for research and development activities that build on eligible entity’s Phase II program and ensure the research funded under such Phase II is rapidly progressing towards commercialization.

“(8) SELECTION.—In selecting eligible entities to participate in a commercialization assistance pilot program under this subsection, the head of a covered agency shall consider—

“(A) the extent to which such award could aid the eligible entity in commercializing the research funded under the eligible entity’s Phase II program;

“(B) whether the updated Phase II commercialization plan submitted under paragraph (4) provides a sound approach for establishing technical feasibility that could lead to commercialization of such research;

“(C) whether the proposed activities to be conducted under such updated Phase II commercialization plan further improve the likelihood that such research will provide societal benefits;

“(D) whether the small business concern has progressed satisfactorily in Phase II to justify receipt of a subsequent Phase II SBIR award;

“(E) the expectations of the eligible third-party investor that provides matching funding under paragraph (5); and

“(F) the likelihood that the proposed activities to be conducted under such updated Phase II commercialization plan using matching funding provided by such eligible third-party investor will lead to commercial and societal benefit.

“(9) EVALUATION REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, a report including—

“(A) a summary of the activities of commercialization assistance pilot programs carried out under this subsection;

“(B) a detailed compilation of results achieved by such commercialization assistance pilot programs, including the number of eligible entities that received awards under such programs;

“(C) the rate at which each eligible entity that received a subsequent Phase II SBIR award under this subsection commercialized research of the recipient;

“(D) the growth in employment and revenue of eligible entities that is attributable to participation in a commercialization assistance pilot program;

“(E) a comparison of commercialization success of eligible entities participating in a commercialization assistance pilot program with recipients of an additional Phase II SBIR award under subsection (ff);

“(F) demographic information, such as ethnicity and geographic location, of eligible entities participating in a commercialization assistance pilot program;

“(G) an accounting of the funds used at each covered agency that implements a commercialization assistance pilot program under this subsection;

“(H) the amount of matching funding provided by eligible third-party investors, set forth separately by source of funding;

“(I) an analysis of the effectiveness of the commercialization assistance pilot program implemented by each covered agency; and

“(J) recommendations for improvements to the commercialization assistance pilot program.

“(10) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means a Federal agency required to have an SBIR program.

“(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means a small business concern that has received a Phase II award under an SBIR program and an additional Phase II SBIR

award under subsection (ff) from the covered agency to which such small business concern is applying for a subsequent Phase II SBIR award.

“(C) ELIGIBLE THIRD-PARTY INVESTOR.—The term ‘eligible third-party investor’ means a small business concern other than an eligible entity, a venture capital firm, an individual investor, a non-SBIR Federal, State or local government, or any combination thereof.

“(D) INELIGIBLE SOURCES.—The term ‘ineligible sources’ means the following:

“(i) The eligible entity’s internal research and development funds.

“(ii) Funding in forms other than cash, such as in-kind or other intangible assets.

“(iii) Funding from the owners of the eligible entity, or the family members or affiliates of such owners.

“(iv) Funding attained through loans or other forms of debt obligations.

“(E) SUBSEQUENT PHASE II SBIR AWARD.—The term ‘subsequent Phase II SBIR award’ means an award granted to an eligible entity under this subsection to carry out further commercialization activities for research conducted pursuant to an SBIR program.”.

SEC. 13. PHASE 0 PROOF OF CONCEPT PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL AGENCIES IN PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 9(jj) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “The Director of the National Institutes of Health” and inserting “Each covered agency head”; and

(B) by striking “the Director” and inserting “each covered agency head”;

(2) by amending subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(A) the term ‘covered agency head’ means the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Secretary of Energy;”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “The Director” and inserting “Each covered agency head”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the Director shall consider, in addition to any other criteria the Director” and inserting “each covered agency head shall consider, in addition to any other criteria the appropriate covered agency head”; and

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking “The Director” and inserting “Each covered agency head”.

(b) EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—Section 9(jj)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj)(7)) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 14. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 9(b)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(7)) is amended by striking “to report not less than annually” and inserting “to submit a report not later than December 31 of each year”.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT TO SBA AND THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY.—Section 9(g)(9) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(g)(9)) is amended—

(1) by striking “make an annual report” and inserting “not later than March 30 of each year, submit a report”; and

(2) by striking “and the Office of Science and Technology Policy” and inserting “, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate”.

SEC. 15. SBIR PHASE FLEXIBILITY.

Section 9(cc) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(cc)) is amended by striking “Dur-

ing fiscal years” and all that follows through “may each provide” and inserting “During fiscal years 2018 through 2022, all agencies participating in the SBIR program may provide”.

SEC. 16. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR ASSISTANCE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE, OVERSIGHT, AND CONTRACT PROCESSING COSTS.

Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “September 30, 2022”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation introduced by Chairman KNIGHT and Ranking Member MURPHY of the Committee on Small Business’ Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce aims to modernize and improve the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer, or SBIR and STTR, programs.

The SBIR and STTR programs have helped thousands of small businesses create new technologies, commercialize their ideas, and generate new jobs. While creating these benefits in the private sector, the programs offer, in a cost-effective manner, ways for Federal agencies to solve operational problems. H.R. 2763 strengthens these two programs in quite a few ways.

First, the bill emphasizes agency accountability by creating several firm reporting deadlines for covered agencies and for the SBA to provide future Congresses with improved information that will lead to a better understanding of the programs’ strengths and weaknesses.

Second, the legislation clarifies the congressional intent of the 2011 reauthorization to ensure that taxpayers reap the benefits of the SBIR and STTR programs by binding the technologies developed in the programs to long-term projects at the Department of Defense.

Third, the legislation extends a popular pilot program included in the 2011 reauthorization that would allow all participating Federal agencies to award a phase II contract immediately if the agency finds that the small business concern has already completed work typically done during phase I.

Fourth, it makes permanent the option for all participating agencies to

establish commercialization readiness programs, or CRPs. As a pilot program from the 2011 reauthorization, these CRPs have been shown to provide much-needed support to small companies nearing the completion of the process and have helped advance technology to the commercialization phase.

Fifth, it extends, through 2022, the provision that allows participating agencies to utilize 3 percent of their allocation for administrative functions, conduct outreach in an effort to bring more companies into the SBIR and STTR programs, and increase deterrents to waste, fraud, and abuse.

I want to thank Congressman KNIGHT and Congresswoman MURPHY for the bipartisan work on this important legislation. I would also like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, as well as Chairwoman COMSTOCK and Ranking Member LIPINSKI of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology, for working together with us to produce this bipartisan bill that we have before us this afternoon.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2763, The Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act, which will modernize two programs that provide Federal funding to small technologically advanced firms to research and develop innovative products.

I am proud to have cosponsored this legislation with Congressman STEVE KNIGHT, and I am encouraged that my colleagues on the Small Business Committee and the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee on both sides of the aisle support the bill.

For decades, American innovation and ingenuity have bolstered our economic growth and solidified our country's status as a global leader in technology; and for more than 30 years, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs have provided a critical source of funding to small businesses that engage in research and development. These initiatives were established to help spur innovation and job creation throughout the country.

Since the inception of the programs, more than \$40 billion has been awarded to small, innovative firms to address our Nation's most important research and development challenges. Because of the high-risk nature of their ventures, SBIR and STTR grantees receive R&D funding that might otherwise be unavailable in the private sector.

As a direct result of the Federal investment in these programs, breakthroughs have been made in a wide range of sectors, including agriculture, defense, energy, and healthcare. In

turn, these discoveries have generated tremendous economic growth and job opportunities across the country, including in central Florida.

For many research companies in my district, these two programs serve as a gateway to the Federal contracting field. That is why I am honored to have cosponsored this bipartisan legislation.

The final bill reflects bipartisan compromises and input from both committees of jurisdiction. Most importantly, it includes many provisions focused on developing innovative products that support important national priorities and that can be sold on the commercial market.

To improve oversight of the program, the bill requires the Small Business Administration to submit an annual report to Congress no later than December 31 of each year. This will enable us to better account for the use of funds and to better assess the progress of SBIR and STTR initiatives at participating agencies.

Another provision makes permanent the pilot program that establishes the Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness program, which allows up to 10 percent of agency administrative dollars for sequential phase II awards to eligible businesses.

Finally, the bill includes an amendment that I authored to require participating Federal agencies to take additional steps to educate small firms about the SBIR and STTR programs and to encourage more small firms to apply for funding.

After more than a decade of fits and starts with these two programs, H.R. 2763 will make program improvements and provide much-needed certainty to small businesses seeking to commercialize. By authorizing the administrative fee to run these programs for an additional 5 years beyond its current authorization, Congress is taking proactive steps to give small firms the confidence they need to continue developing innovative products.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce on the Small Business Committee.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his hard work and for his leadership, and I want to thank my partner in this, Congresswoman MURPHY, for her cosponsoring of this bill and for her work on this important piece of legislation.

A 21st century military requires a 21st century acquisition process, one that is agile, efficient, and effective. I represent California's 25th District, and nowhere will you find a more exemplary place that demonstrates the important role that small businesses play in both our aerospace and defense industrial base.

□ 1430

I see firsthand the innovative effect small businesses make and how they can positively impact government functioning.

The Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer—SBIR and STTR—programs are critical to this impact. Now that these programs have been reauthorized until 2022, it is important that we continue to focus on spurring innovation.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017. My bill reinforces agency accountability by requiring the Small Business Administration to provide Congress with better information and reasonable, hard deadlines. It clarifies congressional intent of the previous authorization to ensure that taxpayers reap the benefits of SBIR and STTR programs by tying them to long-term projects at the DOD. It also allows participating agencies to establish a new, separate commercialization assistance pilot program and extends three popular pilot programs through FY 2022, when the full program will need a full reauthorization.

With the use of SBIR and STTR programs, we can increase small business participation in the defense and aerospace industry while tapping into the true potential their American innovative spirit represents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to vote "yes" on H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CHABOT, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, Chairman SMITH, and all other colleagues on both committees for their work to advance this bipartisan piece to the House floor.

SBIR and STTR are valuable programs that provide competitive research and development grants and contracts to innovative small businesses. Stability and continuity in the SBIR and STTR programs are important goals, which is why I supported the agreement in last year's National Defense Authorization Act to extend the program until fiscal year 2022 at the current allocation level.

In H.R. 2763, the two authorizing committees have come to agreement on a number of policy improvements and some strengthened oversight for the programs.

The policy changes in H.R. 2763 advances sensible ways to further leverage small business R&D to help meet Federal mission needs, as well as contribute more broadly to U.S. innovation and economic growth. The bill includes continued support for early-stage funding for entrepreneurial researchers, provides funding for important agency outreach and administrative activities, streamlines reporting requirements, ensures agency outreach for researchers at minority-serving institutions, and authorizes several additional activities to support implementation of the program.

I am particularly pleased that the bill includes a provision to address current agency shortfalls in fostering the participation of women and minority-owned firms. Fostering diversity in STEM research and innovation is an economic imperative.

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we must continue to encourage such policies.

H.R. 2763 is a good bill that improves the SBIR program and maximizes the benefits of federally funded small business R&D.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairmen CHABOT and SMITH and Ranking Members VELÁZQUEZ and JOHNSON for their leadership on this bill.

The SBIR and STTR programs have helped countless innovative small businesses grow jobs through American ingenuity. This bill will make these programs work even better by providing small businesses with additional tools for bringing innovations to market. Better SBIR and STTR programs mean more successful small businesses and more jobs.

I especially want to thank my colleagues for supporting inclusion of two provisions that I put forward in committee.

First, the bill increases the amount of money that grant recipients are allowed to spend on business and technical services, like market research, intellectual property protection; or participation in entrepreneurial training programs, like the highly successful Innovation Corps program. This helps small businesses, especially startups, use their funds where they know they are needed most, for technical assistance, creative approaches to problem solving, and other types of guidance needed in today's complex marketplaces.

Second, this bill expands the highly successful Phase 0 Proof of Concept

Partnership pilot program, which I helped create at the National Institutes of Health in a previous SBIR reauthorization. This highly successful program provides the earliest funding for researchers exploring the possibility of turning their research into a viable medical product.

After just 2 years in operation, the three hubs created by the NIH program have filed 30 patent applications, negotiated 14 technology licenses, formed 7 companies, and have 70 promising technologies in the pipeline.

This bill extends the Phase 0 program for another 5 years at NIH and expands it to the National Science Foundation, NASA, and the Department of Energy. In doing so, we will be giving a needed boost to more researchers who are budding entrepreneurs who will create the jobs of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, our small businesses deserve support as they drive America's economic growth. This bill will give innovators and entrepreneurs additional tools to drive this growth that we so desperately need. So I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her work on this small business bill. I also thank Chairmen SMITH and CHABOT and Ranking Members JOHNSON and VELÁZQUEZ for including my amendment to benefit minority-serving institutions in H.R. 2763. This is essential to retaining American leadership in innovation and small business development.

The SBIR and STTR programs were both created to expand small business participation in the Federal research mission. One of the four objectives Congress had in mind in establishing the SBIR was to facilitate and increase the participation of minority and disadvantaged persons in technological innovation.

My amendment requires that the participating Federal agencies in the SBIR and STTR programs conduct outreach to minority-serving institutions—MSIs—and Hispanic-serving institutions and faculty conducting research at these institutions so that participation rates in Federal research and development opportunities will increase.

There are many great MSIs and researchers who work at these institutions across the country. For example, California State University Stanislaus, which has a campus in my district, is a Hispanic-serving institution and an MSI, and has been ranked one of the best colleges in our Nation. Our country depends on innovation of MSIs and the intellectual capital of its graduates.

In the 21st century, American economic growth is going to be deter-

mined by the innovation and growth of technology and STEM-focused businesses. It is critical to the growth of our economy that minority-serving institutions and minority-owned businesses are connected to this technological ecosystem.

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Reauthorizing the SBIR and STTR programs are critical to supporting our Nation's most forward-thinking entrepreneurs and innovators. I am relieved that we are preserving the critical parts of the programs and continuing to improve upon the programs themselves.

These programs have proven to be one of the most successful Federal programs for technological innovation in United States history, delivering more than 70,000 patents and valuable innovations in agriculture, defense, energy, health sciences, homeland security, space, transportation, and other fields.

Through Phase I and Phase II SBIR, countless jobs have been created in the capital region of New York. It is through programs such as SBIR that our region has developed the underpinnings of support for a boom in high technology innovation and economic development.

One of many examples of this is Ecovative Design located within my congressional district in Green Island, New York, which has benefitted from the SBIR program over a number of years. These efforts will allow the company to continue its work on a replacement of engineered wood resins that will be economically competitive and nontoxic.

The resin system represents cost and energy savings, and is capable of leveraging existing manufacturing equipment in production today. This funding will help them deliver on the promise of this innovative technology.

Gavin McIntyre, cofounder and chief scientist at Ecovative said: "We're very excited to bring our new material technology to market and displace toxic formaldehyde-based resins. The SBIR/STTR program was fundamental to how Ecovative got its start and has enabled us to continue to take risks and develop game-changing technology."

While this bill is a positive step forward towards helping more small businesses, we must do more to help other small businesses develop these types of game-changing technologies.

I recognize the value of research and I will fight to see more funding for all these agencies and, in turn, more funding for the SBIR and STTR programs.

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, supporting our entrepreneurs and small businesses are a top priority for both sides of the aisle. Our bill will make it easier for small firms that receive SBIR and STTR awards to bring their products to market and achieve commercial success.

The SBIR and STTR programs are also critical to our economy, as they support our Nation's job creators and ensure that our country continues to produce cutting-edge research and development. This ingenuity is what makes our country a global economic powerhouse.

These programs, while successful, can be improved. The bill before us is a step in the right direction insofar as it will ensure that all Federal agencies are enhancing efforts to help more small businesses obtain SBIR and STTR funding and bring their innovative products to market.

Therefore, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who spoke on this legislation, a very bipartisan, good legislation, here this afternoon on the House floor.

In closing, whether it is new software system for tracking contract payments or a new medical device to help with cancer treatments, or a new piece of technology that literally saves lives on the battlefield, the SBIR and STTR programs have consistently delivered results to Federal agencies. They are worthy programs that do what they are supposed to do, but we can always do better. This legislation improves and modernizes these programs, and I ask that all of my colleagues support it.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017.

And I thank the gentleman from California, Mr. KNIGHT, for introducing this important legislation. He serves on the two Committees that share jurisdiction over the SBIR and STTR programs: the Small Business Committee, chaired by my good friend, Mr. CHABOT, and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, which I chair.

Mr. KNIGHT took the lead on last year's timely reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR programs, and he is the sponsor of H.R. 2763, which makes a number of needed policy changes to increase the programs' efficiency and effectiveness.

The SBIR program was signed into law by President Reagan in 1982, followed by the STTR program in 1992. These programs help spur economic innovation and competitiveness, and increase small business participation in federal research and development activity.

SBIR and STTR award winners convert the results of taxpayer-supported pioneering research into products that are critical to our economic competitiveness and national security. Recent examples include parts for NASA's Mars Rover and a unique cockpit airbag system to protect Army helicopter pilots.

Today 11 federal agencies provide funding to small businesses through SBIR, and five agencies provide funding through STTR—a total of nearly \$3 billion this fiscal year. That's more than 66 times greater than the \$45 million spent under the original program in 1983.

Recipients of SBIR and STTR funding have boosted scientific and technological innovation and created hundreds of thousands of American jobs.

Several large, international companies like Qualcomm, Sonicare and Symantec can trace their initial growth to when they were small businesses that received SBIR and STTR support.

I want to call attention to two provisions of H.R. 2763 that were added by Members of the Science Committee.

A provision authored by Mr. HULTGREN requires participating federal agencies to give priority to SBIR and STTR projects that will strengthen American manufacturing innovation and increase manufacturing jobs in our country.

A provision authored by Mr. HIGGINS requires federal agencies engaged in cyber security research to give priority to SBIR and STTR projects that will spur advances in cyber security to protect the American people from increasingly aggressive and malicious cyberattacks.

The legislation before us addresses a number of red flags raised by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) about lax administration of the SBIR and STTR programs.

Several participating agencies do not produce accurate, timely information that Congress requires to evaluate program performance.

The U.S. Small Business Administration has not submitted its required, comprehensive annual report to Congress since 2013.

The last administration provided virtually no information to Congress and taxpayers about the SBIR and STTR programs.

It's reassuring that SBA associate administrator Joseph Shepard promised during a joint hearing of our Committee and the Small Business Committee that annual reports will be submitted on time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2763 was unanimously approved by both the House Small Business Committee and the House Science Committee. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2763, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

POWER AND SECURITY SYSTEMS (PASS) ACT

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 190) to provide for consideration of the extension under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of nonapplication of No-Load Mode energy efficiency stand-

ards to certain security or life safety alarms or surveillance systems, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 190

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Power And Security Systems (PASS) Act".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF NONAPPLICATION OF NO-LOAD MODE ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARD TO CERTAIN SECURITY OR LIFE SAFETY ALARM OR SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS.

(a) Section 325(u)(3)(D)(ii) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(u)(3)(D)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking "2015" each place it appears and inserting "2021"; and

(2) by striking "2017" and inserting "2023".

(b) Section 325(u)(3)(E) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(u)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking "July 1, 2017," and inserting "the effective date of the amendment under subparagraph (D)(ii)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) TREATMENT IN RULE.—In the rule under subparagraph (D)(ii) and subsequent amendments the Secretary may treat some or all external power supplies designed to be connected to a security or life safety alarm or surveillance system as a separate product class or may extend the nonapplication under clause (ii)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 190.

External power supplies are used for all sorts of devices, and we have learned from experience that the Federal energy efficiency standards sometimes don't work in the ways we want them to. In particular, we need an exemption from these rules for the security and life safety alarms and surveillance alarms.

S. 190, the Power and Security Systems, or PASS, Act, provides targeted exemptions that allow these critical uses to stay on the market.

Devices like home security alarms or fire detection need to be on 24/7, 365, but the 2007 energy law on energy efficiency standards for external power supplies does not allow for this. Since then, Congress has created exemptions for these "always on" devices, but this exemption ended on July 1 of 2017. S. 190 extends this exemption out to 2023.

