The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Dr. J. Todd Mullins, Christ Fellowship Church, Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thank You for hearing our prayers today. We are humbled that today, as we call out to You, You listen to us. We ask that You bless the Members of Congress as they lead our great Nation. Grant them wisdom for the decisions they face, and may we remain dependent upon You, never forgetting Psalm 33:12 that says, “Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.”

We pray for those in Texas, in Florida, in Puerto Rico, and in the Caribbean, who are recovering from the devastating hurricanes. Give them peace and courage as they rebuild their lives. Bless the first responders and those serving the people impacted by these storms. Grant them Your strength for their assignments.

Guide our President. Give him clear vision to steer our Nation during these troubled days, and grant strength to the Members of this House as they represent the people across our land.

We ask this in the name of our Savior, Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO 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 PASTOR J. TODD MULLINS

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today especially pleased to have had my personal pastor, Todd Mullins, give our opening prayer this morning to the House of Representatives.

I am honored to welcome Pastor Mullins onto the floor of the House of Representatives as our guest chaplain this morning, and I thank him for sharing those very important words with our colleagues and that scripture as well.

Todd Mullins is the senior pastor of Christ Fellowship in Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, where he served since his father founded the church in 1984.

I can say a great deal about my friend, Pastor Todd Mullins, but the most important thing that I could say about him is that he is a man of God, and that he works every single day to try to help and change lives.

I think that is the most important thing any one of us can do. That is why I am so proud to call him a friend. He is a person who has devoted his life to working on the lives of others.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

SNAP: 40 YEARS OF PROVIDING NUTRITION TO AMERICANS

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, tomorrow marks the 40th anniversary of the Food Stamp Act of 1977, which was a landmark bill that made the program more effective and more efficient.

Today, we no longer refer to it as food stamps, but as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. In 40 years, there have been numerous changes and updates, but the goal remains the same: to end hunger in America.

SNAP lessens the effects of poverty on some of our most vulnerable citizens. The results are proven. According to the Census Bureau, SNAP lifted 5 million Americans, including 2.2 million children, out of poverty in 2012 alone. SNAP generates $1.80 in economic activity for every $1 in new SNAP benefits.

In 2013, SNAP payment accuracy was 96.8 percent, which was a historic high.
Participating in SNAP for 6 months decreased food insecurity up to 10 percent, including households with children.

Mr. Speaker, for over four decades, the program has become more effective, more efficient, and more modern. I look forward to continuing our work to improve SNAP, to serve those in need, and to provide pathways out of poverty.

SUPPORT THE DREAM ACT
(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in calling for a vote on H.R. 3440, the clean Dream Act, a bipartisan, bicameral bill with 200 cosponsors in the House.

It builds upon the great success of DACA, which opened the door for nearly 800,000 DREAMers who had come forward, passed background checks, and have been granted permission to live and work legally in America without fear of deportation.

They kept their promise to the Nation they know and love, and our government must honor its commitment to protect them. The faith community and business leaders are implored Congress to pass the Dream Act. Polling shows that the American people strongly believe and support the DREAMAct. Eighty-six percent of Americans support a right to residency for undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children, according to a recent ABC News/Washington Post poll.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud nation of many immigrants from around the world, the Dream Act honors our history and our heritage. I thank my Republican colleagues who have signed on, and I urge all others to join us. It is the right thing to do for our young people, especially our country. Support H.R. 3440, the Dream Act.

RECOGNIZING HOPE THAT BINDS
(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hope That Binds, an organization based out of Carlisle County, Kentucky, that aids in domestic and international adoption services.

The organization was recently recognized as a 2017 Angels in Adoption honoree. Wendy Davis-Wilson, Jeff and Benita Davis, and Brooke Kelly have all dedicated their time to bridging the gaps in the complicated adoption process. We are very thankful for the dedication of our adopted parents themselves, have a sincere passion for ensuring resources are available for families wishing to adopt.

Through Hope That Binds, a network of loving families is growing and expanding constantly. To date, more than 40 families have been assisted through the organization’s fundraisers and grant programs.