The result of this bill would be that these important security systems will continue to be available, preserving the jobs of those who make them, and, most importantly, the safety of those who use them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 190, the Power and Security Systems, or PASS, Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a noncontroversial technical fix to a Department of Energy efficiency standard, and it has widespread bipartisan support.

I would also like to acknowledge my colleagues, Mr. WELCH from Vermont, Mr. BROOKS from Alabama, as well as Senator GARDNER and Senator CANTWELL, for their work in sponsoring this bill and getting it to the floor here today.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would simply amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to require the Department of Energy to issue a rule by July 1, 2021, which would determine whether energy conservation standards for external power supplies should be amended.

The rule must contain any amendment standards and would apply to products manufactured on or after July 1, 2023.

Mr. Speaker, current law exempts external power supplies for security or life safety systems from energy conservation standards until July 1, 2017. This bill simply extends that exemption to July 1, 2023.

Mr. Speaker, this clarification is necessary in order to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices that are designed to power security alarms, life-saving devices, and surveillance systems.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, this legislative fix has widespread support from both houses of Congress, from both sides of the aisle, as well as from industry and the energy efficiency community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this valuable piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I close with a short and sweet: good bill, vote for it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 190.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CLINICAL CARE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 920) to establish a National Clinical Care Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 920

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Clinical Care Commission Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CLINICAL CARE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established, within the Department of Health and Human Services, a National Clinical Care Commission (in this section referred to as the “Commission”) to evaluate and make recommendations regarding improvements to the coordination and leveraging of programs within the Department and other Federal agencies related to awareness and clinical care for at least one, but not more than two, complex metabolic or autoimmune diseases resulting from issues related to insulin that represent a significant disease burden in the United States, which may include complications due to such diseases.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of the following voting members:

(A) The heads of the following Federal agencies and departments, or their designees:

(i) The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(ii) The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

(iii) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(iv) The Indian Health Service.

(v) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

(vi) The National Institutes of Health.

(vii) The Food and Drug Administration.

(viii) The Health Resources and Services Administration.

(ix) The Department of Defense.

(x) The Department of Agriculture.

(xi) The Office of Minority Health.

(B) Twelve additional voting members appointed under paragraph (2).

(2) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—The Commission shall include additional voting members, as may be appointed by the Secretary, with expertise in the prevention, care, and epidemiology of any of the diseases and complications described in subsection (a), including one or more such members from each of the following categories:

(A) Physician specialties, including clinical endocrinologists, that play a role in the prevention or treatment of diseases and complications described in subsection (a).

(B) Primary care physicians.

(C) Non-physician health care professionals.

(D) Patient advocates.

(E) National experts, including public health experts, in the duties listed under subsection (c).

(F) Health care providers furnishing services to a patient population that consists of a high percentage (as specified by the Secretary) of individuals who are enrolled in a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act or who are not covered under a health plan or health insurance coverage.

(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The members of the Commission shall select a chairperson from the members appointed under paragraph (2).

(4) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at least twice, and not more than four times, a year.

(5) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

(c) DUTIES.—The Commission shall evaluate and make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and Congress regarding—

(1) Federal programs of the Department of Health and Human Services that focus on preventing and reducing the incidence of the diseases and complications described in subsection (a);

(2) current activities and gaps in Federal efforts to support clinicians in providing integrated, high-quality care to individuals with the diseases and complications described in subsection (a);

(3) the improvement in, and improved coordination of, Federal education and awareness activities related to the prevention and treatment of the diseases and complications described in subsection (a), which may include the utilization of new and existing technologies;

(4) methods for outreach and dissemination of education and awareness materials that—

(A) address the diseases and complications described in subsection (a);

(B) are funded by the Federal Government; and

(C) are intended for health care professionals and the public; and

(5) whether there are opportunities for consolidation of inappropriately overlapping or duplicative Federal programs related to the diseases and complications described in subsection (a).

(d) OPERATING PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after its first meeting, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Congress an operating plan for carrying out the activities of the Commission as described in subsection (c). Such operating plan may include—

(1) a list of specific activities that the Commission plans to conduct for purposes of carrying out the duties described in each of the paragraphs in subsection (c);

(2) a plan for completing the activities;

(3) a list of members of the Commission and other individuals who are not members of the Commission who will need to be involved to conduct such activities;

(4) an explanation of Federal agency involvement and coordination needed to conduct such activities;

(5) a budget for conducting such activities; and

(6) other information that the Commission deems appropriate.

(e) FINAL REPORT.—By not later than 3 years after the date of the Commission’s first meeting, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Congress a final report containing all of the findings and recommendations required by this section.

(f) SUNSET.—The Commission shall terminate 60 days after submitting its final report, but not later than the end of fiscal year 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act, a bipartisan bill that has received unanimous support within both the House and the Senate Chambers. S. 920 is the Senate companion to my bill, H.R. 309, which is cosponsored by over half of my House colleagues.

It has this level of support because our Nation faces an epidemic. Diabetes or prediabetes affects over 100 million Americans. Nearly one in three of our neighbors is affected.

This legislation will also help many others who are affected by other diseases like heart disease, obesity, and many others.

When I first came to Congress in 2009, it was crystal clear that we had a big problem. The benefits of all the Federal research dollars going into these diseases were simply not making their way to patients. Researchers at the NIH, the CDC, the DOD, the VA, and the FDA weren't sharing diabetes research. Who knows? Sharing information may have put us on a path to cure diabetes.

It was clear then, and it is still clear today: we need a laser-like approach to improve patient care by pursuing a strong Federal focus on research.

This bill accomplishes that goal by creating a National Clinical Care Commission comprised of doctors who specialize in diabetes care for patients.

This commission will have 3 years to strengthen the partnership between Federal stakeholders and health professionals who will bring hands-on, clinical experience to improve care.

This is not a new, unending bureaucracy. After 3 years, this commission will sunset. In 3 years, it will be gone.

We have already made such a huge investment of taxpayer dollars into research. It is time to leverage that investment into meaningful prevention and effective treatment options.

President Reagan once said: "There is no limit to the amount of good you can do if you don't care who gets the credit."

That is why I stand here today in strong support of my bill, which became Senator SHAHEEN's bill, because this bill will help so many Americans who are suffering from diabetes.

So today I ask my colleagues to again help all those who suffer from diabetes and other complex metabolic and autoimmune disorders by voting for S. 920.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation aims to help improve Federal efforts to treat

and to prevent metabolic and autoimmune disorders related to insulin.

The most common metabolic disorder in the U.S. is diabetes, which affects more than 25 million Americans. Another 86 million Americans have prediabetes, a condition associated with an increased risk of developing type 2 diabetes and heart disease.

Mr. Speaker, diabetes takes a huge toll on human health; in fact, it is the seventh leading cause of death in our Nation.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, all too often diabetes leads to avoidable complications, such as blindness, such as limb amputation, and also kidney failure.

In addition to the effects on human health, Mr. Speaker, diabetes care makes up a large percentage of U.S. healthcare expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, currently \$1 of every \$5 of healthcare cost is spent caring for people with diabetes. The proportion of Medicare funding is even greater than this. Currently, \$1 of every \$3 of Medicare expenditure is spent caring for people with diabetes.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, that is why it is important to improve the Federal efforts that prevent avoidable cases of diabetes and other metabolic disorders, and to ensure that all Americans have the treatment and the management services necessary to successfully manage this and other similar conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was previously passed in the 114th Congress and again at the beginning of the 115th Congress. I am pleased to see that the Senate took action on this legislation to support passage of this bill into law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on S. 920, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act, sponsored by Senator SHAHEEN.

This legislation has been around for a while. It has been championed in the House by our good friend and fellow Texan, Representative PETE OLSON, as H.R. 309. This bill has strong bipartisan support. It passed this House unanimously earlier this year.

Diabetes and other endocrine disorders have been a great cost burden on Medicare and, in fact, our Nation's healthcare system in general. Thirty million Americans have diabetes, 84 million Americans have prediabetes, and three out of four Americans on Medicare have diabetes or prediabetes. And \$1 out of every \$3 Medicare spends is spent on diabetes.

This bill will establish a clinical care commission to evaluate and recommend solutions for better coordination and use of Federal programs aimed at improving care for people with diabetes and other related endocrine dis-

orders. This commission will be tasked with identifying gaps where new approaches are needed, eliminating duplication across Federal agencies, and leveraging the Federal resources and tools available to enhance the quality of patient care.

I am confident their work will improve the lives of tens of millions of Americans living with diabetes and with other endocrine disorders while beginning the process of reducing the staggering impact of these diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank and commend our colleague, Representative PETE OLSON, for spearheading this important initiative. I want to thank him for bringing it to the floor of the House as many times as he has. This has been a lengthy process, but today, with the passage of this bill, we are voting on final passage, and this bill will be sent to the President's desk for signature. Mr. Speaker, Mr. OLSON's long and arduous journey now will be completed with the passage of this bill, and we should all look forward to that.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBACK).

Mr. LOEBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for yielding time to me today to speak on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act. S. 920, as was mentioned already, creates a commission comprised of clinical endocrinologists, other physician specialists, primary care physicians, healthcare professionals, patients, and representatives from the Federal agencies most involved in diabetes care.

The commission is charged with making recommendations to streamline Federal investments in diabetes, to improve the coordination and clinical care outcomes for people with diabetes, prediabetes, and other insulin-related metabolic and autoimmune diseases.

Passage of this legislation will help the Nation undertake more and innovative approaches to diabetes and its disease complications, for which the United States spends some \$322 billion annually.

I urge the Secretary also to move expeditiously to set up the commission so it can begin its important work as soon as possible. Clinical training and expertise in diabetes and other insulin-related diseases will be needed to lead the commission, and it is my hope that a clinical endocrinologist will be chosen to serve as the chairperson of the commission. I think that is very important.

With a clinical endocrinologist as chair and representatives from other medical specialties, healthcare professions, and patient advocacy groups, serving alongside with Federal diabetes experts, the commission created under S. 920 will help to ensure that new innovative medications and devices are

effectively translated to the clinical setting for the benefit of patients. That clinical translation is so important.

The work of the commission will help improve the lives of the tens of millions of Americans living with diabetes while simultaneously beginning the process of reducing the staggering impact of diabetes and its disease complications and the dollars that, as has already been mentioned, are associated with that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank in particular Representative OLSON for his persistence, as was already mentioned, and for sponsoring this bill in the House. I was very happy to lead the way as the Democrat on this side of the aisle on this bill, and for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who supported this bill that enabled House passage of the legislation earlier, as was mentioned, and now we are finally going to get it over the finish line. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative OLSON in particular for his efforts on this.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa for those kind words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, again, short and sweet. This is a good bill. It is the first step towards actually funding a cure for diabetes. Maybe we will do that. By the way, it leaves here and will be signed into law before this week ends. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" when this vote comes up for a final passage vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 920.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JOHN F. NASH, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2302) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2302

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

SECTION 1. DR. JOHN F. NASH, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2302, introduced by the gentlewoman, Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN from New Jersey. The bill designates the post office located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2, in Princeton, New Jersey, as the Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office.

John Nash was a brilliant mathematician, publishing groundbreaking work in many areas. One of his most famous contributions was to the field of game theory, creating what is known as the Nash equilibrium.

For his achievements, he won a Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 1994, and the Abel Prize from the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing more about Dr. Nash's life from the gentlewoman from New Jersey, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise to urge support for my bill, H.R. 2302, which would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street in Princeton, New Jersey, as the Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office.

As a legendary figure of Princeton University's mathematics department, Dr. Nash was famous both for his genius and his life story. Born in Bluefield, West Virginia, in 1928, Dr. John Nash was a child prodigy who graduated from the Carnegie Institute of Technology at age 19, with both a bachelor's and a master's degree in mathematics.

Dr. Nash subsequently received his doctorate in 1950 from Princeton University and published a groundbreaking theory of noncooperative games later that year, which is now known as the Nash equilibrium.

His monumental work in mathematics, game theory, economics, and evolutionary biology has influenced generations of experts in these fields.

In addition to his academic contributions, Dr. Nash gained worldwide acclaim from the 2001 film "A Beautiful Mind," which portrayed his vast accomplishments while living with schizophrenia and throughout his recovery from mental illness.

In recognition of his lifelong work, Dr. Nash was awarded a Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 1994, and the 2015 Abel Prize from the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters.

Tragically, he and his wife, Alicia, were killed in an automobile accident in 2015 on their return from receiving the award in Norway.

Finally, I want to end my remarks by congratulating Ms. Lyla Malloy, the student in my district whose essay submission to our post office naming competition was chosen out of 84 entries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 2302 in recognition of Dr. Nash's important contributions to our country, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2302.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONUSES FOR COST-CUTTERS ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 378) to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 378

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 4511 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "Definition" and inserting "Definitions"; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and";

(B) by striking "this subchapter, the term" and inserting the following: "this subchapter—

"(1) the term"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: "(2) the term 'wasteful expenses' means amounts made available for salaries and expenses accounts, operations and maintenance accounts, or other equivalent accounts—

"(A) that are identified by an employee of the agency under section 4512(a) as wasteful; and

"(B) that the Chief Financial Officer of the agency determines are not required for the purpose for which the amounts were made available.".

(b) *AUTHORITY.*—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “The head of an agency may pay a cash award to any employee of such agency whose identification of wasteful expenses to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency has resulted in cost savings for the agency.” after the first sentence;

(B) in paragraph (1) by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$20,000”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “Chief Financial Officer,” after “Inspector General.”;

(ii) by striking “employee designated under subsection (b)” and inserting “designated employee”; and

(iii) by inserting “or identification” after “disclosure”; and

(D) in the matter following paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “, Chief Financial Officer,” after “Inspector General”; and

(ii) by inserting “or identification” after “disclosure”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “awards permitted under this section” and inserting “awards for the disclosure of fraud, waste, or mismanagement under this section”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of the agency determines that potential wasteful expenses identified by an employee meet the requirements of section 4511(a)(2)(B), the head of the agency shall notify the President for purposes of proposing the expenses for rescission under title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.).

“(2) In the case of an agency for which there is no Chief Financial Officer, the head of the agency shall designate an agency employee who shall have the authority to make the determinations for identification of wasteful expenses under this section.

“(d) The head of each agency shall make available, along with, and in the same manner and form as, the provision of information required under section 1116 of title 31, information on disclosures of wasteful expenses under this section, including—

“(1) a description of each disclosure of possible wasteful expenses identified by an employee and determined by the agency to have merit; and

“(2) the number and amount of cash awards provided by the agency under subsection (a).

“(e) An individual may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the individual is—

“(1) an officer or employee of the Office of the Inspector General of an agency; or

“(2) ineligible for a cash award under section 4509.

“(f) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

“(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

“(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

“(g) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017, and every 3 years thereafter for 6 years, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.”.

(c) *TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4511 and inserting the following:

“4511. Definitions and general provisions.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gen-

tlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 378, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017.

The people in the best position to identify waste throughout the Federal Government are the employees on the front lines at the Federal agencies. They are the ones on the ground who know when agencies waste money. It is in the taxpayers' best interest to encourage Federal employees to report waste when they see it.

H.R. 378 increases the incentive for Federal employees to report wasteful spending by authorizing a reward of up to \$20,000 for blowing the whistle on waste. This incentive is especially necessary at the end of the fiscal year when too many agencies adopt a “use it or lose it” mentality regarding their budgets.

Some agencies fear that if they do not spend every last dollar in their budget, that Congress will somehow decrease their future funding. That dynamic leads to the most outrageous expenditures in the last week before the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

Under the structure put in place by H.R. 378, agency leadership will also be able to verify that spending identified by whistleblowers is actually wasteful. This was a concern raised by our colleagues in the minority. We are thankful for their constructive work in getting this bill to a mutually agreeable compromise.

The bill also maintains Congress' constitutional role in the appropriations process. As we know, Congress is responsible for authorizing spending by the Federal Government, and this bill is careful to respect that authority.

After the agency's chief financial officer affirms that the spending in question is indeed wasteful, the agency must submit a report to the President. The President may then submit a recommendation to Congress to eliminate the wasteful spending in question.

H.R. 378 is the result of a bipartisan process, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill as an example of what we can achieve when both sides put their minds to reform and husband the taxpayers' dollars.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 378, the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act, as reported by the committee. This legislation enhances the existing award program for Federal employees whose identification of waste, fraud, and abuse results in cost savings to an agency.

Every day, Federal employees across the country provide vital services to the American people. They ensure that our veterans receive the benefits to which they are entitled. They work to keep our air safe to breathe and our water safe to drink. They spend long hours and put their lives at risk to safeguard our national and homeland security. And Federal employees are on the front lines in ensuring that these important missions are carried out as effectively and efficiently as possible.

I think we can all agree that no one benefits when taxpayer dollars are wasted. This bill aims to increase government efficiency and save taxpayer dollars by providing incentives to Federal employees to identify wasteful spending. The legislation allows an agency head to award an employee a bonus for the identification of wasteful expenses that result in agency cost savings.

The bill also doubles the amount that an inspector general may award an employee for disclosures of waste, fraud, and abuse that result in cost savings from \$10,000 to \$20,000.

In addition, the bill contains several accountability measures so that Congress and the American people can determine whether the legislation is working as intended. First, agencies must include information on disclosures of wasteful spending and awards distributed under this legislation in their annual, publicly available, performance report.

The bill also includes a requirement that the director of the Office of Management and Budget submit a report to Congress each year certifying that each agency's cash award program complies with the bill.

In addition, the bill requires a GAO report on the operation of awards program within 3 years, including any recommendations for legislative changes. Democratic members of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee raised concerns about prior versions of this bill, and I want to thank Chairman GOWDY for working with us to address those concerns. The bill we have before us today reflects bipartisan concerns.

We must support Federal employees who identify ways to increase efficiency and reduce waste. I believe this bill does that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Bonuses

for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017. I wish to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, what we see today in my bill is what I think the American people want, Republicans and Democrats working together with good, commonsense legislation that makes sense and saves the American taxpayer's money.

Let's face it: whether we are a family or a business, we have to manage our money in the private sector; and the Federal Government, for far too long, has been guilty of spending waste, fraud, and abuse. There have been so many problems, and the American people know it.

When we go home and we talk with our constituents, they want us to be very good stewards of their money, and they deserve that. That is exactly what this bill does, and it does it in a way that does a lot of different things that I think is great.

First of all, as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have said, it incentivizes Federal employees to detect waste. We all know that government has a tendency, when they have a pool of money, to spend it, whether they need it or not. So if a Federal employee can go in there, find this problem out, tell the agency head, he or she now can get up to \$20,000 of incentive pay. So we have incentivized fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government. That is great, and that is just good government.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we look at the United States Constitution, and that is a document that our Founding Fathers gave us and is so important. Why is that so important with this bill? Because when that agency head goes to the President of the United States with this recommendation, the President of the United States has to come where? Back to the Congress, where he should have to come.

When Congress looks at that recommendation from the President, Congress then can make the final determination. So we have fiscal responsibility, we have constitutional sanctity, and we have good government.

Most of all, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We have Republicans and Democrats working together, the way the American people want us to do, to be fiscally responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this good government bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 378, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECIPIENTS OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2196) to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2196

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

SECTION 1. RECIPIENTS OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES.

Section 2302(b)(8)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "or to the Inspector" and all that follows through "such disclosures" and inserting "the Inspector General of an agency, a supervisor in the employee's direct chain of command and up to and including the head of the employing agency, or to an employee designated by any of the aforementioned individuals for the purpose of receiving such disclosures".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2196, a bill I introduced with Ranking Member CUMMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. FARENTHOLD from Texas earlier this year to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients.

Whistleblowers in the Federal Government should be able to tell their supervisors when something is wrong. That is true no matter what, but especially so in cases involving classified information, which implies a matter of national security.

If whistleblowers cannot make a protected disclosure to their supervisors, they are more likely to make an illegal disclosure to people or entities without the proper security clearances.

Under current law, whistleblowers in the intelligence community can make protected disclosures to their supervisors. However, whistleblowers dealing with classified information outside

the intelligence community do not have that same protection.

Federal employees inside the intelligence community can blow the whistle to their supervisors, to the appropriate inspector general, and to Congress. Employees outside the intelligence community do not have those protections when it comes to classified information, and they have fewer options when it comes to blowing the whistle, except to put it in the hands of those who have no clearances.