In addition, I would like to recognize Josh and Mandy Thurman, who were also selected as Angels in Adoption honorees. After a 2-year adoption process starting in 2013, the Thurmans brought their son, Townes, home to Simpson County, from Ethiopia. Families like the Thurmans make a major difference in the lives of children who need loving families.

On behalf of the First District of Kentucky, I congratulate both families in their efforts to make the dream of a family a reality for children in need.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, here we are 9 months into the year, and the Republican-led Congress has zero major legislative accomplishments to show for it. While Democrats continue to offer an agenda that gives Americans a better deal, really a better life, Republicans are continually obsessed with their Republican healthcare bill, this repeal and replace with.

Recently, they have had to pull back again from their Graham-Cassidy approach to this. Why? Because it means less care, less coverage, higher premiums, higher copays. It is bad policy. We ought to be focusing on what we can do to make it right to fix the problems we see in healthcare, not this obsession to check a political box and repeal healthcare for the American people.

Meanwhile, there is no infrastructure plan. America’s roads and bridges are falling apart. There is nothing on the floor of the House to address that—something the American people all agree we need to do. There has been nothing done to make sure that 800,000 DREAMers are not deported away. They have a tax plan that rewards 5,400 American families with a quarter of a trillion dollars in tax breaks. This is the wrong direction for America.

RECOGNIZING BICENTENNIAL OF PETERSBURG, INDIANA
(Mr. BUCHSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a notable Hoo- shier milestone, the bicentennial of the city of Petersburg, Indiana. Located in Pike County, this southern Indiana community was settled on land donated by Peter Brenton in 1817, and was established just 1 year later after Indi- ana had become a State.

From its earliest days as a pioneer settlement near the Buffalo Trace and the White River, Petersburg is today a vibrant community and the seat of the county government. Blessed with an abundance of natural resources, it is a lead-er in Indiana’s power generation industry.

While rightfully proud of its favorite son, baseball great Gil Hodges, Peters- burg is squarely focused on a promising future. It boasts wonderful, new downtown housing; a new downtown public li-brary; and just dedicated its first fire department. It looks forward to exciting development opportunities along I-69.

I proudly salute the city of Peters- burg; its mayor, R.C. Kilipsch; and its loyal citizens on this historic occasion.

RECOGNIZING MIDDLETOWN POLICE OFFICER MEGAN FREER
(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, over the course of several weeks this summer, our Nation focused on my district as the tragic news of missing teenagers led the news.

My heart goes out to the families of those boys and our entire community touched by this tragedy. In that dark- ness, we saw the best of our commu-nity shine through: neighbors in pray-er; local businesses engaged in inves-tigation efforts; and through it all, the commitment and the dedication of our local law enforcement officers.

One such officer, Middletown Town-ship Police Officer Megan Freer, was recently recognized at the National Liberty Museum in Philadelphia for
her investigatory work. Middletown Police Chief Joe Bartorilla noted well: Megan exemplifies our law enforcement who are committed to doing the very best job they can, day in and day out to protect and safeguard our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Officer Freer and the entire law enforcement community in Bucks County, to include District Attorney Matt Weintraub, who committed to this investigation. Through their efforts, our community can begin to heal from this terrible tragedy that we suffered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

HURRICANES HARVEY, IRMA, AND MARIA EDUCATION RELIEF ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1866) to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

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 "Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. ALLOCATION AND USE OF CAMPUS-BASED HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFECTED AREA.—The term "affected area" means an area for which the President declared a major disaster or an emergency under section 401 or 501, respectively, of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191) as a result of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, Hurricane Maria, Tropical Storm Harvey, Tropical Storm Irma, or Tropical Storm Maria.

(2) AFFECTED STUDENT.—The term "affected student" means an individual who has applied for or received student financial assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), and who—

(A) was enrolled or accepted for enrollment on August 25, 2017, at an institution of higher education that is located in an affected area, but whose parent or parents resided or was employed on August 25, 2017, in an affected area; or

(B) suffered direct economic hardship as a direct result of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, Hurricane Maria, Tropical Storm Harvey, Tropical Storm Irma, or Tropical Storm Maria, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) WAIVERS.—

(1) WAIVER OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding sections 413(a)(2) and 443(b)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b–2(a)(2) and 1067–52(b)(5)), with respect to funds made available for award years 2016–2017 and 2017–2018—

(A) in the case of an institution of higher education that is located in an affected area, the Secretary shall waive the requirement that a participating institution of higher education provide a non-Federal share to match Federal funds provided to the institution for the programs authorized pursuant to subpart 3 of part A and part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b–3(d) and 1087–52(d)), with respect to funds made available for award years 2016–2017 and 2017–2018;

(B) in the case of an institution of higher education that is not located in an affected area but has enrolled or accepted for enrollment any affected students, the Secretary may waive the non-Federal share requirement described in subparagraph (A) after considering the institution’s student population and existing resources.

(2) WAIVER OF REALLOCATION RULES.—

(A) AUTHORITY TO REALLOCATE.—Notwithstanding sections 413(d) and 442(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b–3(d) and 1087–52(d)), the Secretary shall—

(i) reallocate any funds returned under such section 413D or 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that were allocated to institutions of higher education for award year 2016–2017 to an institution of higher education that is eligible under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) waive the allocation reduction for award year 2018–2019 for an institution of higher education that is eligible under subparagraph (B) returning more than 10 percent of its allocation under such section 413D or 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for award year 2017–2018.

(B) INSTITUTIONS ELIGIBLE FOR REALLOCATION.—An institution of higher education is eligible under this subparagraph if the institution—

(i) participates in the program for which excess allocations are being reallocated; and

(ii) either—

(I) is located in an affected area; or

(II) has enrolled or accepted for enrollment any affected students in award year 2017–2018.

(C) BASIS OF REALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall—

(i) determine the manner in which excess allocations will be reallocated pursuant to this paragraph; and

(ii) give preference in making reallocations to institutions that are part of an institution of higher education located in an affected area.

(D) ADDITIONAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may waive or modify any statutory or regulatory provision relating to the reallocation of excess allocations under subpart 3 of part A and part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b et seq. and 1087–51 et seq.), in order to ensure that...
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Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 533, I call up the bill (H.R. 2792) to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. NOEM) and the gentleman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) each will control 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2792, the Control of Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017. In 1996, Congress and President Clinton worked together to reform welfare and reignite the American Dream for families in need.

Aligned with this goal was a provision prohibiting a range of welfare benefits—including Supplemental Security Income—to fugitive felons and violators of probation and parole because safety net programs need to be protected from abuse so they can remain in place for those individuals who need them.

Individuals who evade justice violates the social contract that grants them this safety net. Simply put, it is incoherent and self-defeating that a nation of laws would pay a wanted person and prolong their flight from justice. Unfortunately, due to a number of factors involving the courts, these provisions have been watered down in recent years and rendered ineffectual.

Through the CUFF Act, Congress can stand up, once again, on behalf of our communities and affirm what every participant in our society should understand: if you have an outstanding warrant for your arrest, you have an obligation to face justice or clear your name.

This legislation not only stops benefits from going to those who are not following the law, but it also helps law enforcement apprehend those suspects. A 2007 report by SSA’s inspector general found that this policy aided law enforcement in finding almost 60,000 individuals who were evading arrest for outstanding warrants. In fact, law enforcement thinks this policy is so effective that the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs’ Association have expressed support for the CUFF Act.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that this commonsense bill is endorsed by law enforcement and has a proven track record of success, I anticipate that my colleagues may try to convince you otherwise. I have heard many of their arguments when the Ways and Means Committee considered this bill and when the Rules Committee also considered this bill.

So let’s take each of those concerns in turn.

Some may say that this bill would only apply to those individuals with felony warrants. Some may say that this bill would only apply to those individuals with outstanding warrants.

In reality, SSA already has a wide authority to exempt individuals if the alleged offense is nonviolent and not drug related.

Some may say that this bill would throw beneficiaries off the rolls with no warning. In reality, the SSA provides beneficiaries advance notice of 35 days before suspending SSI benefits, and there is a robust appeal process for recipients who have had their benefits suspended.

Some may say this bill is burdensome to law enforcement. In reality, this bill is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs’ Association because it helps them do their job to locate individuals.