Federal employees outside the intelligence community must be reassured that they can report wrongdoing to the appropriate people, including their supervisors. With this protection, whistleblowers will be less likely to disclose potentially sensitive information on waste, fraud, and abuse to the media, or other entities or individuals without the proper security clearance.

This bill allows whistleblowers to make protected disclosures of classified information to individuals within their chain of command. There are very few conceivable circumstances in which a whistleblower complaint to a supervisor would jeopardize national security, but such disclosures are not currently protected, as strange as that may seem.

There is no reasonable basis for concern about giving whistleblowers throughout the Federal Government the right to contact those individuals about waste, fraud, or abuse of a classified nature. These additional protections will make it easier for these employees to do the responsible thing when it comes to classified disclosures.

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

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

I want to thank Representative STEVE RUSSELL for introducing this bill, along with Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member ELLIJAH CUMMINGS, and Representative STEPHEN LYNCH.

This bill would provide important protections to whistleblowers who handle classified information and want to report waste, fraud, and abuse.

Under this bill, an employee who is covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act could disclose to any supervisor in his or her direct chain of command classified information the employee reasonably believes shows wrongdoing.

Under current law, if a whistleblower discloses classified information, the whistleblower is protected only if he or she makes those disclosures to the Office of Special Counsel, an inspector general, the head of the whistleblower's agency, or an employee designated by the head of the agency.

This bill would encourage employees who handle classified information to use proper channels to blow the whistle on waste, fraud, and abuse. Allowing employees to go to a supervisor with evidence of wrongdoing may be less intimidating than going to the agency head or an inspector general.

This bill is modeled on language in the Presidential Policy Directive issued in 2012. That directive, PPD 19, provided whistleblower protections to intelligence community employees who are not covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act.

□ 1530

This bill will provide a more consistent approach for employees who handle classified information by ensuring that employees who are covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act will blow that whistle to a supervisor, the same way that intelligence community employees who are covered by PPD 19 can do so.

This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS, Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas, and Mr. LYNCH of Massachusetts for their great bipartisan support in this needed reform, and I urge my colleagues to support my bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2196, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALL CIRCUIT REVIEW ACT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2229) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2229

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “All Circuit Review Act”.

SEC. 2. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD DECISIONS RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7703(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “During the 5-year period beginning on the effective date of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012, a petition” and inserting “A petition”.

(b) DIRECTOR REVIEW.—Section 7703(d)(2) of such title is amended by striking “During the 5-year period beginning on the effective date of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012, this paragraph” and inserting “This paragraph”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2229, the All Circuit Review Act, which Ranking Member CUMMINGS of Maryland and Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas introduced earlier this year. It is critical that we guarantee whistleblowers have access to fair and efficient reviews of their claims of retaliation.

Between 1982 and 2012, whistleblowers could only appeal retaliation rulings made against them by the Merit Systems Protection Board, or the MSPB, to the Federal circuit. That monopoly led to the Federal circuit shaping key interpretations of whistleblower protection law without a check by any of the other circuit courts.

In 2012, to the wide acclaim of the whistleblower community, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act ended the Federal circuit court’s monopoly over whistleblower retaliation appeals. The result, as expected, was better case law and more expeditious appeals.

As a pilot program, that expansion was set to expire 3 years after enactment. In 2014, Congress acted to extend the program until November of this year. Now, this highly effective program will expire next month unless it is renewed. The whistleblower community has benefited tremendously from the pilot program. There is no good argument against making this permanent.

Critics had feared that expanding jurisdiction over the MSPB appeals would lead to a torrent of cases for those circuits, swamping dockets across the Nation. Those fears have proved to be unfounded. Instead, the whistleblower community has benefited from other circuits having an opportunity to interpret Federal whistleblower case law.

H.R. 2229 makes the all circuit expansion permanent, ensuring the benefits of the pilot program continue. This bipartisan initiative will put the question of appeal jurisdiction for whistleblower retaliation cases to rest once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2017.
Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: I write with respect to H.R. 2229, the “All Circuit Review Act.” As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 2229 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 2229 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2229 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 2229.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2229, the All Circuit Review Act. As you noted, certain provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I appreciate your willingness to forego action on the bill in the interest of expediting this legislation for floor consideration. I agree that foregoing consideration of the bill in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or any similar legislation.

I will include a copy of our letter exchange on H.R. 2229 in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the All Circuit Review Act.

This week the House is considering several bills to strengthen protections for whistleblowers. This is a bipartisan bill introduced by Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Representative BLAKE FARENTHOLD.

This bill would help level the playing field for whistleblowers by making permanent a pilot program that allows

Federal whistleblowers to file appeals in courts where they work or live rather than in the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Federal circuit has a terrible track record on whistleblower cases. Allowing other courts around the country to hear whistleblower cases will provide a check on the monopoly the Federal circuit has held for many years.

The bill would also authorize the Office of Personnel Management to appeal a decision of the Merit Systems Protection Board to any appeals court with jurisdiction.

This bill was listed on the Project On Government Oversight's list of legislative reforms Congress should enact in 2017. Protecting whistleblowers is not a partisan issue. It is a patriotic issue. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), ranking member of the full Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I introduced the All Circuit Review Act, Mr. Speaker, to send a clear message to all Federal employees who blow the whistle on wrongdoing that we here in Congress have their backs.

This bill would give Federal employees who face retaliation for blowing the whistle a more equitable playing field when they challenge that retaliation in court. Under the bill, whistleblowers could file appeals in the jurisdictions where they work or live, rather than having to file appeals in the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. Whistleblowers who live outside of Washington, D.C., should have the same opportunities as those who live in Washington.

I want to thank Representative BLAKE FARENTHOLD for cosponsoring this bill with me. Representative FARENTHOLD has been a steadfast supporter of this basic due process right for Federal employees.

The bill we are considering today makes permanent a pilot provision that was included in the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act, which was signed into law in 2012. That pilot provision will expire in November if we do not send this bill to the President before then.

Without this bill, whistleblowers could appeal a decision of the Merit Systems Protection Board only to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The Federal circuit has historically been overly restrictive of whistleblower rights.

According to the Merit Systems Protection Board, 29 cases have been appealed to courts other than the Federal circuit since 2012. The Project On Gov-

ernment Oversight sent a letter to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on May 2, 2017, in strong support of this bill. Executive Director Danielle Brian wrote as follows: "The pilot program has been a success. It has not resulted in a flood of whistleblower appeals as opponents of the program asserted it would do, and it allows for potential circuit splits, which encourage sister circuits to review the laws and allows for possible Supreme Court review. It is working exactly as intended and should be made permanent before it expires in November 2017."

The bill was approved by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee without opposition in May. Two years ago, Congress approved an extension of the All Circuit Review Extension Act pilot program in 2014 without a single negative vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the whistleblower bill.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Chairman GOWDY for his support of this legislation, and for the hard work of Ranking Member CUMMINGS of Maryland and Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas for all that they have done to bring this needed bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2229.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2989) to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2989

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Born into slavery on the Eastern Shore of Maryland in 1818 and given the name Frederick Augustus Washington Bailey after his mother Harriet Bailey, Frederick Douglass has been called the father of the civil rights movement.

(2) Douglass rose through determination, brilliance, and eloquence to shape the Amer-

ican Nation. He was an abolitionist, human rights and women's rights activist, orator, author, journalist, publisher, and social reformer.

(3) Taught basic reading skills by his mistress until she was forced to stop, Douglass continued to teach himself to read and write and taught other slaves to read despite risks including death.

(4) During the course of his remarkable life Frederick Douglass escaped from slavery, became internationally renowned for his eloquence in the cause of liberty, and went on to serve the national government in several official capacities.

(5) Forced to leave the country to avoid arrest as an escaped slave, he returned to become a staunch advocate of the Union cause and helped recruit African-American troops for the Union Army, including two of his sons, Charles and Lewis Douglass. His personal relationship with Abraham Lincoln helped persuade the President to make emancipation a cause of the Civil War.

(6) With the abolition of slavery at the close of the Civil War, Douglass then turned his attention to the full integration of African-Americans into the political and economic life of the United States. Committed to freedom, Douglass dedicated his life to achieving justice for all Americans, in particular African-Americans, women, and minority groups. He envisioned America as an inclusive Nation strengthened by diversity and free of discrimination.

(7) Douglass served as an advisor to Presidents. Abraham Lincoln referred to him as the most meritorious man of the nineteenth century. Douglass was appointed to several offices. He served as the United States Marshal of the District of Columbia under Rutherford B. Hayes' administration; President James Garfield appointed Douglass the District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds. In 1889, President Benjamin Harrison appointed Frederick Douglass to be the United States minister to Haiti. He was also appointed by President Grant to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Commission of Inquiry to Santo Domingo.

(8) Douglass lived in the District of Columbia for 23 of his 57 years as a free man, and in recognition of his leadership and continuous fight for justice and freedom, his home, Cedar Hill, was established as a National Historic Site in Anacostia, in Southeast Washington, DC.

(9) The statue of Frederick Douglass in the United States Capitol is a gift from the almost 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

(10) All Americans could benefit from studying the life of Frederick Douglass, for Douglass dedicated his own life to ensuring freedom and equality for future generations of Americans. This Nation should ensure that his tireless struggle, transformative words, and inclusive vision of humanity continue to inspire and sustain us.

(11) The year 2018 marks the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Frederick Douglass, and a commission should be established to plan, develop, and carry out, and to recommend to Congress, programs and activities that are fitting and proper to celebrate that anniversary in a manner that appropriately honors Frederick Douglass.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission (referred to in this Act as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. DUTIES.

The Commission shall have the following duties:

(1) To plan, develop, and carry out programs and activities that are fitting and

proper to honor Frederick Douglass on the occasion of the bicentennial anniversary of Douglass' birth.

(2) To recommend to Congress programs and activities that the Commission considers fitting and proper to honor Frederick Douglass on such occasion, and the entity or entities in the Federal Government that the Commission considers most appropriate to carry out such programs and activities.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 16 members appointed as follows:

(1) Two members, each of whom shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President.

(2) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Maryland.

(3) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Massachusetts.

(4) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of New York.

(5) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) Three members, at least one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(7) Three members, at least one of whom shall be a Senator, appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

(8) Two members, at least one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives, appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(9) Two members, at least one of whom shall be a Senator, appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) QUALIFIED CITIZEN.—A qualified citizen described in this subsection is a private citizen of the United States with—

(1) a demonstrated dedication to educating others about the importance of historical figures and events; and

(2) substantial knowledge and appreciation of Frederick Douglass.

(c) TIME OF APPOINTMENT.—Each initial appointment of a member of the Commission shall be made before the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP.—If a member of the Commission was appointed to the Commission as a Member of Congress, and ceases to be a Member of Congress, that member may continue to serve on the Commission for not longer than the 30-day period beginning on the date that member ceases to be a Member of Congress.

(e) TERMS.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(f) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the powers of the Commission but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(g) BASIC PAY.—Members shall serve on the Commission without pay.

(h) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(i) QUORUM.—Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(j) CHAIR.—The Commission shall select a Chair from among the members of the Commission.

(k) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair. Periodically, the Commission shall hold a meeting in Rochester, New York.

SEC. 6. DIRECTOR AND STAFF.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of a Director and such additional personnel as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—

(1) DIRECTOR.—The Director of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(2) STAFF.—The staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

SEC. 7. POWERS.

(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(b) POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action that the Commission is authorized to take by this Act.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable the Commission to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(d) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(f) GIFTS.—The Commission may solicit, accept, use, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or devises of money or other property for the purpose of carrying out its duties.

(g) VOLUNTEER AND UNCOMPENSATED SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Commission may accept and use voluntary and uncompensated services as the Commission determines necessary.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than August 1, 2018, the Commission shall submit to Congress an initial report containing its recommendations under section 4(2).

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2019, the Commission shall submit a final report to Congress, and shall include in the final report—

(1) a summary of its activities and programs;

(2) a final accounting of the funds the Commission received and expended; and

(3) any other information that the Commission considers to be appropriate.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting the final report pursuant to section 8(b).

SEC. 10. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No Federal funds are authorized or may be obligated to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2989, the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission Act, introduced by Ms. NORTON of the District of Columbia and Mr. HARRIS earlier this year.

Next year will mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Douglass, a man who has been called the father—and rightfully so—of the civil rights movement.

Douglass was born into slavery in Maryland around 1817 but escaped by the age of 21. Douglass went on to publish an autobiography documenting his life as a slave, called, "Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass," while a fugitive slave.

Throughout his remarkable life, Douglass advocated for justice for all Americans, encouraging President Lincoln to make emancipation a cause of the Civil War, and advocating for the full integration of African Americans into political and economic life in the United States both during and following the war.

H.R. 2989 establishes the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission to recommend the best ways to celebrate the legacy of a man who dedicated his entire life to ensuring freedom and equality for all Americans.

H.R. 2989 would do this by creating a 16-member commission to plan, develop, and coordinate activities fitting and proper to honor Mr. Douglass. The commission will submit two reports to Congress with recommendations for activities, programs, and other important information. The commission will end 30 days after the submission of its final report.

The amended text considered today adds a new section clarifying that the commission will not receive additional authorized funds and will, instead, rely on private funds for its operations.

The commission presents an important opportunity to recognize and support Frederick Douglass' leadership and body of work. He was a phenomenal man, and I am proud to also be a cosponsor of this important bill.

I would like to thank Ms. NORTON, Mr. HARRIS, and the 16 other cosponsors for their hard work on this bill in honor of Frederick Douglass.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the lead sponsor of this bill, Representative ANDY HARRIS, for working closely with me on the bill of which I am a cosponsor, and I want to thank my good friend Representative RUSSELL, who is managing on the other side, for also being a cosponsor of this bill.

My thanks also to Chairman TREY GOWDY, Ranking Member ELLIJAH CUMMINGS, and Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for bringing this bill to the floor in time to begin the commemoration, in 2018, of the bicentennial of the birth of Frederick Douglass.

I am pleased that this bill has not only bipartisan, but bicameral support. Senators CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and BEN CARDIN have introduced the companion bill in the Senate.

□ 1545

The bill would establish a commission to plan and carry out programs and activities, as well as to recommend to Congress programs and activities that the Federal Government could undertake to honor and celebrate the life of Frederick Douglass during the bicentennial of his birth in 2018.

Frederick Douglass was born into slavery in 1818 on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He learned basic reading skills from his mistress and continued to teach himself and other slaves to read and write despite the risks he faced, including death. After two attempts, Douglass successfully escaped to New York and went on to become this country's leading abolitionist and antislavery lecturer.

He served in several administrations, including as close adviser to President Abraham Lincoln, U.S. Marshal of the District of Columbia under President Rutherford B. Hayes, and District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds under President James Garfield. In 1889, President Benjamin Harris appointed Frederick Douglass to be the U.S. Minister to Haiti. He was later appointed by President Ulysses S. Grant to serve as secretary of the commission of Santo Domingo.

Douglass dedicated his life to achieving justice for all Americans. He lived in the District of Columbia for 23 of his 57 years as a free man, and his home at Cedar Hill is an official National Historic Site in southeast Washington, D.C. Every year, thousands of Americans and others visit Cedar Hill. The Frederick Douglass statue that stands in his honor in the United States Capitol is a gift from the nearly 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), who is the original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the committee for promptly reporting H.R. 2989 to the floor for consideration.

I rise today in support of a bill I have cosponsored with Delegate NORTON, the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission Act. As we approach the 200th anniversary of Frederick Douglass' birth, I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

The purpose of this bill is more than just honoring the birth of one great civil rights leader. Its purpose is to recognize his lasting impact on American Government, culture, and values. Frederick Douglass' work stretched far beyond the fight for legal freedom into the equally important fight for social and cultural equality.

Born on Maryland's beautiful Eastern Shore, Douglass escaped slavery to become an author, abolitionist, and true American hero. Frederick Douglass is a model for the values that make our Nation great: equality, liberty, and a commitment to working hard and helping others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to honor Frederick Douglass and the resounding impact his work has had on modern American culture by passing this legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo all of the comments that we heard. It is important that all of us take time and pause to recognize the tremendous work that Frederick Douglass did not only in his life, but how he impacted the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2989, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSP MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3031) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for flexibility in making withdrawals from a Thrift Savings Plan account, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3031

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "TSP Modernization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN ACCOUNT WITHDRAWAL FLEXIBILITY.

(a) POST-SEPARATION PARTIAL WITHDRAWALS.—Section 8433(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "and who has not made a withdrawal under subsection (h)(1)(A) may make one withdrawal" and inserting "may make one or more withdrawals"; and

(B) by striking "as a single payment" and inserting "in the same manner as a single payment is made"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) Withdrawals under this subsection shall be subject to such other limitations or conditions as the Executive Director may prescribe by regulation."

(b) LIMITATION ON RETURN OF PAYMENT RELATING TO A CHANGE IN ELECTION.—Section 8433(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "except that in the case of an election to receive an annuity, a former employee or Member may not change an election under this section on or after the date on which an annuity contract is purchased to provide for the annuity elected by the former employee or Member" after "this subchapter"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "change an" and inserting return a payment that was made pursuant to an"; and

(B) by striking "on or after" and all that follows through "the former employee or Member".

(c) ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC ANNUITY IN ABSENCE OF ELECTION.—Section 8433(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "(1) Notwithstanding" and inserting "Notwithstanding";

(2) by striking "this paragraph" and inserting "this subsection"; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

(d) ALLOWANCE OF MULTIPLE AGE-BASED IN-SERVICE WITHDRAWALS.—Section 8433(h) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by inserting "limitations or" before "conditions".

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 8432b(h)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 8433(d), or paragraph (1) or (2) of section 8433(h)" and inserting "subsection (d) or (f) of section 8433".

(f) REGULATIONS.—As soon as is practicable, as determined by the Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, but not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Executive Director shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date on which the regulations prescribed under subsection (f) take effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3031, the TSP Modernization Act of 2017, introduced by Ranking Member CUMMINGS from Maryland and Mr. MEADOWS from North Carolina earlier this year.

Federal employees enrolled in the Federal Employees Retirement System—known as FERS—enjoy the benefits of a three-part retirement structure. Those are a defined benefit pension plan, Social Security, and a 401(k)-style defined contribution plan known as the Thrift Savings Plan, or TSP.

With its low administrative costs and simple design, the TSP is an ideal retirement vehicle. Participants can choose from a variety of investment options, including index funds designed to track the Standard & Poor's 500 Index, the Dow Jones U.S. Completion Total Stock Market Index, or a low-risk government securities investment fund.

Participants can also passively manage their investments by putting money into a Lifecycle Fund, which allows the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board to purchase a combination of investments based on the year the employee is expected to retire.

Employees have a lot of options when investing their TSP funds, but when it comes to withdrawing their funds, the options are much more limited. This is because current statutory rules preclude employees from taking multiple post-service partial withdrawals. Employees cannot request a partial withdrawal or annuity purchase after making a periodic payment withdrawal election.

Statutory rules also require the purchase of an annuity if a participant fails to make an election by age 70½. The rules also restrict an employee's ability to make multiple in-service, age-based withdrawals.

The Board conducted a study in 2013, which found that separated participants moved \$9 billion from the TSP fund to other, costlier institutions. Nearly one out of every three of these participants cited a desire for additional withdrawal flexibility.

The study also found that, among currently employed participants, the same ratio of participants requested additional withdrawal flexibility for age-based withdrawals to address life events that arise. This bill would afford those additional flexibilities to address those concerns.

The bill provides more control to Federal employees over their own retirement by allowing for multiple post-separation partial withdrawals and in-service, age-based withdrawals. H.R.

3031 allows employees to change withdrawal elections as they grow older, and it allows the Board to avoid purchasing expensive annuities if a participant fails to make an election by age 70½.

This bill puts power and control in the hands of the employees that make our Federal Government run to make retirement decisions based on their personal situations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3031, the TSP Modernization Act of 2017.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which would help modernize the Federal Government's Thrift Savings Plan by aligning it with current practices for private sector 401(k)s.

I thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Chairman MEADOWS for their work on this important, bipartisan bill that would give TSP participants more flexibility in making withdrawals from their accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3031, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3031, the TSP Modernization Act of 2017.

I thank the Government Operations Subcommittee chairman, Mr. MEADOWS, for working with me in a bipartisan manner on this commonsense, good government bill. I also thank the Oversight and Government Reform Committee chairman, Mr. GOWDY, for his support of this legislation.

Congressman MEADOWS and I introduced this legislation to make the Federal Government's Thrift Savings Plan more closely align with private sector best practices by allowing TSP participants more flexible withdrawal options.

In 2013, the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board found that employees who separated from Federal service transferred \$9 billion out of their TSP accounts to other financial institutions. TSP participants do this because private sector 401(k) plans provide more flexibility, and they wanted more options for withdrawing money in case they needed it.

A 2014 survey of TSP participants who withdrew funds showed that more than 50 percent reported that they wanted more flexibility to withdraw funds to address life events.

Current law limits participants to only one withdrawal from their TSP

accounts while in Federal service after reaching age 59½, and participants who make this type of age-based withdrawal cannot take another partial withdrawal once they separate from service. Similarly, participants who are separated from Federal service and who have not made a prior age-based withdrawal are restricted to making only one partial separation withdrawal.

H.R. 3031 would eliminate these restrictions and allow participants to make multiple age-based and post-separation withdrawals from TSP accounts. The bill also would allow participants to elect to combine partial withdrawals with an annuity. It also would eliminate automatic annuities as a default option in the absence of an election by participants.

By providing greater withdrawal flexibility, studies show that participants would be more likely to keep their assets in their TSP accounts. For example, a study issued by Vanguard in 2013 found that 50 percent more participants and assets remain in retirement plans when partial disbursements are allowed.

Providing more withdrawal options for Federal employees and retirees in the TSP may help their financial security since administrative fees for the TSP are much lower than fees charged by other financial institutions.

This legislation is supported by the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, the American Federation of Government Employees, and the National Treasury Employees Union.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Chairman GOWDY, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and Chairman MEADOWS for their outstanding work in addressing the needs of Federal employees who give selfless public service to our Nation and should have this flexibility in their retirement planning.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3031, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

FITARA ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3243) to amend title 40, United

States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3243

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF SUNSET RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY AND RISK MANAGEMENT OF MAJOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.

Subsection (c) of section 11302 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking the first paragraph (5).

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF SUNSET RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PORTFOLIO, PROGRAM, AND RESOURCE REVIEWS.

Section 11319 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF SUNSET RELATING TO FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INITIATIVE.

Subsection (e) of section 834 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 44 U.S.C. 3601 note) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2020”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 3243, the FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017, introduced by Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ISSA, Ms. KELLY from Illinois, and Mr. MEADOWS earlier this year.

Today, the Federal Government spends more than \$90 billion on Federal IT, with approximately 75 percent of this money spent on archaic and legacy IT. This means we are paying more for less: less capability and less security. Meanwhile, major Federal IT investments often result in multimillion-dollar cost overruns and delays.

This state of affairs led the Government Accountability Office to designate Federal IT acquisition and management as high risk in 2015, meaning

this area is at high risk of waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement.

In 2014, Congress passed the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, otherwise known as FITARA, to address some of these IT challenges.

Congress has maintained a watchful eye to ensure agencies fully implement the requirements of FITARA and use it as a vital oversight tool. In fact, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has held five hearings on FITARA implementation.

The committee also created a FITARA scorecard to hold Federal agencies accountable for meeting FITARA requirements, some of which sunset in the near term.

This bill will help us facilitate Congress’ oversight efforts by extending key FITARA requirements to improve Federal IT.

For example, this bill extends requirements for agencies to publicly report schedule and cost information and to assess the risks of major IT investments. This bill also extends requirements for each agency to regularly assess its IT portfolio, look for opportunities to reduce duplication, and find savings.

Finally, the bill will help us continue to hold agencies accountable for consolidating and optimizing their data centers by extending these requirements—and GAO’s verification of these requirements—through 2020.

The GAO, which has been instrumental in assisting Congress oversee FITARA implementation, supports extending the FITARA sunset dates.

Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia and Mr. ISSA from California have been the key leaders on the original FITARA law, and they have come together again to sponsor this bill, along with Representatives MEADOWS and KELLY.

The FITARA Enhancement Act is truly a bipartisan effort in making sure Federal agencies get their information technology management and acquisition houses in order.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, DARRELL ISSA, the cosponsor of this bill and the cosponsor of the original FITARA; and my good friend from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for his able management today.

The Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, or FITARA, was enacted 3 years ago. It represented the first major reform of the laws governing the procurement and management of Federal IT since the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996.

FITARA is the framework for IT procurement and ensures the Federal Government is making smart and effective investments to modernize its IT, which is badly needed.

It has seven pillars:

First, it enhances CIO authorities, responsibilities, and accountability.

Second, it enhances transparency and improves risk management by requiring detailed information on investments to be published on the IT dashboard.

Third, we increased the frequency of portfolio reviews from annual to quarterly and included key decisionmakers from the agency and OMB to not only look for ways to increase efficiency, but to eliminate duplication.

Fourth, we built on the Federal data center consolidation effort to push agencies to realize big savings from this low-hanging fruit.

Fifth, people. Recognizing that Federal IT success is only as good as the people behind it, FITARA calls for expanding the training and use of IT professionals.

Sixth, FITARA seeks to maximize new tools like the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative, taking a page from the private sector to reduce duplicative spending on common purchases and off-the-shelf items.

Finally, FITARA advances a government software purchasing program to allow for purchasing licensing agreements that can be made available for use by all Federal agencies.

FITARA is a rubric for IT procurement that, hopefully, someday enables initiatives like the Modernizing Government Technology Act to build on our success of improving how the government acquires and modernizes IT.

When the stakeholders met on Federal IT from government agencies and industry, both Mr. ISSA and I constantly were reminded of why previous major IT reform efforts had fallen short of their potential: the lack of robust implementation plan and congressional oversight.

As Mr. RUSSELL indicated quite clearly, in that latter regard, we have robust oversight, and it will continue.

One of the things we had in FITARA were some sunset provisions, in the hope and expectation that, by having that, we would encourage cooperation and implementation. That cooperation and implementation is uneven throughout the Federal Government.

The GAO, or Government Accountability Office, recommended that we have this bill to extend those sunset provisions to buy a little bit more time to get with the program for those Federal agencies.

So that is what this bill does, but it builds on FITARA, which is the framework for IT procurement and modernization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), an original cosponsor of this bill and also the former chairman of the Government and Oversight Reform Committee.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, no one has ever had a better partner on a piece of

legislation than I have had. The best way I can describe Mr. CONNOLLY is, like anyone else who came to a realization of something, he came to it with a great deal of zeal. This partnership, which began before the passage in 2014, to modernize a 1996 initiative that had fallen short, has been his passion and mine.

Normally, when you are chairman, people talk about what divides the committee. But nothing united us more than recognizing that over \$80 billion was being spent—and much of it needlessly. We don't achieve what we want to because there is never enough. Part of it is how we procure.

Prior to the passage of this legislation, it certainly was possible to have major pieces of procurement have somebody in charge who could not, in fact, change or drop the expenditure and who could not simply say: This isn't working. On top of that, often the people who did have the authority lacked the expertise. This has been true in all sorts of areas. There is much more work to be done.

Unlike Clinger-Cohen, which went on for 18 years before being updated, we were just 3 years past the implementation of this bill. With Congressman CONNOLLY's effort, we are coming back and making real changes—ones that can continue the process and speed it up.

Obviously, there are some areas like the IT dashboard and others that simply need to be continued to be renewed. This bill does it.

When I first talked to Mr. CONNOLLY, he was the best known for absolutely wanting to consolidate processing centers; consolidate these server farms that had proliferated. The number he had at the time turned out to be, although exorbitant, less than a quarter of the number we found. So there is more work to be done.

Procurement has to be done smart and is often consolidated. With the help of my colleague and Senator WARNER, the passage of the DATA Act allowed us to find, with greater detail, redundancy of expenditure.

So as we reauthorize FITARA, we also have the information to consolidate purchasing across vast numbers of agencies, eliminate redundancy, and, in fact, buy better. More needs to be done.

As Mr. CONNOLLY said so accurately, more money is spent on legacy systems than is spent on new systems that will actually save money and provide better services both to government workers and to the public.

So as we reauthorize the bill, I look forward to the oversight that the Oversight Committee has done and is able to do, and I look forward to continuing to work with my partner from Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 3243, the FITARA Enhancement Act.

FITARA is bipartisan legislation that has made significant strides in reforming government IT and making agencies more accountable. I thank Representative CONNOLLY for all his hard work on this bill, as well as my good friend who has just spoken, Mr. RUSSELL.

This bill would extend three provisions of FITARA that are set to expire. These provisions include the provision on Federal data center consolidation; transparency and risk management of major IT systems; and agencies' IT portfolio, program, and resource reviews, also known as PortfolioStat.

These provisions provide transparency and accountability for agencies and should be continued. GAO reports that if we allow these provisions to expire, we will miss out on major savings. IT spending makes up roughly \$100 billion of government spending each year. We cannot afford to allow this legislation that will save funds and help modernize IT assets to simply expire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to strongly support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOWDY, Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia, and Mr. ISSA from California for this important and continued work that will not only improve IT and reduce duplication but will continue to save billions of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3243.

The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. 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 motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1629

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 452, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 3243, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SPECIALIST JEFFREY L. WHITE, JR. POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 452) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

YEAS—418

Abraham	Cartwright	Doyle, Michael
Adams	Castor (FL)	F.
Aderholt	Castro (TX)	Duffy
Aguilar	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Cheney	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Chu, Judy	Dunn
Amodei	Cicilline	Ellison
Arrington	Clark (MA)	Emmer
Babin	Clarke (NY)	Engel
Bacon	Clay	Eshoo
Banks (IN)	Cleaver	Espallat
Barr	Clyburn	Estes (KS)
Barragán	Coffman	Esty (CT)
Barton	Cohen	Evans
Bass	Cole	Farenthold
Beatty	Collins (GA)	Faso
Bera	Collins (NY)	Ferguson
Bergman	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Comstock	Fleischmann
Biggs	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Connolly	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Fox
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Franks (AZ)
Black	Correa	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Costa	Fudge
Blum	Costello (PA)	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gaetz
Blunt Rochester	Cramer	Gallagher
Bonamici	Crawford	Gallego
Bost	Crist	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Garrett
F.	Cuellar	Gianforte
Brady (PA)	Culberson	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Cummings	Gohmert
Brat	Davidson	Gomez
Brooks (AL)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Danny	Goodlatte
Brown (MD)	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Gottheimer
Buchanan	DeGette	Gowdy
Buck	Delaney	Graves (GA)
Bucshon	DeLauro	Graves (LA)
Budd	DeBene	Graves (MO)
Burgess	Demings	Green, Al
Bustos	Denham	Green, Gene
Butterfield	Dent	Griffith
Byrne	DeSantis	Grijalva
Calvert	DeSaulnier	Grothman
Capuano	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Carbajal	Deutch	Gutiérrez
Cárdenas	Diaz-Balart	Hanabusa
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Handel
Carter (GA)	Doggett	Harper
Carter (TX)	Donovan	Harris

Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast

Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford

Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta
Bridenstine
Curbelo (FL)
Flores
Granger

Huffman
Kelly (PA)
Lawrence
Long
Marino

Meehan
Olson
Perry
Smucker
Thompson (CA)

□ 1654

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FITARA ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3243) to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]
YEAS—418

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas

Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Culler
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis

DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frélinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gotthelmer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast

Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta
Bridenstine
Flores
Granger
Huffman

Kelly (PA)
Knight
Lawrence
Long
Marino

McCaul
Meehan
Perry
Smucker
Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1702

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 562, and "yea" on rollcall No. 563.

LIMITING TO A CERTAIN DATE APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 7 OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 81

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall apply to H. Con. Res. 81 not earlier than November 2, 2017, but on the same terms that would have adhered on October 13, 2017.

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

There was no objection.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT DUSTIN WRIGHT

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a Toombs County native. Twenty-nine-year-old Staff Sergeant Dustin Michael Wright was one of the three U.S. Army Green Beret soldiers killed in the line of duty last week.

The U.S. Africa Command says Dustin was part of a team assisting in advising local forces in southwest Niger at the time of the ambush.

A 2007 graduate from Toombs County High School, Dustin joined the Army soon after graduation, following in the footsteps of his parents and his brother. His family remembers him as a beloved jokester and was always making people laugh. He took great pride in serving the country, and I am so proud to see the Toombs County community coming together to paint the town red, white, and blue in honor of Dustin's life. Dustin was truly a hometown hero, and Toombs County will remember him often.

As Jesus said: "Greater love has no one than this, to lay down one's life for his friends."

Dustin sacrificed his life for his brothers and sisters in service to this great country. I will never forget our freedom fighter from Toombs County.

MaST COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL NAMED A 2017 BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize MaST Community Charter School, an incredible institution in my district that was just named a 2017 Blue Ribbon School of Excellence by the Department of Education.

MaST is a groundbreaking educational community that emphasizes collaborative, technology-driven, hands-on learning. They are preparing the next generation of American leaders and visionaries who will change the future in ways we can only imagine.

Blue Ribbon schools are characterized by the highest level of academic excellence and by their success in closing achievement gaps across student populations.

These elite institutions are a gold standard of instruction, inclusion, and innovation. MaST Community Charter School was one of only 342 schools across the country to earn this honor this year.

I want to congratulate the teachers, staff, administrators, parents, and students of the MaST Community Charter School on their remarkable and well-deserved achievement.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JESUS A. PERMUY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor my constituent, Jesus A. Permuy, for a lifetime of service to our south Florida community and to the cause of liberty in my native homeland of Cuba.

Like my family and me and so many others in my congressional district, Jesus was forced to flee Castro's brutal tyranny. Jesus embraced his new life here in the United States and became involved in numerous civic and community affairs while working to restore freedom and democracy in Cuba.

In 1976, Jesus secured accreditation for the Christian Democratic Movement of Cuba to speak before the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

For decades, Mr. Permuy has been involved in a number of human rights advocacy organizations denouncing the systemic repression brought upon the Cuban people by the evil Castro regime. Jesus founded the Center for Human Rights in Miami. He is a dedicated husband, a proud father of 8 children, and a grandfather of 11 grandchildren. Jesus is a shining example to us all.

Thank you, Jesus A. Permuy, for your service to our community and to my native Cuba.

REFUGES HAVE A TREMENDOUS IMPACT

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, each year, millions of Americans visit wildlife refuges throughout the country. They generate over \$2 billion in economic activity and create 35,000 jobs. This wouldn't be possible without help from dedicated and hardworking volunteers.

That is why we have introduced H.R. 3979, bipartisan legislation that reauthorizes the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer, Community Partnership, and Education Program. This program ensures public access to refuges for exploring, hunting, fishing, and studying wildlife.

Refuges have a tremendous impact, even in Brooklyn, where Fish and Wildlife Service staff and volunteers work with local public schools to cultivate the next generation of conservationists and wildlife enthusiasts through hands-on learning.

Carmen Wheeler, a second grade student in Brooklyn, recently wrote to me and said: "I think we should keep the wildlife refugees safe, even if they are far away, because they will always keep our world healthier."

We are with you, Carmen.

GIVING TO CHARITY IS CRUCIAL

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to announce the introduction of the Universal Charitable Giving Act. Many Americans believe that people, not the government, offer the best solutions to solve the ailments that face our society. Strong families, strong churches, and strong communities are the foundations of our Nation. By supporting charities, we can make our communities and our country a better place for Americans from all walks of life.

Giving to charity is crucial for economic prosperity, happiness, and the success of our people, but for too long only the most wealthy have been incentivized to give to the causes they believe in.

The Universal Charitable Giving Act incentivizes charitable giving for low- and middle-income taxpayers. It would allow everyone to deduct charitable giving, regardless of itemizing status.

With tax reform, our aim is to increase take-home pay for middle America. With my bill, our goal is to increase support for all charities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the great work of our faith-based and charitable organizations by supporting this bill.

NAFTA RENEGOTIATIONS BEGIN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week, the fourth round of NAFTA renegotiations will begin. President Trump will have an opportunity to deliver on his promise last year to get a better deal for American workers. I hope he does.

Our current trade deals are rigged in favor of the largest corporations in this country and against working people. In my home State of Rhode Island, we have lost 41,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the WTO took effect. That is more than half of the manufacturing jobs in my State. The folks who kept their jobs have seen their paychecks get smaller.

Rhode Islanders know, most importantly, that we need a trade deal that is fair; but they know that trade deals that we have now help powerful corporations, but they are killing American jobs, helping corporations outsource jobs at the expense of working people.

This week I am asking President Trump to demand a new NAFTA agreement that has strong labor and environmental protections, that end foreign tribunals that allow corporations to sue the U.S. Government and force taxpayers to pay the bill, that has better Buy American requirements, that has strict protections against currency manipulation, that has strong rules of origin on manufactured goods, and that has provisions that bring down the cost of prescription drugs.

These are commonsense provisions that will empower American working families, and they should be included in any new trade agreement.

HOPE FOR TRAFFICKED VICTIMS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for years, Lynda could not bring herself to speak about her past turmoil and nightmares.

Lynda is finally telling about her tortured life. When she was 16, two neighborhood boys drugged and sexually assaulted her. Highly drugged, the boys convinced her to have sex for money just once. But it wasn't for just one time, Mr. Speaker. They set up online advertisements to sell her and other girls.

When one of the other girls tried to escape, they tied her to a chair and beat her up mercilessly. They mixed drugs into the food to maintain control over the girls. It was years before Lynda finally escaped her turmoil.

Today, the rape and torture still haunts Lynda, but she works every day to become a survivor. I recently introduced the Abolish Human Trafficking Act that provides grants to ensure that

victims like Lynda get help and services, such as mental health counseling, legal aid, job training, things that they deserve from us. This will help trafficking victims put their broken lives back together.

Trafficking is a scourge, and we need to send a message to everyone that our kids are not for sale.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1715

WHITE HOUSE IMMIGRATION PRINCIPLES

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the cruel immigration proposal unveiled by the White House this week. This proposal goes beyond some of the worst immigration bills. It demands billions more for border security, tightens asylum standards, cuts off legal immigration, and implements a faulty points-based system, undercutting our core values as a country and destroying our economy and our future.

Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of all immigrants to the United States are women and children, and these policies will disproportionately hurt them. A points-based system eliminates family-based immigration, and it is insulting to the valuable contributions of women, especially.

Nearly 70 percent of all women immigrants with legal status obtained it through the family system, and many are stuck in visa backlogs waiting years and even decades to reunite with their families.

Mr. Speaker, immigration has never been just about immigration. It has always been about who we are as a country and what we are willing to stand up for. I believe the majority of my Republican colleagues want to pass the Dream Act, and I ask them to join us in rejecting these anti-immigrant poison pills and proposing real solutions that benefit the American people and unify our country.

RECOGNIZING JEREMY RICH, NEW YORK'S 2017 NATIONAL DISTINGUISHED PRINCIPAL

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeremy Rich, the principal at Barringer Road Elementary School in Ilion, a constituent of the 22nd Congressional District. For his stellar record of service, professionalism, and contributions to the educational process, Mr. Rich was named New York's 2017 National Distinguished Principal by the National Association of Elementary School Principals.

In 2013, Mr. Rich became the principal of Barringer Road Elementary. Since that day, he has arrived at school promptly at 6:30 a.m. each morning, bringing a positive attitude and inspirational words to each morning announcement.

Prior to his service at Barringer Road, Mr. Rich served as principal at the now-closed Remington Elementary School, where he was integral in facilitating the successful merger of the Mohawk and Ilion school districts.

During his time at Ilion Junior High School, he served as the principal, the dean of students, and an English teacher.

Mr. Rich's commitment to his role is unparalleled. Both teachers and parents alike describe Mr. Rich as comforting, helpful, and passionate. One teacher described him as a "superstar principal and a fantastic human being." Mr. Rich's record exemplifies his clear dedication to public education, his students, and our community.

Please join me today in congratulating this well-respected educator and beloved member of the 22nd District.