Finally, some may raise concerns that it targets minority populations caught up in overcriminalization or overly harsh sentencing. To those concerns, I say that these issues are absolutely important, and I look forward to us having those conversations about criminal justice reforms here in Congress. However, that conversation is outside the scope of the legislation that we have before us today.

My legislation does not speak to the content of a warrant, just the fact that one exists. The decision to grant a warrant is made by a judge in a court of law, not by the Social Security Administration. It should not be the duty of the American taxpayer to subsidize individuals who are wanted by the police.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, if an individual has an outstanding warrant, it must be addressed and cleared. This bill does nothing to change that.

Under my bill, nobody will lose their SSI benefits because of misdemeanor offenses such as merely having a parking ticket, petty theft, or even evading the police. This bill stops payments to individuals who have outstanding warrants for felonies. These are crimes like murder, rape, and kidnapping. It also stops payments to individuals with probation and parole violations, limiting their ability to evade arrest.

Supplemental Security Income is a lifeline to those who are in need. We must ensure we are not further facilitating criminal activity in communities that are all too often already struggling.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time that we are spending to consider this important legislation, and I appreciate the opportunity to stand in support of my bill today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my mother used to say: ‘‘If you have an outstanding warrant for your arrest, you have an obligation to face justice or clear your name.’’

The American taxpayer is asked to subsidize individuals with felony warrants. Some may say this bill targets people who have a failed policy. So let’s take each of those concerns in turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?
wrong is wrong if everybody is wrong. H.R. 2792 is wrong. It is cruel. It is discriminatory.

I strongly oppose this Republican effort to strip low-income seniors and those with severe disabilities of Supplemental Security Income benefits for SSI. I join in opposing with over 110 civil rights, disability, and aging advocates who have warned that H.R. 2792’s harsh cuts will discriminate based on age, race, ethnicity, ability, income, and will further criminalize poverty.

I also strongly oppose the majority’s decision to condition the reauthorization of our successful home visiting program on this bill’s harm to the elderly and infirm.

SSI is only available to people who are elderly, who are severely disabled, and who have little or no assets. The typical SSI recipient lives on less than $750 a month. So, by design, H.R. 2792 will only harm very poor, elderly, and disabled people. Within the population of active SSI recipients, approximately 83 percent are disabled, one-third are age 65 and older, and two-thirds are age 50 and older.

I reject proponents’ claims that this bill will only target fugitive felons. In reality, terminally ill patients who are not typically eligible for SSI are also terminally ill patients who do not have any assets. The majority’s terminology is not a justifiable means of distinguishing those who are eligible for SSI.

As an African-American man, I am very familiar with the decades of research documenting the racial-ethnic discrimination in our justice system. As an advocate for criminal justice reform, I know the dozens of studies documenting the faulty criminal justice data system on which benefit terminations will pivot solely because this bill removes due process by adjudication.

I reject proponents’ claim that only individuals charged with violent crimes or costly financial theft are affected by this bill. By undermining the constitutional presumption of innocence and depriving individuals of due process adjudication in a court of law, H.R. 2792 magnifies the deep inequities in our criminal justice system based on race, ethnicity, and income.
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There is strict enforcement of these standards, with over 70 percent of those who apply being denied.

What kind of person will they finance this child abuse prevention program from? Well, the 50-year-old man who had a 20-year-old daughter—this is a true case—that had been issued when he failed to show up for court.

Why did he do that? Shouldn’t he be punished?
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This legislation will take SSI bene-
fits from individuals and stop those payments to those who have felony ar-
rest warrants or who have violated their probation and parole.

I want to go through the process so that everyone recognizes that there is plenty of time for individuals to go through the appeal process. Notice is given if there is a warrant that they need to get rectified with the jurisdic-
tion that has authority. So let me step through this.

Step one is through the Office of the Inspector General. Law enforcement agencies give OIG information about individuals who have outstanding felony arrest warrants or who are vio-
lating conditions of probation or parole.