FOCUS ON THE PAIN THAT PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say what the world is coming to and how much our friends, our neighbors in America have had to go through: the most recent tragedy and massacre in Las Vegas, and now the horrendous, unspeakable tragedy by fires in California. I offer my sympathy to my friends, MIKE and JARED, Congresspersons in California, and we look forward to working with them, and offer our sympathy for those who are lost, those who are missing.

I think it is important, as we have these natural disasters, that we really attentively work on the pain that people are suffering; that is on the back side of Puerto Rico, where there is no power, and we don't know the assessment of loss of life, there is no housing; from Florida to the U.S. Virgin Islands, where people are still waiting for relief, and the attention is not at the peak that it should. Then, in my own community, we are in desperate need of housing. We have senior citizens, after Hurricane Harvey, being dismissed and out of their homes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are looking for a new disaster supplemental food program. We have the okay from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We have the State of Texas ready to work with us, but we must make sure that our local officials realize that this is a disaster and an emergency and that they move forward quickly to serve the people who are hungry and who are in need.

So, Harris County, you need to move faster to use the Federal funds that we now have.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF TOM PETTY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Gainesville's native son, Mr. Tom Petty.

Thomas Earl Petty was born on October 20, 1950, and, over a career that spanned five decades, collected 28 top 10 hits, the most of all time.

But his contribution cannot be measured in hits or awards. He wrote America's soundtrack. Tom Petty's story sounds familiar. He grew up in a small town, struggled, persisted, and then succeeded—a true American Dream story.

But it is not what he did; it is how he did it that strikes us. It is the honesty, wit, and sentimentality that made his music special. Every hit Tom Petty crafted became an anthem, each song a score to the memorable moments of our lives. American life would be much diminished without his work.

Jefferson and Madison wrote our system. Twain wrote our story that described Early American folklore. Petty wrote our songs. The songbook of America is bigger and brighter because of him.

Rest in peace as you continue "Runnin' Down a Dream."

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are here today because, almost 11 months ago, the American people voted to give Republicans control of unified government. They were tired of being crushed by rising healthcare costs due to ObamaCare. They wanted America's economy to prosper again. They wanted a secure border.

During the months that followed, Congress worked with President Trump to sign over 50 bills into law. On top of that, the House passed over 270 laws that now sit in the Senate awaiting action.

Despite this legislation, there is a unified voice that is loud and clear arriving daily from our base, saying, "Get something done." The reason for that call is because Americans continue to be crushed by government policies, something that is very evident. These are the same policies that drove them to vote for us in the first place.

Americans are scarred by the broken promises of the former administration. They could not keep their doctor, even

though they were told by the former President they could. Their premiums did not go down \$2,500, and their exchanges did not work.

ObamaCare resulted in fewer options and increased costs for many Americans. Out-of-pocket costs continue to soar, with overage deductibles for bronze plans topping \$6,000 in 2017.

Some States, like Arizona, faced premium increases of 116 percent; Oklahoma, 69 percent. Tennessee faced a 63 percent increase. And one-third of counties have only one insurer offering coverage on the exchange. Some entire States like Wyoming, right below me, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and Alaska only have one insurer.

Think about that. This trend is predicted to worsen, with half of American counties only having one insurer in 2018.

As we have come to almost 8 years with the ACA, or ObamaCare, we run a risk of thinking that it is normal. Our healthcare system was not perfect before. We are not making that case. But ObamaCare made what was already bad even worse.

We cannot think of these stats as mere numbers. Americans are really suffering under this law. Just because Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL gave up on repealing ObamaCare in the Senate does not mean Americans will give Congress and Republicans a pass. We cannot and we must not give up on this important promise.

The burden of ObamaCare is only made worse by the lackluster growth of the economy in recent years. During the Obama administration years, the economy failed to grow even once at the historic goal of 3 percent a year, something we just saw in our last quarter.

Americans are as industrious and innovative as ever. Americans' work ethic is not the problem. It is our antiquated tax system that has been bogged down over the years by regulators and lobbyists.

Since our last major rewrite of the Tax Code 31 years ago, the same year that "Top Gun" was number one in the box office, 1986, our Tax Code has added over 35,000 pages. Think about that—35,000 pages. That is about three changes per day. Each page is another carve-out or a loophole for the well connected, leaving the rest of the economy behind.

Our companies are at a disadvantage internationally, as our tax rate stands at 35 percent, the highest, as we know now, in the industrialized world.

Families continue to be punished with a marriage penalty.

Our Tax Code should be a competitive advantage for our companies competing with the world. It should encourage innovators to push the boundaries and find success.

The call to get something done that we hear loud and clear from Americans is also coupled with a call to make sure that we are doing our very best to secure the border. Perhaps there is no

more vocal call from the past year than to build that wall.

In 2016, the United States saw a surge in illegal border crossings, with 46,000 illegals apprehended in that October alone. This is both a fiscal and a security issue.

Border security is more than just the border, though. Visa overstays are responsible for up to 40 percent of illegal immigration. We need a solution, and we need an action to this problem if we are truly to secure the border.

To add to these problems, more than 100 sanctuary jurisdictions have enacted policies which restrict cooperation with ICE, allowing potentially dangerous illegal immigrant criminals to remain in our country.

I am confident that the American people will deliver their final grade on Republicans over the next 3 months simply based on the three issues, the three promises that I am speaking about today: number one, continuing to work and replace and repeal ObamaCare; number two, reforming the Tax Code; and, number three, securing the border. In short, repeal, reform, secure; repeal, reform, secure. We need to fulfill these promises in the next 3 months. The urgency and the time is now.

As I said before, the status quo on these policies is literally crushing Americans, and this is why they elected Republicans. In fact, since 1913, when Republicans expanded, or when the House expanded the 387 Members to 435, this is the only time in history when back-to-back Congresses, the Americans have elected 240 or more Republicans, and it is time we did our job. We need to keep our promises to the American people.

I am pleased to be joined by members of the Republican Study Committee today to talk about the importance of keeping these promises. That is why it is my privilege to introduce one of our newer members from Kansas, Representative RON ESTES.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, after a decade of inadequate economic growth across America, there is new growing optimism that our economy is about to be set free again. Consumer confidence in the economy is the highest it has been since 2000. Why? I believe this is because the American people expect us to reform our broken Tax Code, and they are excited about it.

Our outdated and overly complex Tax Code has held our economy down for the past decade. It is time we fix this and empower working families in America.

Real tax reform will be the best way to help America climb up the economic ladder. A stronger economy will bring higher wages and better jobs. The goal is to make our Federal Code simple and to make it fair.

□ 1730

The Tax Code, as it is, only benefits the rich and well-connected who can

hire an army of lawyers to protect their interests. This is why Republicans are looking to enact real reform for all Americans. The argument against tax reform is this: the plan is just a tax cut for the rich.

The reality is, this tax reform framework is focused on helping middle class families. The tax system is laid out by Republicans that allows low- and middle-income workers to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks in order to save for their children's college, for their retirement, or any other things that they want.

I implore my colleagues across the aisle to do what is right and help to fix our antiquated Tax Code.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ESTES. Perhaps no one knows more and has had more experience than the chairman of our Judiciary Committee, a former immigration attorney who has spent years working on resolving these issues.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman organizing this hour of Special Order remarks, and your leadership on these three important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the importance of bolstering enforcement of existing immigration law and securing the border. The interior enforcement and border security are vital to enhancing public safety, keeping the door open to law-abiding immigrants, protecting our borders, and restoring the rule of law.

Under President Obama, interior enforcement deteriorated dramatically as his administration refused to enforce immigration laws, rewrote the law through executive action, and implemented policies that enabled millions of unlawful and criminal aliens to remain in the United States free from any possibility of removal.

The Obama administration's policies had—and continue to have—disturbing consequences. The rule of law was undermined as hundreds of thousands of Central American unaccompanied minors and families arrived at the southwest border during the Obama years and were released into the U.S. Too many Americans were killed or seriously harmed at the hands of aliens who joined gangs or committed crimes.

Fortunately, the Trump administration has begun to reverse the Obama administration's disastrous policies and is enforcing the law as written by Congress. President Trump has issued executive orders to strengthen interior enforcement and implement strong border security measures. The Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security are already executing these executive orders, and there have been quick results.

Illegal border crossings at the Southwest border dropped dramatically at the beginning of the Trump administration due, in large part, to consistent

enforcement of the law and the strong message that the U.S. no longer tolerates illegal immigration.

However, illegal border crossings are rising again despite the best efforts of the Trump administration, demonstrating that the President should be granted additional, long-needed legislative tools. The House Judiciary Committee has been hard at work to improve our Nation's immigration laws and has already approved bills that are crucial to enable our country to gain control of our immigration system.

The Davis-Oliver Act is the keystone of our interior enforcement efforts and is named after Placer County Detective Michael Davis, Jr., and Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver, two California law enforcement officers who were murdered by an unlawful immigrant in October 2014.

The bill improves the enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws to enhance public safety. Specifically, the Davis-Oliver Act provides tools to crack down on dangerous sanctuary city policies and contains much-needed changes to protect American communities from unlawful immigrants who commit crimes in the United States, or are gang members.

The Davis-Oliver Act also enhances national security by improving our Nation's first line of defense, the visa issuance process. It provides thorough screening of foreign nationals seeking to enter the United States in order to prevent terrorists from entering our country. The bill also ensures the rule of law and removes the ability of any President to unilaterally shut down immigration enforcement by granting States and localities the authority to voluntarily assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration law and to enforce their own immigration laws consistent with Federal practices.

The House Judiciary Committee has also approved several bills to reform the asylum and refugee programs to curtail rampant fraud, while ensuring that our Nation continues to be a safe haven for those persecuted around the world. The surge of Central American unaccompanied alien minors and family units seeking to enter the U.S. illegally at our southern border put a strain on manpower and resources. It also exposed loopholes in our Nation's immigration laws that are being exploited by smugglers and others seeking to game the system.

The Asylum Reform and Border Patrol Act makes a number of improvements to our Nation's laws to prevent fraud and abuse in the system and assure that asylum is reserved for those truly fleeing persecution in their home country.

Further, the Protection of Children Act makes sure that unaccompanied alien minors who make the dangerous journey to the United States are swiftly and safely returned home. For those who stay with a sponsor in the United States while awaiting their immigration hearing, the bill provides for

greater transparency and safety to these minors to ensure that they are not inadvertently delivered into the hands of criminals or abusers.

The Refugee Program Integrity Restoration Act reforms the refugee program by curbing fraud and strengthening public safety and national security. It also provides State and local governments the power to decide if refugees are to be resettled within their communities and gives Congress, not the President, the authority to set the overall refugee ceiling for each year.

The House Judiciary Committee also plans to bring up a bill that protects jobs for citizens and legal workers, the Legal Workforce Act. This bill requires all U.S. employers to check the work eligibility of all future hires through the tried and tested E-Verify system. E-Verify quickly confirms 99 percent of work-eligible employees and takes less than 2 minutes to use.

Over 740,000 American employers currently use E-Verify, and 83 percent of America's employers support a mandatory electronic verification system. While many aspects of our Nation's immigration system need to be improved, including our guest worker program for American agriculture, we must strengthen the enforcement of our immigration laws. Immigration enforcement is crucial to maintain our sovereignty, to protect national security, and to restore the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Congress to take up the House Judiciary Committee's immigration enforcement bills soon.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and appreciate those powerful words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), a colleague and one of the sharpest, most intellectual Members of Congress.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if you were trying to do damage to the United States and you wanted to design a Tax Code that hindered economic growth, that diverted a lot of productive energy, that basically kept America from reaching its economic potential, you probably couldn't do much worse than designing the code that we have.

It is enormously complex—70,000 plus pages. I confess, there is no way I can do my own taxes, and I think that is true for millions and millions of Americans. There is a frustration with that, but it also costs massive amounts of money and diverts energy. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars that get diverted to complying with the Tax Code, and that is not optimal for economic growth.

It repels capital and incentivizes companies to relocate overseas and take jobs overseas. You see companies reincorporating in Ireland or Canada. That is because we have the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. We are almost trying to send businesses overseas.

It doesn't allow middle class families to keep enough of the money they earn. If you look over the past decade or so, family income really hasn't risen by that much, yet the cost of living has gone up. So by taking more and more from taxes, it makes it harder for middle class families to make ends meet.

So reforming the Tax Code, doing a nice, big tax cut, I think is long overdue. It would be a boon to our economy. You would have a simple system—no more 70,000 pages. Fill out your taxes on a postcard. That not only is more economically efficient, it gives people a lot of peace of mind to know they can do their taxes themselves. It is going to incentivize us to bring all of the trillions of dollars in overseas profits, and bring it back to the United States so that we can invest it here through our companies and create more jobs here.

It will make our American businesses more competitive. Our business tax system is outdated. It is uncompetitive. This, I think, will change a lot of that by having a competitive business tax rate, and I think that that will mean more economic growth.

So I think all that is pretty obvious to most people who look at this in a fair way. The question for us now is, we have to produce this bill. We have been talking about tax reform for a long time this year, and I think that is great, but it is time right now for us to produce this bill, debate it here in the House, pass it, and send it over to the United States Senate.

I am not encouraged when, given the urgency of this, we are going on a recess next week. The House is not going to be here. You are not going to have a tax bill marked up in the Ways and Means Committee or unveiled to the public. Members are not going to be debating that. I think it is time that we do that, and I think there should be a sense of urgency with that.

We have got to get our job done. I think the bill should have been passed by now, but let's get it done. Send it to the Senate. I don't think you would probably have very smart money to bet that the Senate is going to come through in the clutch. They haven't shown they can do that yet. But this is going to be a big question for them: Can you get anything done in the U.S. Senate? This is something that we know we need to do. It will be good for our economy.

All of the Republicans have said that our Tax Code is a disaster. So if we send them a good bill, this is going to be a major test. Can you apply the majority that the voters gave us? Can you honor your promises and do something good for taxpayers? I hope the answer is yes. But I think in this body we have got to be focusing on, let's put the Senate to the test. Let's draft, debate, and pass a strong, bold, tax cut and tax reform.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I always appreciate the contribution that

the gentleman makes to the House and to the American people.

I could not agree more. For those who may be listening or watching, you may have seen, in the last few months, a heightened energy, or an urgency when it comes to calling out our partners in the Senate to begin to move and to begin to act—not just on things like repealing the healthcare, ObamaCare, but also moving, getting ready to move, hopefully, on tax reform.

I know there has been some agreement on the framework, but, as the details continue to be more and more clear, we hope our colleagues on the Senate are ready to move quickly and swiftly for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), a brand-new Member who came in from a special election to replace OMB Director Mick Mulvaney when he took the position with President Trump's administration. He has gotten up to speed quickly and is a huge asset to the Republican Study Committee and to the House Republicans as a whole.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Republican Study Committee's three promises in 3 months' pledge to repeal ObamaCare, secure the border, and enable comprehensive tax reform.

I applaud RSC's Chairman Mike Walker for his leadership on this and on this initiative. On the promises to repeal and secure, the House has begun to deliver by passing the American Health Care Act and providing \$1.6 billion in border wall funding.

Tonight, I want to focus on the third promise: passing comprehensive tax reform. Our Nation's Tax Code affects every family, business, and worker and is a key driver behind America's economic competitiveness. Congress has not passed comprehensive tax reform since 1986. That is 31 years.

The average cost of a new house then in the United States was \$89,430. For a new Ford F-150 pickup truck, the average price was \$8,350. Mr. Speaker, it has been way too long before we have taken comprehensive tax reform into consideration.

Since then, the number of pages in the IRS code has increased by nearly 50,000 pages. The corporate tax rate is at 35 percent, which is the highest in the industrialized world. Ireland's, to give you an example, is 12 percent. This is inexcusable.

Congress took an important step forward last week through passing a budget resolution, and now it is time for the Senate to do their job on the budget so that we can deliver comprehensive tax reform for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, our tax reform plan is both profamily, and proworker. The typical American family will receive a \$4,000 pay raise under our plan and will turbocharge the economy through enabling gross domestic product growth to reach 3.2 percent minimum for the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the House leadership, Chairman BRADY, and all of the congressional Members to pass this fair and simple tax reform package to make this country as great as it can be.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. As you see, three promises, 3 months; October, November, December, three promises, 3 months: repeal, reform, and secure. That is the promise from the Republican Study Committee, making up 157 members, 17 of the 20 chairmen.

□ 1745

Now it is in our ability to make sure this gets through the Senate and passed into law by the President. We can't force all that, but what we are committed to is doing our part and doing our job to get these pieces of legislation through regular order to the House for a vote to fulfill the promises that most of us ran on over the last several elections.

It is also a wonderful privilege tonight to introduce our House veterinarian—the gentleman can define that as he would need if we need a House veterinarian—but the great Representative from central Florida who does fine work in the House, Dr. TED YOHO.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the three promises, 3-month initiative that you have outlined here, and I think it is so important that we follow through with this.

I want to start with tax reform. Members can say: Why do we need tax reform? I think it is self-evident. Our Tax Code, as you heard, is the most burdensome in the world. It stifles economic growth, entrepreneurship, and it creates noncompliance. So we need to simplify it. We have told the American people we were going to do that if we get in charge.

I think the repeal of ObamaCare—and some people get offended if we call it ObamaCare, so I will refer to it as the Affordable Care Act. It has disrupted over 20 percent of our economy, and I think it is not affordable. We can talk to so many different people. I know our premiums went up \$11,000 since I have come to Congress. In fact, our policy got canceled when I came to Congress because of ObamaCare.

Then I think the third part of that is we promised the American people that we would repeal this in its entirety and fix healthcare so that people have access to healthcare, it is affordable, and that it is quality care is the part that gets left out.

Then I want to touch on border security. This is something that we have all run on. Any nation needs a secure border. A sovereign nation has to have a secure border, and they have to have control over their border. However, due to the failures of politicians past and present, the U.S. southern border, in particular, remains porous.

I applaud President Trump for releasing a set of principles which I fully endorse and his priorities that are focused on making our borders more secure. President Trump's consistent message calling for better enforcement of our immigration laws and improving border security is one of the main reasons he won the Presidency.

President Trump is sticking to his campaign promises, which is refreshing to see in Washington, D.C., these days, a town where too many times there is an aversion to making tough decisions in fear of how that will be viewed in the next election. So it is refreshing to see President Trump do what he said he was going to do.

Protecting our borders, ending sanctuary cities, and facilitating State and local cooperation in immigration enforcement are commonsense ideas that will protect national security, promote public safety, and deter future illegal immigration. We are hard at work on solving these problems of illegal immigration in the House.

Just three real quick facts:

From November 2013 to July 2014, officials apprehended 143 individuals listed on the U.S. terrorist watch list trying to cross the Mexican border and enter the U.S. illegally. So many times I hear people say that this is not true and that this does not happen, but we know better.

As of 2014, illegal immigrants were convicted and sentenced for about 13 percent of the crimes in the United States.

Then, lastly, border security should also focus on maritime domain. Our Coast Guard, a hardworking branch of our military service, has set a new record for cocaine seizures at sea for the second consecutive year, seizing more than 455,000 pounds of cocaine in 2017 that was destined for the homeland.

So I am proud to join the Republican Study Committee in recognizing the necessity of border security today.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative YOHO, and we appreciate the gentleman's work in the United States House.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most accomplished men, sometimes a person whom we refer to as "Governor" around here when it comes to political minds, is the gentleman from South Carolina, Representative MARK SANFORD. Week in and week out, he is a very diligent and great leader in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to the fine gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would make two quick points on the importance of tax reform. One, I would refer to an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal. What it talked about was the nexus between deficits and tax reform. Oddly enough, if you look at the numbers here of late and if you look at the 2017 CBO report, what it shows is that,

in fact, deficits are creeping up again. Last year's number is \$668 billion.

What they point to in this editorial was that a good part of the reason why deficits have escalated has been tied to anemic economic growth and that, unlike other recoveries that had been more robust in nature, the revenues had not come in as they have in past recoveries. As a consequence, deficits have exploded.

So if you care about the deficits—and I do, and I know that the gentleman from North Carolina does, and I know that other members of the RSC do. If you care about deficits, then you have got to do something about tax reform this year was, in essence, the premise of the editorial.

The other point I would make is this. In a capitalistic society, capital matters. In essence, it is a mathematical formula.

Savings drives investment, which drives productivity gain, which ultimately impacts standards of living or wages, which we talk about. There are only two ways of increasing or improving human productivity. One is with gray matter: you can build a better mousetrap because you have been well educated and you can think of something different. The other is with physical capital. One person with a bulldozer can move a lot more dirt than one person with a shovel.

Yet what we oftentimes forget in the debate on tax reform is how important it is that we encourage and, in essence, complement the efforts of those who are out there risking on a daily basis. So with that in mind, it is important that we have tax reform that includes people who are actually, again, building businesses.

Think about this: the top 25 percent of the earners out there pay 90 percent of the taxes; the top 10 percent pay 60 percent of the taxes.

Now, let's define that for just a second. If you are in the top 25 percent, that begins at \$77,000. If you are in the top 10 percent, you are at \$133,000.

Now, tell me this: When I talk to a truck driver and a schoolteacher at home, their combined income could be around \$100,000. Are they rich? I would say no. But they are out there making the kinds of risks that are necessary to the building of capital that was exactly what The Wall Street Journal talked about.

If we want to do something about deficits, and if we want to do something about capital formation that is so necessary to raising wages, then we have got to do something about this equation. It is important that those earners and those small-business people not be left out, as is the case right now. That is yet another reason why tax reform is so important this year.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SANFORD; I appreciate the gentleman's good words, experience, and knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of Congress as a whole, it is well past time to make

sure that tax reform and tax relief gets across to the American people.

A lot of times we talk about classes. The truth is it is probably better terminology to talk about income levels, lower, middle and higher income levels. That is one of the reasons that we are pushing forward the Charitable Giving Act, which is something that impacts both the lower and middle income levels.

We believe that is something that needs to be connected to tax reform to make sure that those folks who come from a background of teachers and truck drivers as we just heard about, but also other areas of the middle class and maybe lower income levels, something that they have a way where they are able to make sure that every dollar and every sacrifice they give back to a charitable organization—whether it is a local church or whether it is to the United Way—to make sure that every dollar is counted.

This is something that has been going on way too long. As we know, there are 75,000 pages right now of IRS Tax Code regulations. If the IRS wants to come after a private citizen, the private citizen doesn't have much of a resource ability to fight back whether it is in the legal or whether it is extended wealth. This is a machine that has been building, and the bureaucracy has been growing well past time.

It is time to neuter the IRS. One of the ways we can do that is reducing it from seven tax brackets down to three. It was erroneously shared by somebody across the aisle recently that we are driving up the lowest bracket from 10 percent to 12 percent. The truth is this: we are condensing it right now to three tax brackets—35 percent, 25 percent, and 12 percent—and doubling the standard deduction from \$12,000 to \$24,000. This is something that we are looking forward to doing to benefit the American people.

We talk much in these Halls about bipartisan support or bipartisan this or that. When did it become an issue, when did it become a problem, and when did it become a point of contention to allow the American people to keep more of the money from the hard work they put in and day out, week in and week out? That is something that we must do. That is something that should not even be a place of argument or a place of debate when it comes back allowing these folks to continue.

For some, we can get past the tax credit language. We can move on beyond the charitable deductions and all the different political and accounting words. What about just the family of four that needs another car, that needs to be able to afford a car payment to get a mom or a dad back and forth to work, or maybe a teenager in the house? We have been through that twice now. We had more claims than we probably should, but we get it. But also, maybe it is a few more times out to eat or to the movies, the things that

make you want to get up every day and continue to pursue that American Dream.

But not only from the individual side of this—certainly very important—but what about this corporate tax rate, this business rate that we talk constantly about that almost has become Washington jargon talking points? Why is that so important?

Over the years since the 1930s and 1940s, our corporate business rate has climbed to the highest in the industrial world.

Why is that? Why would we make it tougher on our manufacturers and our companies to have a higher tax rate? What incentive is it to stay here? We could track company after company.

I come from the State of North Carolina where textiles and furniture used to be two of our top three job providers. A lot of those companies now you will find in Vietnam or other places.

That corporate tax rate that literally has gone through the roof, why wouldn't we want to reduce that business rate? Why wouldn't we want to incentivize companies to begin to bring those jobs back to the United States?

I think it is crucial, and I think it is something that all of us should have the energy and the ability to be able to get behind and really push forward.

We have been promising this for how long? Since 1986? I was a junior in high school. Thirty-one years this has been on the docket, and the moment is now for us to deliver. If it is not now, as Reagan used to say, then when? Then how?

What should we be doing if it is not fulfilling the very promise that we have made to the American people, and that is that we are going to provide genuine—not some kind of phony legislation, not some kind of showboat, but genuine tax reform and tax relief for the American people?

Now, you may hear sometimes that, hey, the Republican plan is only for the most wealthy. Let's look at the numbers. Let's put a little math equation up, if we could, please.

Let's say that the most wealthy—if you are talking about somebody who makes \$1 million, let's say we reduce their taxes by 1 percent. My math that I am doing here in my mind, that comes to about \$10,000.

Let's say, if you go to that middle-income family, two parents working as hard as they can, they are bringing about \$50,000 a year annually, yet their tax break, their tax benefit is 10 percent. Now, math tells me that is only \$5,000 compared to the \$10,000.

So you may hear the spin from time to time, well, the wealthier are getting the higher tax break, the wealthier are getting the higher tax credit. Listen, when it comes to dollar for dollar, the impact that that makes to the middle and lower income families is drastic. I will tell you this. Every time we turn around, every time that each Member goes back and forth to his district, he

is hearing the same message: "Get something done."

Tax reform is one of those areas where, specifically, we are being compelled, we are being urged, and we are being called. My fellow Members in the House, please hear those urgent voices right now. Even if Members want to move past the tax relief and the humanitarian component, is it not politically strategic for us to do what we have promised to do on behalf of the American people?

As I said in my opening, I am confident that the American people will deliver the final grade over the next 3 months. The 115th Congress, what kind of grade will we have over the next 3 months if we do not deliver on these three promises?

I am hoping that that urgency is resonating. Repealing and replacing, continuing to fight to repeal and replace ObamaCare, to make sure that we are continuing to reform and do everything that we can to reform the Tax Code. Finally, the promise that we have been making year after year is to make sure that we are protecting the American people by securing our border.

I understand that each of these items is a major legislative item in its own right. To be frank, we should have been delivering on them throughout the year. It is October, the 10th month of year. It is high past time. We only have such a busy agenda this late in the game because we haven't delivered on our promises.

□ 1800

I want to thank my colleagues and fellow Republican Study Committee members tonight for joining us this evening.

I would ask the American people to continue to support and continue to urge their Members of Congress to deliver on these promises.

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

REAUTHORIZE CHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, as a father, and as a grandfather, nothing I do is more important than ensuring every child in Arizona and America has the opportunity to live up to their God-given potential. No matter where they live, kids deserve to grow up healthy, with every chance to succeed.

That is why it is beyond unacceptable that, for the first time ever, Congress missed the deadline to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program.

For decades, CHIP has been a bipartisan program and has been reauthorized with broad support, until now. It has now been 11 days since CHIP ex-

pired. This is an outrage for children across the Nation who depend on the affordable, quality care they receive, thanks to CHIP. It is especially troubling for Arizona.

Arizona has had the unfortunate distinction of being one of the worst States for healthcare access for children. Until last year, it was the only State in the entire Nation without an active Children's Health Insurance Program.

Arizona froze CHIP KidsCare program in 2010. At its height, the waiting list for coverage after the freeze topped 100,000. I repeat: the list topped 100,000 because of a freeze put on by the State of Arizona.

Two years ago, Congress reauthorized CHIP and included enhanced match rate funding for States under the Affordable Care Act. Thanks to advocates on the ground and with bipartisan support in our State legislature, this enhanced funding finally paved the way for our State to reopen KidsCare.

Last year, KidsCare began enrolling children—over 23,000 so far. We have just begun the hard work of educating and reaching out to the working families who qualify for coverage.

Arizona is one of a handful of States, as you can see here in this chart in blue, that would run out of Federal funds to cover children by December of this year, absent congressional action.

Families in these States are the most at risk for losing critical access to care, until Congress steps up to the plate and passes a robust reauthorization with enhanced rate funding.

I have met and heard from many of these families and their providers. I know what is at stake for them.

Cate Arnquist is a mother from Tucson, Arizona, whose 8-year-old son, Zachary, was approved for coverage through KidsCare last month. This is a huge relief to Cate, who recently moved to Arizona with her husband and works at a local elementary school. Cate said:

It's important for me to know that if I need to take him to the doctor, I will be able to take him. As a parent, your kids are always your biggest priority. I think every parent wants to make sure their kids are healthy.

Cate, I couldn't agree with you more. Kids like Zachary deserve to know that their elected officials here in Congress are looking out for them.

Graciela is a working single mom who lives in Phoenix. Her 17-year-old daughter, who suffers from high blood pressure, relies on KidsCare coverage. Graciela says:

I just pray and ask everybody who is behind CHIP to think about it. They don't know how hard it is sometimes when you are a parent and you don't know what to do. Should I put a plate of food on the table or should I take my kid to the doctor?

These are questions no parent in Arizona or in America should have to ask themselves. Doctors in our community agree.

A pediatrician practicing in Gilbert, Arizona, shared an important story

with us about a family with five children in her practice. The father works as a grocer, but makes \$20 too much to qualify for Medicaid. That is \$20.

One of the children has significant developmental delays and another child has a serious neurological disease. After the youngest child was born, it became clear that he most likely had the neurological disease as well.

The doctor referred this child for evaluation, but the family was unable to take him to the neurologist because they could not afford the office visits and diagnostic testing necessary. Had KidsCare been open at the time, the family could have applied for coverage, since they qualified, based on their income.

This story and our experience in Arizona should be a cautionary tale for the rest of the States who may freeze their program if Congress fails to reauthorize CHIP now.

No family should be put at risk when they need help for their kids. Working families like these are doing their best to make ends meet and raise healthy kids.

Reauthorizing CHIP isn't just the right thing to do morally, but it is the smart, economic decision for our communities. I understood that when I was a Republican State legislator and fought for KidsCare, and I understand it now here in Congress.

We all know that when children have meaningful access to quality, affordable, comprehensive healthcare coverage, our schools, families, and our State's bottom line all win.

Healthy kids have a better shot in school and grow up to be healthy adults. When we invest in them, when we invest in their families, we are investing in their futures and our future.

We must do better. Instead of playing partisan games and spending time on bills that make coverage and affordability worse for Americans, we need to make CHIP reauthorization front and center of our focus.

While I am pleased that the Senate Finance Committee and the House Energy and Commerce Committee have started to take up action, it is past time to get a robust bill to the President's desk.

CHIP has long been a bipartisan program, and I will keep working with anyone, regardless of office or party, to make sure our kids have the care they deserve. They are counting on us. We cannot let them down.

I am pleased to be joined this evening by my colleagues who are committed to fighting for kids in our communities. I want to thank them for joining this Special Order hour to fight for CHIP and a strong reauthorization process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CİCİLLİNE).

Mr. CİCİLLİNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding and for his leadership in organizing this Special Order hour.

There is no more sacred responsibility that we have than to ensure that the children in this country have access to quality, affordable healthcare. So I rise this evening to speak in support of the vital Children's Health Insurance Program, also known as CHIP.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, CHIP authorization expired on September 30, 2017—this past September. This program assures that 9 million children, including 27,000 children and pregnant women in my home State of Rhode Island, are provided with low-cost health insurance, which covers essential services such as routine checkups, immunizations, doctor visits, prescriptions, dental and vision care, inpatient and outpatient hospital care, laboratory and x-ray services, and emergency services.

This historically bipartisan program has been successful in lowering the percentage of children who are uninsured from nearly 14 percent when it started in 1997 to 4.5 percent in 2015. Historic achievements.

If not extended by Congress soon, many States will no longer be able to fund the program and will begin limiting coverage, some as early as the end of this year.

In fact, the Kaiser Family Foundation recently concluded that, without an extension of CHIP, "States would face budget pressures, children would lose coverage, and implementation of program changes could result in increased costs and administrative burden for States as well as confusion for families."

If not extended by Congress soon, many States will no longer be able to fund the program and will begin limiting coverage.

Congress must also act with urgency to extend and reauthorize the other programs that were enacted in the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, including extending funding for community health centers; the Personal Responsibility Education Program; the rural and Medicare-dependent hospitals program; Teaching Health Centers; Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; and the Special Diabetes Program for type 1 diabetes and for Indians.

These critical programs, as well as CHIP, are vital to the American healthcare system, and they support access to high-quality, affordable care.

I want to again thank the gentleman from Arizona for providing this Special Order. This is urgent and should be an urgent priority for the Congress of the United States to reauthorize this critical program to absolutely insist that children—as I said, 9 million children across this country—have access to quality, affordable healthcare, including 27,000 children and pregnant women in my home State.

Democrats are urging our Republican colleagues to reauthorize this bill immediately so that the families who are so anxious about whether or not they

will continue to have the ability to access quality, affordable healthcare can rest comfortably and know that this work is done.

I thank the gentleman again for his leadership and for yielding to me on this very important issue.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for caring about our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a new low for this Congress to allow the critical and bipartisan Children's Health Insurance Program to expire. This program is 20 years old, and this has never happened, where we have allowed the basic safety net healthcare program for children to expire.

We hear over and over again, Mr. Speaker, you talk about the ne'er do well, lazy ones of our constituents who are poor and don't want to work. But, Mr. Speaker, these are children who are ineligible for work and unavailable to take care of themselves. We are destroying the health safety net for children.

But it is not that we haven't had time to extend CHIP. We have renamed post offices. We have renamed a highway. We have advanced the House budget reconciliation riddled with unpaid tax cuts for the wealthy, including the repeal of the estate tax, which alone would increase our deficit by \$269 billion by 2025. Mr. Speaker, that is billion with a B.

Are Republicans in this body trying to solve the budget crisis and our deficit problem by cutting CHIP?

I don't think so.

Even more, Mr. Speaker, last week, we spent a considerable amount of time debating the 20-week abortion ban. We heard passionate speeches about how important it was to preserve the life of fetuses. We spent all this time and speaker after speaker making emotional demands on this body that we restrict women's body autonomy, but we spent no time reauthorizing the program for little Junior, once he crowns and is born—the basic healthcare that he needs immediately exiting the womb.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, simply put, it is hypocritical for you to say that life ends as soon as the umbilical cord is cut. And, Mr. Speaker, your actions prove it.

You know, I am of the mindset of one of our news reporters, Rachel Maddow, that we ought to just watch what you do and not what you say.

Almost 9 million children depend on CHIP for healthcare; 9 million children from low- to moderate-income families who will lose access to vaccinations, routine checkups, dental care, mental healthcare, prescriptions, and some of these children are profoundly disabled.

Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen to the 24 percent of the children enrolled in CHIP that have special

healthcare needs, including asthma and learning disabilities?

The health of our children depends on this program, yet, Mr. Speaker, all you can do to muster up a reauthorization for CHIP is to fund it by increasing Medicare premiums—Medicare, a program designed for people over 65—and cutting the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

All you can do, Mr. Speaker, is to pit old people against our babies in order to provide basic healthcare to children. This sounds really Faustian, and it is unimaginable, yet this is the reality that we are working with.

Mr. Speaker, it is now time to put these politics aside and to reauthorize CHIP now for 5 years. This is a disgrace not only in this Nation, but internationally. I, as an American, don't want to be judged by putting our kids last.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I am kind of new to this body, but when I came here, I came with the same intention as I did when I first got into the Arizona State Legislature. One of the first issues I worked on was this program, a program that helped kids stay healthy, a program so that they could be successful at school, a program that is imperative. Yet, today, millions of people around this country, millions of families around this country are asking themselves: What are they going to do about my children's health? What is going to happen? Who is going to be there for my child?

When I was a police officer, I had, sadly, the ability to see people in poverty day in and day out, what it meant to their families, but especially what sick children look like, what it means to see children taken out of homes in ambulances instead of having preventative care, what it means for a child to have to be in a hospital instead of having had the ability to have preventative care, what it means to a child with disabilities to have to go through that process and not have the physical therapy that is needed.

This happened time and time again before CHIP became reality. I don't think America wants to go back there. I think America wants to move forward and make sure our children are healthy and able to withstand the issues in our society that lead us to make sure that they do.

I cannot understand, for the life of me, why we would keep these families—it is 11 days now. It is going to mean many more. We will have to find some level of agreement. Yet, as was just mentioned by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, we are funding this by taking money away from the elderly, from those also in need, from those also at risk.

I have to say that when I patrolled the streets of Chicago, I did so to make sure that people were saved and safe. And I can't believe that I have come to

this body and found out that we are willing to keep these families waiting, we are willing to sit back and not understand the core issues of what it means to those families to have to suffer through this process of the unknown of their child's future healthcare.

I have to say that this is an issue that most Americans and most of this body agree to. I don't know why we have gone down this path of taking money—or thinking of taking money away from the elderly. It is wrong. But I do know that we should get this dealt with quickly and make sure the families in America that need it can provide for their children's health.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative LANGEVIN, the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate all his time and effort he is putting into bringing attention to this vital issue. It is an honor to join him this evening as we highlight the imminent need to pass a full reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Now, I represent the great State of Rhode Island, a State with over 27,000 children and pregnant women at risk of losing healthcare if CHIP is not fully funded. It is deeply troubling to me and many of my constituents, my colleagues in government; and we fought hard over the years to make sure that we did better by our young people, by the most vulnerable, and by pregnant women in making sure that they had the healthcare coverage that they desperately need and deserve.

Now, in Rhode Island, the lack of a reauthorization endangers \$26 million in Federal funds that support this vulnerable population, many of whom will not otherwise have comprehensive coverage. This is particularly frustrating because congressional Republicans knew that CHIP funding would expire on September 30. They had ample time to fix this problem in a bipartisan way and have chosen not to.

Instead of proactively crafting legislation to ensure 9 million low-income children and families maintain access to affordable, high-quality healthcare, Republicans focused their efforts on gutting the Affordable Care Act to the exclusion of everything else.

Now, in the service of their political priority to eliminate coverage for 23 million, they are passing on an opportunity to govern on multiple healthcare fronts. Rather than work to find meaningful bipartisan solutions, Republicans still seek ways of systematically unraveling ACA protections and have only offered untenable options to offset the cost of CHIP. That is no way to govern responsibly or to even remotely do it in a bipartisan way, which they could do.

Now, their plan to pay for healthcare for one population by stripping access to healthcare from another is wrong. This approach of robbing Peter to pay

Paul does nothing to build a foundation for a healthier future, nor does it protect the communities with sufficient healthcare access today.

Proposing to slash the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund and creating a greater financial burden on seniors by suggesting destructive Medicare changes are not acceptable ways to bring Democrats to the table and pass a CHIP reauthorization with bipartisan support. Which, by the way, I am sure my colleagues have mentioned as they were speaking tonight, when CHIP was first authorized, it was done collaboratively in a bipartisan way at a contentious time in Congress, back when it was first enacted. But they found a way to do the right thing for vulnerable individuals, particularly our children, and we need to come together again.

We have a responsibility to move quickly, to ensure our children continue to have access to high-quality, affordable coverage. States like Rhode Island deserve to know that we will support the efforts to provide for the children in the State. The health professionals who treat these children deserve more certainty. Most importantly, the children who benefit from CHIP deserve much better than to be threatened with coverage termination because my colleagues in the majority can't set aside their political ambitions and goals.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again thank my colleague for raising an alarm bell on this issue, calling attention and focusing the American people on the need to reauthorize CHIP.

We take great pride in Rhode Island that over the years we have built a very strong program to cover vulnerable children and pregnant women. We have been leaders in the country in having a very low rate of uninsured. Going back even before the ACA was enacted, we had a model program with our Rite Care and Rite Share program. There were hard-fought battles that moved the ball forward for providing better and more responsible health coverage for the people who need it and deserve it the most.

We need to come together now in a bipartisan way to make sure that CHIP is reauthorized. We cannot let this program fail. We cannot fail our children, our most vulnerable populations. We can come together in a bipartisan way. Democrats stand ready to do just that, come together in a bipartisan way to reauthorize CHIP, just as it had been authorized in a bipartisan way when it was first created.