Then OIG compares this information to its computer files of individuals receiv-
ing these dollars or serving as rep-
resentative payees. If there is a match, OIG verifies the identity of the indi-
vidual, ensures that the warrants for the individual are still active, works with local law enforcement to attempt to locate the person, and then OIG re-
fers the individual to SSA to begin the sus-
pension process.

When this process gets to the Social Security Administration, SSA sends an advance notice to the individual. This notice proposes the suspension of ben-
efit payments and informs the indi-
vidual of their right to appeal the sus-
pension decision, payment continu-
ation, and the timeframe to take such actions after receiving the advance not-
tice.
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This notice includes why the SSA is sus-
pending benefits and where, why, and when the warrant was issued. If SSA finds out, through a data match, 35 days is given for the individual to protest. If the individual protests, SSA will not suspend benefits until it fig-
ures out if the individual qualifies for a benefit. If the SSA discovers the indi-
vidual does not appeal his or her advance notice, then the SSA will suspend the benefits.

If the individual does appeal and gives his or her advance notice and pro-
vides evidence for the payment con-
tinuation, the SSA verifies the evi-
dence and then continues the pay-
ments.

Other things that we should know about this legislation and what this in-
cludes is that warrants may only be re-
 solved in the issuing jurisdiction. Grounds for dismissal of a warrant in-
clude identity theft, administrative error, and the individual’s own move from the jurisdiction, especially if low income.

Warrants for misdemeanors remain warrants for misdemeanors and cannot become felonies. There is also latitude for the Commissioner to make deci-
sions in special areas where there may be something to be considered such as dementia or low-income abilities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been thor-
oughly vetted. We are making sure

that the only people who are denied their SSI benefits are those who have felony warrants for their arrest or have violated probation or parole and have not gotten straight with law enforce-
ment and rectified that past infraction.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gen-
tleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), an icon for human rights.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. For many years, I have been a proud member to serve on the Ways and Means Committee, the oldest com-
mittee in the U.S. Congress. Our com-
munity has a responsibility to put peo-
ple before politics. We have a commit-
ment to act in the best interest of all, not just a select few. Most impor-
tantly, we have a duty to protect and preserve the United States Consti-
tution.

Today, Mr. Speaker, it hurts my soul that our committee will pass a bill that attacks the constitutional prin-
ciple that you are innocent until prov-
en guilty.

Where is the reason? Where is the compassion? What is the purpose? How can you gamble with the livelihood of those who are most in need? How can we punish the sick, the disabled, and the elderly? How can we pass a bill that targets Latinos, African Ameri-
cans, and Native Americans? Mr. Speaker, how can you rob Bob to pay Paul?

Mr. Speaker, I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote “no” on this mean and spiteful bill. It should never have seen the light of day. The American people deserve better, much better. We can do better. This bill should not be on the floor of the House. It is not worthy of the paper that it is written on.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield my-
self such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I live in the State of South Dakota. I have some of the poorest counties in the Nation in my State, and they happen to be my Native American Tribes. They face 80 to 90 percent unemployment, poverty like no other place in the country, and they are isolated. They also have very high drug and crime rates.

In fact, we have seen a record number of murders in these communities, es-
pecially on the Pine Ridge Reservation, in this calendar year, and it is deeply discouraging and disheartening to me to think of someone who could have committed a murder in one of my commu-
nities in the State of South Dakota, that there is a felony warrant out for their arrest, and that we may not be able to find them. This bill will fix that situa-
tion.

If that individual is receiving SSI payments, that helps law enforcement locate those individuals who have gone out and committed crimes against in-
ocent people. Rape, murder, kidnap-
ping, they all happen in my Native
American Tribes, and this helps law enforcement find them and bring them to justice. It is one of the important things that this legislation will help us do in some of our most vulnerable communities.

I also recognize that the previous speaker talked about the fact that we need criminal justice reforms, and that is a very good debate that we should be having in Congress. But this is not the bill to talk about criminal justice reform because this is not germane to the discussion that we are having today.

I wanted to speak for a minute on what is good cause because there is latitude for good cause within statute today, and I think there is some confusion as to exactly how this bill would be interpreted when it is signed into law.