Now, I know that there are many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who care as passionately about covering low-income children, providing affordable healthcare, doing the right thing by our children, and I look forward to reaching out across the aisle to do just that. Let's do this in a bipartisan way. Let's do the right thing and put partisan politics aside and cover our children.

Mr. Speaker, I thank again Mr. O'HALLERAN for his leadership on this vital issue, and I look forward to continuing to work with him as we reauthorize CHIP, hopefully in the very near future. Again, we got to do this together.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island not only for his discussion today, but also for all his work on behalf of the children of America. I think that his record speaks for itself, and it is obvious that what we just heard came from his heart. So I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I asked my fellow colleagues, when they start to work on this bill again—hopefully, they do it in a speedy fashion—that when they wake up in the morning, they think of what it means to have their child potentially without healthcare, what it means to have the unknown that we don't know if next month or the month later they will lose that coverage because Congress has failed to address the issue that they have all agreed on for 20 years. We have to and we must find a way to come to agreement.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, Mr. HIGGINS from Louisiana.

THE PLIGHT OF THE CITIZENS OF LOUISIANA IMPACTED BY HURRICANE HARVEY

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise unscripted to bring to the attention of the entire Nation the plight of the good citizens of Louisiana who were impacted by Hurricane Harvey last month. Beside me at this graph shows the rainfall, the water event of Hurricane Harvey as it impacted Texas and Louisiana.

□ 1830

As anyone can see, it was a tremendous water event, unprecedented rainfall, that overwhelmed any water management system. And, as anyone can see, the parishes of southwest Louisiana were impacted, as well as many counties in Texas, yet, as we discuss disaster relief, Louisiana is absent from our conversation. I point out, to all who would choose to witness, the State line of Louisiana, as defined by the Sabine River, and the impact of Hurricane Harvey.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Harvey did not recognize the artificial State boundaries that we have created as a Republic, nor should we as we provide disaster relief for our citizens. Just after Hurricane Harvey had impacted Texas and Louisiana, my office drafted

a letter to the executive branch to a President that I admire and respect, advising him of the impact, and begging his expedited approval of the disaster status once the formal request had been submitted by our Governor.

Sometime later, just 2 weeks ago, that formal request was submitted by the Governor of our State. Just after that submission, my office drafted and submitted a second letter requesting expedited approval of disaster status for these citizens of Louisiana, who were clearly just as impacted by this storm as many citizens in Texas.

Tomorrow, we shall send a third letter, this time signed by the entire Louisiana delegation. I ask that the Nation recognize the plight of the people I represent. The good and patriotic citizens of southwest Louisiana are suffering.

I respect and admire my President, I support him, I have supported him since day one, and I support him still. But it is important that we, as representatives of we the people, communicate clearly our intent and our service.

I beg that the leaders of the executive branch level would witness this clear evidence of the need for disaster declaration of the parishes of southwest Louisiana. And I beg that this message is received with the spirit with which it is delivered, which is respectful, yet in determined service of the citizens whom I have sworn to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding these precious moments to me.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had some interesting days here, but, over the weekend, being back in Texas, I am hearing the cries from people all over east Texas. There is a small number that say: Hey, I am not making much, and I am getting a subsidy from the government, so I am okay on my healthcare, I am young, I have no health problems, and that is fine.

But over and over, there is a cry going out around America that says: We elected Republicans in the majority in the House and the majority in the Senate to help us with our healthcare—with really health insurance. Everybody can get healthcare. You can just go to the emergency room, whether you have money or not.

This is really more about health insurance. Some of us have not wanted health insurance to make our major decisions for us on our own healthcare. We haven't wanted the government to make major decisions on our healthcare, but both are making those decisions for people across the country today.

Unfortunately, there are people telling me they are paying \$8,000, \$10,000, \$12,000. I heard one for \$20,000 yesterday from Texas, \$20,000 for the family's insurance, and they have a \$12,000 deductible, and they can't afford either one. They expected help.

President Trump is not the Congress. He has pushed, shoved, cajoled, done

everything he could to try to get Congress moving in the House after a back and forth, wailing, gnashing of teeth. We got a bill. It wasn't perfect by any stretch. But at least it would have given people relief from high premiums, most Americans. Hopefully, Republicans won't misrepresent the truth, as some did.

Actually, we know some people just flat lied about ObamaCare. People who said, "If you like your insurance, you can keep it," they knew it was a lie. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. They knew that was a lie.

And now the people are suffering the consequences of trusting people in government who lied to them. They were deceived. But even with all the deception, most of the time it appeared that a clear majority of Americans did not want what was fraudulently called the Affordable Care Act. There was nothing affordable about it, unless you didn't have any healthcare problems at all.

People who are carrying the weight of the taxes in this country have needed help. They counted on us to provide legislative changes, repeal of ObamaCare, let's put a system in place where people can make their own healthcare decisions, and we sent the bill to the Senate, and I still believe we should have been demanding more of the Senate every day.

I know there are a lot of people who say: Well, Republicans can't lose the majority in the Senate because there are a bunch more Democrats whose seats are up this time instead of Republicans. Yes, we can lose the majority, even when there are more Democratic seats up for election.

That is what happens when people are sorely disappointed. Many stay home, and the wrong people will get elected when too many people stay home.

But the adage is, still true, democracy ensures people are governed no better than they deserve. So whether anybody liked or disliked President Obama as our President—and, by the way, for those who like to throw out the term "hater," I don't hate anybody, but I can certainly disapprove of conduct.

For 8 years, America deserved Barack Hussein Obama. Before that, whether you like him or not, I like him, America deserved George W. Bush. Before that, America deserved 8 years of William Clinton—I forget his middle name. Before that, 4 years of George H. W. Bush. Before that, 8 years of Ronald Reagan. And I am very pleased that America deserved Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton last November.

It is interesting, though, being in hearings today and hear people clamoring that they demand action from this department, that department, it is taking too long, while, at that very moment, Democratic Senators at the other end of this building are doing everything they can to prevent confirmation of President Trump's appointees

to those departments so they can start getting things done.

It is amazing when one party like that can hold the ability, because of the filibuster rule, because of the requirement for 60 votes, apparently, they are able to hold up these appointees. To me, that is all the reason to go ahead and say: Do you know what, you are demanding action from people who you have not confirmed yet, so we are not going to let you play that game anymore. You have people saying, "Oh, my goodness, these departments aren't getting decisions made, aren't getting their work done," and all the while you are holding them back from being able to do it by not confirming the people who need to be doing that work.

The Senate ought to just say: We are not playing that game, we are not letting you play that game, we are going to call the game off, we are going to get serious about America's problems, and we are going to confirm President Trump's nominees with 51 votes, not just judges, we are going to confirm his nominees with 51 votes. We cannot tolerate people—really it is fraudulent activity to hold back the nominees from being confirmed and then vilify the administration for not getting the work done that those nominees who hadn't been confirmed will have to do.

The Senate needs to respond. The Senate did not respond to the bill we sent to them. That was quite interesting. In my 12 years here, I have never seen a situation like that, Mr. Speaker, where some of us got calls from people in the Senate who don't normally get calls, and that included people from the Tuesday Group, the Freedom Caucus, the Republican Study Committee, and the Republican leadership. They all were asking the same question: Okay, would you please promise us that if we pass this healthcare bill in the Senate that you will not take it up and pass it in the House? Because it is only if you guys promise us, the Republicans promise us, you won't pass the bill that we have down here—apparently, it was so bad—that we will let it go to committee, or you will amend it, but you just promise us you won't pass the bill if we pass it.

Well, as far as I know, everybody I talked to gave reassurance to the Senators who called them and said: No, we promise, we won't pass your bill, it is terrible, we won't, we can assure you.

Even with those assurances, just the effort to get something passed so that we can come together in a conference between House conferees and Senate conferees, just to come together for the chance—this bill that the Senate was taking up to have some skinny repeal, they called it, of ObamaCare, and at least some measure of change to the suffering that people are enduring right now, and they still couldn't get 51 votes, which is all they needed under the reconciliation process.

Even when they were assured: We promise you, we won't pass this bill,

you will get another chance to vote, just help the process, let's get it to conference, so we can get some relief to the American people who are suffering, suffering so much that they would go so far as to give us the majority in the Senate after they have given us the majority in the House, and give us the White House as a Republican Party—*incredible*.

But the American people are still suffering. And the budget apparently does not provide for ObamaCare to be repealed and replaced under reconciliation for the next 12 months. So unless the Senate feels enough heat from the American people—the Republicans that is—they are not going to do anything about ObamaCare that they promise to repeal and replace.

□ 1845

Apparently, it is going to have to get pretty hot in the kitchen down in the Senate to get people down there worked up enough to finally give the American people the relief that the Senate Republicans promised.

Now, I don't like talking about this, despite what some may think. It is much nicer to get along and go along, but people are suffering because we haven't kept our promise. The Senate couldn't pass anything that would get the American people some relief from all the suffering from ObamaCare.

For those who are not aware, yes, there were bailouts for the monopoly insurance companies. Some made record profits, and yet they are still, under ObamaCare, the way it was written, supposed to get bailouts.

So it appears pretty clear the design of ObamaCare was to make it fail. Apparently, people at the top of some of these insurance companies have not been smart enough to figure out that they signed their own death warrants when they embraced ObamaCare, but it appears it was designed to make people angry at the greedy, allegedly corrupt health insurance companies.

I don't think they are corrupt, but there sure was a lot of greed there between some of the pharmaceutical companies and the health insurance companies signing on. Some of them tried to say: Well, oh, but we needed to be at the table.

We are going: Not if you are on the menu you didn't want to be at the table.

I am sure the executives that have their golden parachutes leave the health insurance companies after 5, 6, 7 years with their incomes.

The design was the health insurance companies make a fortune, people's premiums kept going through the roof, deductibles kept going through the roof, bailouts were provided to insurance companies that had record profits, and then the design ultimately would be the American people getting so angry that they would lash out and say: Enough already. I never thought I would say this, but anything has got to be better than these insurance compa-

nies, the handful that are left, so let's just let the government take care of everything.

Then we get a system that is twice as bad as the VA for all Americans, so all Americans can suffer fairly, equally, instead of getting what used to be some of the best healthcare ever in the history of the world.

We have another issue I want to touch on. Our Taxed Enough Already Caucus had a meeting yesterday and heard from Luke Rosiak, who has done more investigation on the IT scandal here on Capitol Hill, apparently done more investigation than anybody at the FBI. We keep hearing rumors that the FBI is reporting there is nothing to this, kind of like the Clinton scandal, the money that the Clinton Foundation got from the stockholders of Uranium One—she approves the sale of 20, 25 percent of America's uranium production; it ends up going to the Russians—the email scandal, that obviously there were efforts to destroy and obfuscate evidence that was being sought, and Comey went out of his way to protect Ms. Clinton. There is just so much there that needs to be investigated.

The Attorney General apparently can't investigate because of his own recusal. Mr. Rosenstein is sure not going to investigate it and thinks Mueller will do it.

Mueller is disqualified from doing it. Although he is such a problem, he will not disqualify himself. Comey is a material witness—should be—in the investigation.

As the Washingtonian reported back in 2013 in this long expose they did on glorifying Mr. Comey and Mr. Mueller's relationship, that Comey knows that basically, in essence, if the world were on fire, the one person who would be there with him, protecting him, standing with him, would be Mr. Mueller. Mueller cannot investigate anything in which Comey is a witness. He can't.

So what does he do? Comey goes and hires more lawyers. He has already had more lawyers than anybody I am aware of—ever. He is already exceeding the very general charge he got, going back years before he needed to. I mean, this is just incredible.

They were a problem 10 years ago. The Obama administration had 8 years to get into it. Mueller, as FBI Director, had plenty of time to get into it.

So there is only one thing we can be looking at, and that is a vendetta by Robert Mueller after some people. He is clearly disqualified. Comey is in it up to his eyeballs. We have got to have a special prosecutor that will look into the matters that should be investigated.

Then we have this issue on Capitol Hill. We need to know how compromised our computer system, our IT system on the Hill has been.

We had a guy named Imran Awan working on Capitol Hill, started working with Democrats' computer systems

12 years or so ago. He was not even an American citizen at the time.

Apparently, if there has ever been a background check on Imran Awan, it certainly was not adequate, because in the Imran Awan family and cohorts, you have got bankruptcy; you have got massive indebtedness; there was money received by one of the team, \$100,000 or so, from a known consort with Hezbollah.

Then we find out yesterday—or I did; I had not heard of this before—that Imran Awan, for parts of the year, would not even be here in Washington. He would be in Pakistan servicing up to dozens of our Democratic colleagues' computer systems from Pakistan, making the maximum that somebody working on Capitol Hill could be working for different Members of Congress, and then you add the partial salaries together until you get around \$160,000.

We heard yesterday that as he would get one person up to \$160,000 working for different offices, then they would add another to the payroll and get them up to \$160,000. One of the group owed another individual \$100,000. So with no indication that that individual who was owed \$100,000 ever even came to Capitol Hill or did any work here, he got put on the House payroll and made a couple hundred thousand dollars in return for the hundred thousand that he had loaned to one of the Awan team.

It is just almost inconceivable that we would have someone working with some of the highest privileged material. It seems to me the courts made it clear the speech or debate privilege to protect constituent information, information that people provide to us as whistleblowers, that that is probably more constitutionally protected than the attorney-client privilege. It is that important.

Yet knowing there are countries, there are companies that would pay large amounts of money to know some Members of Congress' schedule, have access to all their emails, see what they are saying about different bills, what they want to do, that is some valuable stuff. And yet, in some years, we were told yesterday, that Imran Awan was servicing Capitol Hill computers from Pakistan.

Now, I don't know how secure the Pakistani internet systems are, but it is kind of hard to believe that the American interests would be as protected in Pakistan and the Capitol congressional computer system would be protected as it is going through the Pakistani internet to be serviced.

We also heard that Imran Awan, from some of the emails that WikiLeaks put out—we don't know if he worked for the Democratic National Committee when they were hacked, but we know there were emails where someone was saying: We need to get into the chairwoman's laptop. We need her password.

Oh, well, Imran Awan has all of her passwords, so check with him.

So we don't know the extent that he could have compromised things, with

all the indebtedness he had and the car dealership that he never reported. Anybody that makes over \$120,000 from Capitol Hill has to report any outside income. He never reported those things.

In fact, it appears to be a crime when he failed to even report that he had his wife on the payroll making money on Capitol Hill in those financial disclosures he filed.

We also know that he had some history of violence complaints. His stepmother complained of being kidnapped by him and forced to sign documents that would turn over money and property that Imran's father supposedly had coming.

We know that he has now been indicted simply on a bank fraud charge for lying in order to get a bank loan, the money from which was sent overseas.

We also learned that they were sending technological equipment over to Pakistan. They were fraudulently filing vouchers showing that \$800 iPads only cost under \$500 so they wouldn't have to be listed on inventory. That obviously makes things more easy to steal.

There were reports, in fact, by the person who rented his house when he and his wife appeared to flee—he was trying to flee when he was stopped at the airport. There were hard drives, all kinds of things.

We know that he and possibly some of those working—maybe they didn't work. We don't know. But \$6 million to \$7 million was paid to him and his family and his cohorts during the time they were working here, and yet he was downloading from Members of Congress' clouds or from their own servers all of their information into a spot where people who weren't authorized could access those Members of Congress' accounts.

This has got to be investigated more thoroughly than it has been.

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

□ 1900

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it is Hispanic Heritage Month, and I want to take this time to honor some great heroes in my district of Hispanic descent, who range from reporters to civil rights heroes, to community organizers, to businessmen and women, and I am just proud to be here tonight to be able to do that.

HONORING DANIEL BARAJAS

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, the first gentleman I want to talk about is Daniel Barajas, the executive director of the Young American Dreamers.

Daniel Barajas was born in Winter Haven, Florida, to a family of migrant

workers. Growing up, he worked in the orange groves of Florida. There, he witnessed firsthand how farmworkers were exposed to dangerous pesticides while working for poverty wages. He also learned about the long-term effects of failed immigration policies, seeing his own father be deported during a local operation.

As a teenager, Daniel saw his friends join gangs to survive poverty and defend themselves against deeply rooted racism within their communities. He joined this path but was dubbed "Lucky" because he survived.

Barajas dropped out of school in the ninth grade but earned his GED in 2001. During an incarceration in 2009, he noticed that inmates had no access to books or to reading glasses. It was then that Daniel founded the Library of Hope to collect books and reading glasses to donate to inmates.

Daniel's younger sister, Maria Isabel, founded the Young American Dreamers, YAD, in 2010 to help local immigrant youth. Maria Isabel passed away in a car accident, tragically, in 2012, and to honor her legacy, Daniel joined YAD and was voted executive director in 2013.

Barajas also continues to fundraise for annual scholarships to local students and participates in philanthropic events in the community.

Daniel now speaks at high schools across Polk County, talks to students about his life, and shows them that one is not defined by their past, and that breaking down barriers is possible.

He also closely works with the Polk County Supervisor of Elections Office to help register voters, increase voter turnout, and distribute clemency applications to help felons restore their civil rights.

Daniel is an example of one who could turn their life around and benefit the community as a whole, and he works with the Mexican Consulate in Orlando to do community workshops to teach immigrant families of their constitutional rights.

Thank you, Daniel, for your contributions.

HONORING ERICKA GOMEZ-TEJEDA

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next is Ericka Gomez-Tejeda with Vamos4PR, Florida chapter. She is the civic engagement coordinator at 32BJ SEIU.

Ericka Gomez-Tejeda came from Colombia to the United States with her mom when she was 8 years old. Moved by her lifelong commitment to her birth country, Ericka moved to Medellin, Colombia, in 2009 and began a master's in theology.

Upon her return to the U.S. 2 years later, she moved to Florida and was elected vice president of SEIU Local 1199 United Health Care Workers East for the Florida nursing home division, representing 11,000 nursing home workers in the State.

In 2014, under the leadership of 32BJ President Hector Figueroa, Ericka returned to the Local 32BJ as deputy director of the 12,000-member New York

City security division, leading the field of operation for the division's first citywide contracts.

In 2016, Ericka moved back to Florida and became the 32BJ civic engagement coordinator and organizer of Vamos4PR, Florida division. With 40 percent of the Orange County Public Schools community speaking primarily Spanish, Vamos4PR parents, teachers, students, and organizations successfully worked with the Orange County Public Schools to ensure English-learning parents get information, orientations, and translation.

The coalition is currently focusing on offering immediate lifesaving resources to Puerto Rico and the cancellation of crippling debt, while working locally to open doors for the newly arrived Puerto Ricans to our region so they can use their knowledge and skills to integrate and contribute to the local economy and society from the day they arrive.

HONORING ESTEBAN GARCES

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to highlight Esteban Garces, Florida State director of Mi Familia Vota.

Esteban directs the Florida operation of Mi Familia Vota, managing strategy, operations, local policy development, campaigns, civic engagement, organizing efforts, and nonpartisan electoral work.

Esteban's career was set in motion at an early age as a victim of landlord abuse. Continued exposure to immigration, education, and racial injustices spurred his interest in social justice. He began his career in social justice organizing, and then electoral organizing.

He joined Mi Familia Vota in 2015 to continue working to create positive change. He was previously the immigration campaign director for SEIU Local 615.

HONORING FRANK LOPEZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Frank Lopez of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Central Florida.

Frank Lopez is the president of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando. Lopez is passionate about what he does, and nothing is more fulfilling to him than being part of a team with similar interests of an organization that is philanthropic and mission driven, and that values and pays tribute to those communities he serves.

Lopez has been successful in creating substantive underwriting support to develop and sustain innovative youth learning and entrepreneurship services. These programs have produced an impressive array of community-building benefits, such as workforce readiness and leadership development, youth entrepreneurship experimental training camps, mentoring and coaching programs, community-based technology, and wealth-building programs.

Lopez served as a member of the U.S. Hispanic Council on Federal Employment that advises the Director of the

U.S. Office of Personnel Management on strategies for improving access of Latinos to the Federal workforce.

Lopez has also served as a founding member of the National Hispanic Outreach Advisory Council, established by Intuit Corporation, focusing on diversity and inclusion, and expanding penetration of equitable tax filing practices within growing Latino communities across the country.

Lopez is also a former president and CEO of the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Foundation, developing strategic services to Latino entrepreneurs from across the Nation.