In some cases, the SSI will not suspend or seek an overpayment of payments for good cause exceptions. There are two types of good cause exceptions that already exist in statute. The mandatory good cause exception is the SAA cannot suspend payments if a court has found the individual not guilty or has dismissed charges. If a court has vacated the warrant or issued any similar exoneration, then they cannot suspend payments. They also cannot suspend payments if there is a mistaken identity due to identity fraud.

The other exception in statute today is discretionary good cause exceptions. The SSA may suspend benefits for mitigating circumstances under two options:

Option A is the individual must prove that the criminal offense was non-violent and not drug related. We also have that the individual has not been convicted of a felony crime since the warrant was issued, and the other point is that the law enforcement agency that issued the warrant reports that it will not act on the warrant. That is other exceptions for good cause.

Option B is the individual must prove all of these factors: if the criminal offense was non-violent and not drug related; the individual has not been convicted of a felony crime since the warrant was issued; the warrant is the existing warrant and was issued 10 or more years ago and the individual lacks the mental capacity to resolve the warrant, which includes those living in a nursing home or mental treatment facility.

So as we have listened to opponents of this bill talk, they have discussed all of these issues as to how these benefits could be taken away from individuals that are clearly covered by good cause exceptions that are already in statute, and those situations are not relevant to what we are having today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, MIECHV Program is an effective evidence-based program that I am proud to support because I know it results in healthier families and stronger communities, but I am shocked at the way Republicans are choosing to pay for it.

Instead of enacting commonsense tax changes that could easily raise the needed revenue, Republicans have reached to the bottom of the barrel to find vulnerable people to harm.

In order to come up with a way to pay for this bipartisan program, they are choosing to take Supplemental Security Income away from vulnerable seniors, low-income individuals, or those with disabilities; and they are doing it by maligning them as fugitives and felons just because they have an outstanding warrant. But the truth is a very different story.

The people who will be hurt by this bill are not hardened criminals. They haven’t even had their day in court yet. In fact, many may not even know about their warrants to police. We have decided that it is not worth pursuing. That is because the warrants are for small issues like writing a bad check or failing to appear for a hearing many years ago.

Worse, certain individuals are elderly, poor, or sick. They deserve support and help, not to be treated as a piggybank. Actually, piggybanks generally indicate savings. This is a policy equivalent of reaching into a couch cushion for change. We are talking about individuals who have a warrant from when they were a teenager or somebody with a mental illness who may not even remember the incident in question. This is cruel and unbecoming of this Congress.

I know because we have tried this before. The last time this penalty was used, it meant catastrophe for very low-income people with disabilities and for seniors. It hurt people like J.H., a Californian with an intellectual disability and other mental impairments. J.H. had his SSI benefits stopped because of an Ohio warrant issued when he was 12 years old and running away to escape an abusive stepfather. This 4-foot-7-inch-tall, 85-pound boy was charged with assault for kicking a staff member at a detention center where he was being held until his mother could pick him up. Many years later, he had no recollection of the incident or the charges, but his SSI benefits were stopped nonetheless.

Is that really how we want to pay for home visitsations: Impoverishing one person to help another?

That is why I worked to curb this bill’s negative effects, by offering amendments that would protect those with dementia or keep it from increasing homelessness. Unfortunately, Republicans rejected both my amendments on a party line basis, so now we are stuck with this overly broad punitive bill that will support our Department of Veterans Affairs and other provisions added to Social Security disability and retirement programs, and the Department of Veterans Affairs benefits has this same provision that have not even had their day in court yet.

The people who will be hurt by this bill are not hardened criminals. They haven’t even had their day in court yet. In fact, many may not even know about their warrants to police. We have decided that it is not worth pursuing. That is because the warrants are for small issues like writing a bad check or failing to appear for a hearing many years ago.

Worse, certain individuals are elderly, poor, or sick. They deserve support and help, not to be treated as a piggybank. Actually, piggybanks generally indicate savings. This is a policy equivalent of reaching into a couch cushion for change. We are talking about individuals who have a warrant from when they were a teenager or somebody with a mental illness who may not even remember the incident in question. This is cruel and unbecoming of this Congress.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792, the hopelessly misguided Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act. As has become sadly routine in this Chamber under Republican rule, this bill considers those merely accused of a crime as if they were convicted felons without bothering with little niceties like due process. Having dispensed with basic constitutional protections, the bill then cuts off vital government assistance to some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

Under current law, the Social Security Administration helps law enforcement track down individuals with an outstanding arrest warrant for an alleged felony or an alleged violation of probation or parole. Those who are actively fleeing law enforcement can also have their Supplemental Security Income, or SSI, benefits terminated. Under this bill, however, SSI benefits, which serve as a lifeline for low-income seniors and people with disabilities, would be terminated, whether or not people are actually attempting to evade justice.

The mere issuance of a warrant or an alleged parole violation with no arrest,
no trial, and no conviction would be enough to cut off vital benefits to the neediest among us. This is not just unconstitutional, it is inhumane. The bill would ensure that many low-income seniors and people with disabilities will lose their benefits unfairly and unnecessarily.

The vast majority of people affected by this bill have outstanding warrants that law enforcement chooses not to bother serving, often because they are for very minor offenses. Many people do not even know that an arrest warrant has been issued for them, but this bill would consider them as felons fleeing justice.

Many warrants are issued on the basis of mistaken identity, inaccuracies, or paperwork errors. It can take months to resolve such errors, which might involve traveling to a distant jurisdiction, hiring an attorney, and working through an overloaded court system.

And supporters of this bill expect people living on less than $750 a month to do all of this: to go to a different jurisdiction, to hire an attorney, to do all of this without benefits they rely on to subsist are cut off?

That is outrageous.

We heard from the gentlewoman from South Dakota about various exceptions to the bill, you can go through this process and that process. With what attorney? With what money? Does this bill facilitate in it to supply attorneys for people faced with this cutoff, people who, by definition, are the poorest people, who can’t afford an attorney?

This legislation is a blatant violation of due process, and it will cause untold suffering to the people who need our help the most. At a time when Republicans are unveiling their proposal for massive tax cuts for the wealthy, this bill is a shameful illustration of the majority’s priorities.

It is also a shameful illustration of something we have seen on this floor too often, and that is the assumption that anyone accused of something is guilty and that we don’t have to bother with a trial, we don’t have to bother with proof, and we don’t have to bother with due process. That eviscerates much of the reason for the existence of this country, to vindicate due process, to give people rights and not to assume that anyone accused of something thinks may have committed a crime is automatically guilty. We believe in due process, and it is not a new concept. Law enforcement chooses not to bother serving, often because they are for very minor offenses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this bill’s defeat.

I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this should really be a wake-up call to this Chamber to defeat this bill immediately. Instead of ramming through a bill that would push more people into poverty, we should be working to create good-paying jobs and expand opportunities for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ‘no’ on this mean-spirited and heartless bill.

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

I just want to remind everyone that the bill we are debating here today would suspend SSI benefits for those who have felony warrants for their arrest and those who have violated probation or parole. That is the discussion that we are having here today. And let’s go back over, in summary, what the policy actually does and says.

This policy should not be thought of in isolation. This is part of a larger effort to reauthorize the evidence-based, outcome-focused Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program. Another H.R. 2824, which passed this Chamber on Tuesday, will be joined with this bill upon passage. It helps to improve the lives of families in at-risk communities, focusing on the first years of a child’s life.

Unlike most Federal social programs, MIECHV funding is tied to real results, which ensures limited taxpayer dollars are actually delivering the intended results and helping those that are most in need.

Under current law, the program is 100 percent federally funded, but H.R. 2824 introduces a Federal match similar to what States must already do in other social programs, such as foster care.
Medicaid, child support enforcement, childcare, and others. The rest of the package ensures this program remains a shining example of evidence-based policy by expecting the program to continue to demonstrate effective outcomes. Program reauthorization is fully offset by the bill, but the result is considering here today. H.R. 2792.

Instead of focusing on our Nation’s debt, we should be doing more of what we are doing right here in these bills: prioritizing Federal spending and focusing on what works by improving the integrity of one program to provide funding for another.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding and the gentlewoman from South Dakota for managing this bill.