Throughout his career, Frank has served several philanthropic and social service governing boards, most recently with SourceAmerica, an organization created by Congress that manages over \$2.5 billion in Federal employment-producing contracts administered locally by affiliated nonprofit agencies across the United States and Puerto Rico.

HONORING INGRID MORFA

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Ingrid Morfa, immigrant, attorney, and activist, a leader in immigration law in central Florida.

Ingrid Morfa is an attorney and first-generation American. Her parents migrated from the Dominican Republic in the 1970s.

As a mother of four, she is a firm believer that educating our community and helping those in need will make the United States a better place for her children and grandchildren for years to come.

Her studies at Harvard University, Barry University School of Law, Cambridge College in the U.K., Kaplan University, and the New York City of Technology College have equipped Ingrid Morfa to help those around her.

As a member of the National Caribbean Leadership Team and the Democratic Hispanic Caucus of Florida, an advocate for domestic violence prevention with Nuevo Sendero, and an attorney who assisted more than 2,000 naturalization applicants and dozens of green card applicants who are victims of domestic violence and crime at no cost, she has shown a devotion to the community that is only surpassed by her love that she has for her family.

HONORING JIMMY TORRES

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Jimmy Torres, community organizer and activist, and also a major member of the SEIU union.

Jimmy Torres Velez grew up in Puerto Rico, where he went to public school. After he finished his bachelor's degree in labor relations at the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus, he went to work with migrant families in southern New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Since then, he has worked for various unions in many States and in Puerto Rico. In those years he has held various positions, including trustee, secretary-treasurer, organizing director, and AFL-CIO State director.

As part of his work, he has created and developed relationships with various Puerto Rican communities. After years organizing public and private sector employees, Jimmy organized and managed the State legislative office for SEIU in Puerto Rico and cooperated with the establishment of the legislative coordinating body for the AARP as well.

After moving to Florida to help with retired members of the Service Employees International Union, he became an activist of the Puerto Rican community and Latino community overall.

To improve the Latino representation in our area, he organized and coordinated the Boricua Vota movement. This movement is a nonpartisan educational and mobilization tool to improve activism and civic engagement and participation of Puerto Ricans in the political process. Jimmy also organized and became president of the Puerto Rico Action Initiative.

To respond to Hurricane Irma, Jimmy has helped to organize a coordinated group called Aid, Support, and Help Coordinating Group, otherwise known as CASA. When Maria devastated the island, CASA galvanized enthusiasm and desire of the Puerto Rican community in central Florida to help their fellow compatriots—my fellow compatriots—on the island and has collected and has sent hundreds of thousands of dollars in goods and merchandise to Puerto Rico.

HONORING JORGE ESTEVEZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Jorge Estevez, WFTV news anchor and journalist in Orlando.

Jorge Estevez is an anchor for the evening newscast of Eyewitness News at 10 p.m. on WRDQ TV 27. He also anchors and reports newscasts on WFTV Channel 9.

Jorge first came to WFTV in 2001 and covered the attacks of 9/11 and how they impacted central Florida's tourism industry.

During the next 5 years as an anchor and reporter for WFTV and WRDQ, Jorge worked on major news affecting the various counties that make up our central Florida community. Jorge anchored several major local stories, including the severe hurricane season of 2004, during which several storms impacted the Orlando area.

Since his return to central Florida, Jorge has been sent to cover major stories. His most recent trip was to Atlanta, where he interviewed Ronny Ahmed, one of three students injured when a shooter stormed the campus of Florida State University in 2014 and started firing at random.

The son of Cuban immigrants, Jorge is from West New York, New Jersey, where he graduated from Rutgers University, like myself, with a dual degree in journalism and communication. Now he is glad to be back in central Florida, where he enjoys the change of seasons each year. He enjoys the warm weather because it gives him a chance to leave

the gym to take his 5-mile runs outdoors, where he can really break a sweat.

Thank you, Jorge, for your contributions.

HONORING JOSEPHINE BALZAC, ESQUIRE

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Josephine Balzac, Esquire, attorney, writer, and professor at Rollins College, specializing in environmental law.

Josephine M. Balzac is currently a visiting assistant professor in the Department of Business, teaching in the social entrepreneurship major. She has had the honor of being part of Rollins College since 2014.

Her greatest honor is receiving two teaching awards from the students: a student government association's Outstanding Faculty Award, and the Walter E. Barden Distinguished Teaching Award. Throughout each of her classes, she makes sure to engage with the local community by bringing her legal professionals and organizations as guest speakers.

Professor Balzac is a licensed attorney admitted to practice law in Florida and the U.S. District Court Middle District of Florida.

In May of 2017, the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, FAMU, College of Law presented her law office with the Distinguished Alumni Award and Professional Excellence Award, Solo Practitioner.

She is also a community rights staff attorney for the Center for Earth Jurisprudence.

During the summer, she is an adjunct law professor at Barry University School of Law, teaching sustainability in business.

Professor Balzac previously worked as an associate attorney at an AV-rated trial litigation firm and worked for a food safety regulatory consulting group.

Ms. Balzac is actively involved in the local community, frequently educating and advocating as an avid speaker on environmental justice, sustainable development, climate change, human rights, food, and social justice issues.

Thank you, Josephine, for your contributions.

HONORING LUIS PASTRANA

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Luis Pastrana, attorney, activist, and professional at Ana G. Mendez University.

Luis Pastrana was born in Puerto Rico. He received his bachelor's degree in business administration from the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus, while simultaneously being commissioned from the Army ROTC as a second lieutenant in the artillery branch.

He taught at the Puerto Rico Junior College of Dona Ana G. Mendez, and many years later came full circle and is now a distinguished professor at the Orlando campus of the Ana G. Mendez University system.

□ 1915

Luis served in the Army for 20 years. He was with the Vietnamese irregular

forces as an adviser for 2 years in the mountains of Vietnam, as well as an adviser to the Spanish Army for a couple of years in Spain and in many other parts of the globe. After retirement, he began to pursue law at the University of Puerto Rico.

He has worked in banking as vice president for investments of the Cooperative Bank, as a general manager for a newspaper in San Juan; he was a candidate for Mayor of Guaynabo, director of finances for the Popular Democratic Party, trial attorney and senior partner of the law firm Pastrana, Perez, Martinez and Quevedo, executive director of the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration for the Southeast of the United States, and now professor of law of the bachelor's degree in criminal justice for the Orlando campus of the Ana G. Mendez University. He published five books, all honoring his Puerto Rican roots.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Luis for his contributions.

HONORING NANCY ALVAREZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Nancy Alvarez. Nancy was part of the first Hispanic anchor team on an English language TV station in central Florida. Along with Jorge Estevez, her coanchor, she brought the 10 o'clock news on Channel 27 TV to number one for the first time in more than 10 years.

Alvarez joined the team at the ABC affiliate in May 2010 and currently co-anchors Eyewitness News This Morning, alongside Jamie Homes. She is the daughter of Cuban immigrants and was born and raised in south Florida, although she considers Orlando a second home. Alvarez has spent most of her journalism career in central Florida, where she has been front and center for every major news event in the last 15-plus years.

She spent years covering the space program at Kennedy Space Center, and was also in central Florida for Hurricanes Charlie, Frances, and Jean, reporting nonstop during the now-infamous 2004 hurricane season.

In recent years, Alvarez was a central part of her station's coverage of the Pulse Nightclub shooting tragedy and covered various stories during the community's journey toward healing. She was also on the air for continuous coverage of Hurricane Irma and traveled to Puerto Rico to report on the devastating impacts of Hurricane Maria.

Alvarez is also a graduate of Florida's Atlantic University, with degrees in communications and history. She has dedicated her career to giving a voice to people in need and using honest journalism as a tool for community service.

Alvarez, a mother of two who is married to a news photographer, has dedicated her life to honoring the sacrifices made by her parents when they came to the U.S. from Cuba. It is her hope that her life, career, and impact have made the hardships they have endured worth it.

HONORING ORLANDO ROLON

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Orlando Rolon. Orlando Rolon was born in Bayamon, Puerto Rico, and has lived in central Florida since 1977. After high school, he served in the United States Marines Reserves for 4 years.

In 1992, Orlando Rolon was hired by the Orlando Police Department. In 1997, Officer Rolon was promoted to sergeant, and, in 1999, he was selected as the first full-time bilingual public information officer in the history of the Orlando Police Department.

In 2003, Sergeant Rolon was promoted to lieutenant. He served as the liaison to the mayor and, during that time, was named adviser for Hispanic Affairs for the City of Orlando. In 2010, he was selected as the special operations traffic enforcement section commander.

In 2013, Lieutenant Rolon was promoted to the rank of captain. He served as a patrol division commander and the crisis negotiation team commander. Prior to his appointment as deputy chief, he was serving as the professional standards division commander, which included internal affairs, planning, fiscal, and training under his command. In 2013, he was named as one of the 25 Most Influential Hispanics in central Florida.

In 2014, Mayor Buddy Dyer appointed Captain Orlando Rolon to the rank of deputy chief.

In 2016, Deputy Chief Rolon was then assigned to patrol services bureau commander, with nearly 400 of the department's sworn staff officers under his command.

Deputy Chief Rolon is a graduate of the Southern Police Institute Command Officers Development Course, the FBI National Academy Session 263, and the Major Cities Chiefs Association Police Executive Leadership Institute IV session.

Deputy Chief Orlando Rolon is a member of the FBI National Academy Associates, Florida Police Chiefs Association, International Association of chiefs of Police, Major Cities Chiefs Association, and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chief Rolon for his contributions.

HONORING ROXY SANTIAGO

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Roxy Santiago, board of directors for the LGBT Center of Central Florida and board of the Pulse Foundation.

Roxy Santiago was born in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, and has lived in Orlando for over 30 years. Roxy has worked for over 12 years at Walt Disney World in numerous management roles and had the privilege of being a personal tour guide for former Presidents and other high-profile individuals.

She was a partner with Phish Phest Entertainment for 10 years. The organization held dozens of events, raising more than \$150,000 for charity over the past decade.

Roxy was Tri-Chair Federal Club Steering Committee member for Human Rights Campaign, in 2006 through 2009; and in 2014 to present, she is currently serving on the Web Communications Steering Committee and Community Engagement.

In 2014, she was honored with being selected among 50 distinguished local LGBT leaders by entering her biography and accomplishments in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and here it is happening again.

In 2015, she became a member of the Democratic Hispanic Caucus of Central Florida and assists in their web communications. In 2015, Roxy also became a volunteer at the American Red Cross of Central Florida. In the aftermath of Pulse, she was hired by the Red Cross in the position of community partnership.

In 2016, she was selected by the National Human Rights Campaign, with 19 other women around the U.S., to attend a workshop for Women and Leadership: Equality for the 21st Century. In 2016, Roxy became a board member for the LGBT Center of Central Orlando and serves as their secretary on the board.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Roxy for her contributions.

HONORING TIRSO MORENO

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Tirso Moreno. Tirso was born in Mexico and came to this country in 1971, with his family to do farm work. He is currently the director of the Farmworker Association of Florida.

In 1982, he became the lead organizer for the Farmworker Project of the Office for Farm Ministry, during which time he and several other farmworkers initiated the Farmworker Association. Under his leadership as general coordinator, the association has grown from a local to statewide organization with over 10,000 members.

Tirso is a cofounder and board member of the Farmworker Health and Safety Institute and serves on the boards of Southern Partners Fund, Domestic Fair Trade Association, National Immigrant Farming Initiative, and the Rural Coalition. He also advocates for farmworkers' and immigrants' rights in national and international meetings.

The Farmworker Association of Florida currently has five offices throughout central and south Florida. The mission of FWAF is to build power among farmworker and rural, low-income communities to respond to and gain control over the social, political, economic, workplace, health, and environmental justice issues that impact their lives.

FWAF's core strategy is to help farmworkers realize their power to be effective agents of social change and personal change by: validating and strengthening the experience and understanding of farmworkers; building farmworkers' capacity to participate in decisionmaking processes that affect

their lives; and raising consciousness about and advocating for farmworkers' and immigrants' rights.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Tirso for his contributions.

HONORING WILLIAM DIAZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor William Diaz, Spanish radio host. Identified as a consistent community leader and insightful journalist, William Diaz's passion to help fellow citizens in life's struggles has been evidenced in the last 28 years of his residency in central Florida.

William's activism in favor of Latin-American political development has granted him daily recognition with most of the Latin-American community in central Florida who listen to him and read his articles.

A native of Cumana, and raised in Caracas, Venezuela, he developed a natural way to start friendships and show loyalty and support for all humanitarian causes.

William was the recipient of a scholarship that brought him to the United States to obtain his postgraduate diploma. In 1976, the University of Texas at Austin gave him a master's degree in mass communications.

William served as a Venezuelan diplomatic official in Europe, when he was designated as general coordinator of the GMA Foundation and the educational attache to the Venezuelan Embassy in Paris, France.

Founder and president of several community organizations in his native Venezuela, in 1989, William brought all of his experience to the U.S. Since then, he has been very active within the Latino community, specifically advising and counseling new nonprofit organizations.

At this time, William is full-time with his radio show, "Cara a Cara con William Diaz," which broadcasts in 18 different counties, founder of Casa de Venezuela, 15 years ago, which gathered most of the Venezuelans in central Florida, and founder of Made in Venezuela Business Club, dedicated to developing networking and promotions of products and services for Venezuelan businessmen and professionals, and current executive secretary of MUD Central Florida, the political organization that hosts and coordinates most of Venezuela's opposition political parties.

HONORING ZORAIDA RIOS-ANDINO

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Zoraida Rios-Andino, president of Mission Boricua.

Zoraida Rios-Andino has been a resident of Orlando, Florida, for 17 years. She has been very active in promoting cultural, social, and historic events in the Puerto Rican community. Zoraida is currently president and founder of Mission Boricua, an organization dedicated to history and civic engagement of the Puerto Rican community. Zoraida supervised the creation and promotion of Mission Boricua's outreach efforts.

Zoraida has been part of the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women,

Orlando chapter; United Front 436, National Boricua Human Rights Network, Orlando chapter; and Asociacion Borinquena. She is currently a board member for Speak Up Florida, and a member and cofounder of The Justice Project Coalition of Central Florida.

In addition, she was an English as a second language instructor, and worked as a personnel administrator for many years. Zoraida was also program coordinator for ALSE, where she assisted hundreds of high school students pursuing postsecondary education.

Zoraida has also led the movement to have the Florida Legislature pass a law in 2014, to put a honorary plaque along Semoran Boulevard in recognition of Rico Piccard, the late civil rights hero in central Florida.

Zoraida has received numerous awards for her community service, like the Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women; Roberto Clemente Community Service Award; Latino History Society President's Award; Outstanding Membership Award from the Asociacion Borinquena; Community Service Award from the office of Congressman Alan Grayson; 2014 Florida State Proclamation recipient from State Representative Victor Torres; Coqui de Oro Award from La Casa de Puerto Rico; the Rico Piccard Award from the Orange County Democratic Party, and more.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Zoraida for her contributions to central Florida.

I am excited to be able to have this opportunity to talk about these heroes—so many who are symbolic of the hardworking Hispanic Americans in central Florida who help out with everyone from our poor, to our civil rights, to education, to the news, to politics, to our environment, to families, to so many important issues that matter to Hispanics across central Florida and across our Nation.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 4006. A bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BOST, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LONG, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LANCE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4007. A bill to revise the quorum requirement for the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4008. A bill making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 4009. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States and title 28, United States Code, to enhance compliance with requests for information pursuant to legislative power under Article I of the Constitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 4011. A bill to amend chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, relating to average fuel economy standards for automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CORREA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4012. A bill to require a National Intelligence Estimate on Iranian proxy forces,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 4013. A bill making appropriations for the Bureau of the Census for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 31, United States Code, to require publication of information relating to regulatory conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4015. A bill to improve the quality of proxy advisory firms for the protection of investors and the U.S. economy, and in the public interest, by fostering accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and competition in the proxy advisory firm industry; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGRO (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the recoupment of separation pay, special separation benefits, and voluntary separation incentive payments from members of the Armed Forces who subsequently receive disability compensation under laws administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs and to impose limitations on the authority of the Secretary of Defense to recoup such pay from members who subsequently receive military retired or retainer pay; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 4017. A bill to authorize the President to take actions to ensure Israel is prepared for all contingencies if Iran seeks to develop a nuclear weapon after expiration of certain provisions of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 4018. A bill to provide for a 3-day waiting period before a person may receive a handgun, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. LOVE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4019. A bill to provide grants to States and Indian tribes to reform their criminal justice system to encourage the replacement of the use of payment of secured money bail as a condition of pretrial release in criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4020. A bill to amend the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 relating to the distribution of food; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide funding for public

transportation services offered by high-performing public and private systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 4022. A bill to implement a strategic approach for providing foreign assistance in order to end preventable child and maternal deaths globally within a generation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 4023. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States educational agencies and local educational agencies to support, develop, and implement formal and informal engineering education programs in elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4024. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and title 39, United States Code, to provide the United States Postal Service the authority to mail alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4025. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand to all firearms the requirement that Federal firearms licensees report sales of 2 or more handguns to the same unlicensed person within 5 consecutive business days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4026. A bill to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 4027. A bill to require global economic and political pressure to support diplomatic denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, including through the imposition of sanctions with respect to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and any enablers of the activities of that Government, and to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. GRIMALVA, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 567. A resolution expressing support for the physician assistant (PA) profession and the designation of the week of October 6

through 12, 2017, as “National PA Week”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 568. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the justices of the United States Supreme Court should make themselves subject to the existing and operative ethics guidelines set out in the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, or should promulgate their own code of conduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 4006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government’s ability to accept the original Smithsonian donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 9; Article III, Section 1; and Article III, Section 2, clause 2

of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority to over the federal courts. In addition, the Necessary and Proper Clause of Article I, section 8 grants Congress the authority to issue subpoenas incident to its legislative power and require compliance with such subpoenas.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 4011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, To Regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 4012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article 1 states “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law”

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 4016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 4017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to “provide for the common Defence”, “to raise and support Armies”, and “to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces” as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 4018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, subsection 3:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1; and

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 4022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 4025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 4026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(2) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, , as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 80: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 140: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 166: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 173: Mr. CORREA, Mr. ALLEN, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 176: Mr. BABIN.

- H.R. 184: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 296: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 350: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 377: Mr. FASO, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 398: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 450: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 501: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 535: Mr. BUDD, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 545: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 664: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 681: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 750: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 785: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 795: Mr. WELCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 807: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 919: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 936: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 960: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 964: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1066: Mr. COFFMAN and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 1111: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1133: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1164: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1223: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1438: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1456: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 1472: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1475: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1478: Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SRES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1494: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1542: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1552: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1555: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1563: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1575: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1585: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1626: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1645: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1651: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1699: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1762: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1779: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1784: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1824: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1825: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1832: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1861: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1865: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 1874: Ms. NORTON and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1896: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1920: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1949: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1953: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1999: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2010: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 2044: Mr. NEAL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2069: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2095: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2121: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2226: Mr. COLE and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2228: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 2230: Mr. PAULSEN and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2282: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2285: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2294: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2295: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2310: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2401: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2418: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2465: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2482: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YODER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2499: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2501: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2589: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2623: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2690: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2740: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2777: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2793: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2801: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2841: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2851: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2856: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2862: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2901: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2902: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2909: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2920: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2938: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2954: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3010: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3030: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3032: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3042: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3186: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3227: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3255: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3273: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3274: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 3282: Mr. HURD.
H.R. 3307: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3349: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3352: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3363: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 3452: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 3487: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3497: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3520: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3591: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3596: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3632: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3671: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3680: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3730: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3731: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3758: Mr. HECK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 3762: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3784: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3820: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 3822: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3832: Mr. LATTA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BUCHSHON.
H.R. 3847: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3852: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3871: Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3875: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3879: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3885: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3889: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3897: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3898: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3917: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3936: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3947: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3948: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3957: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3962: Mr. NADLER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3968: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3969: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3999: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BERA, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4001: Mr. KATKO.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. COSTA.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H. Res. 90: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H. Res. 129: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 142: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 257: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 283: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 327: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 529: Mr. DENT.
H. Res. 555: Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 560: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PALLONE.