The crux of this bill, however, is, again, the Rules Committee and fund the multi-trillion-dollar tax cuts that have just been introduced, that will give millions, if not billions, if not trillions, to the richest of Americans, and that is a very sad commentary.

I oppose the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act because it is not that. It will terminate essential benefits for poor people, deprive poor people of due process, and increase mass incarceration.

If the Rules Committee had simply taken my amendment, it would have remedied these criminal justice defects, which struck the arrest warrant language because it recklessly targets vulnerable people. This bill deprives citizens of due process, particularly where many poor individuals are completely unaware of a pending warrant.

Let me be very clear. What you have is a situation where you may have a mentally ill individual in a nursing home who has a warrant that they are not aware of. You will then cut off their benefits.

What does that do to those families. Prohibiting SSI payments to individuals with an outstanding warrant or parole or probation violation without due process is simply inhumane. This bill would terminate those benefits from very low-income seniors and people with disabilities. They may not even know that they have these warrants.

Now, I am a strong supporter of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program, and I tell you that the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee have an amendment to pay for a 5-year reauthorization of that program, doubling the funding, by closing a tax loophole. They were not allowed to even vote on that amendment.

What does that say? This is a conspiracy.

There are 110 organizations that are against this, including the Alliance for Retired Americans, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Hand in Hand: The Domestic Employers Network, and the Coalition on Human Needs.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a document with the names of all of these organizations.

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the 119 undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose efforts to cut Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to offset the costs of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program.

H.R. 2824 would reauthorize the MIECHV program, which funds voluntary, evidence-based home visiting programs for at-risk pregnant women or new mothers and young children up to kindergarten entry. The current MIECHV program has demonstrated beneficial outcomes associated with improved maternal and child health, including increased access to screening and early intervention for childhood disabilities.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2824 proposes to pay for the extension of the program by cutting off SSI entirely for certain adults and seniors with disabilities, as well as seniors.

H.R. 2824 effectively creates a failed policy that had catastrophic effects for many people with disabilities and seniors, employing procedures that did not withstand judicial scrutiny. The Act currently prohibits SSI payments to individuals fleeing from law enforcement to avoid prosecution or imprisonment. The existing system is already working to ensure that those who shouldn’t be paid SSI benefits don’t receive them.

The proposed cut, Section 201 of H.R. 2824, would bar payment of SSI benefits to people with an outstanding arrest warrant for an alleged felony or for an alleged violation of probation or parole. Most of the warrants in question are decades old and involve minor infractions, including warrants routinely issued when a person was unable to pay a fine or court fee, or a probation supervision fee.

Based on prior experience with SSA’s failed former policy, the people who would be affected are not those who are fleeing the law and whom law enforcement is not pursuing.

Many people are not even aware that a warrant was issued for them, as warrants are often not communicated. It is a very high percentage of people who would lose benefits have mental illness or intellectual disability. Many are unaware of the violation, may not have understood the terms of parole or probation, or may have other misunderstandings about their case.

Warrant data is notoriously inaccurate. Fourteen percent of the arrest warrants processed by the federal Warrant Information Network in 2004 were later dismissed by the courts or executive action. The state of Alabama, even with an audit mechanism in place, reported a 13% error rate in its arrest warrant databases. Due to these kinds of inaccuracies, some people will have their SSI benefits cut off as a result of a mistaken identity, or paperwork errors, which can take months or even years to resolve.

When this failed policy was previously implemented by SSA, many of those who had their benefits cut off had no arrest warrant outstanding against them. For example, Sandy v. Astrue was, in 2008, a 52-year-old woman who received notice from SSA that she was losing her disability benefits because of a warrant for her arrest in Miami, Florida. Ms. Martinez had never been to Miami, never been arrested, never used illegal drugs, and is eight inches shorter than the person described in the warrant. Despite an obvious case of mistaken identity, Ms. Martinez was left without her sole source of income. It was only after filling a lawsuit in federal court that Ms. Martinez was able to have her benefits restored.

Resolving outstanding warrants can be very difficult and most people must go before a judge in the issuing jurisdiction, and typically need counsel to assist them in navigating the process. Often, people have moved and the information is often far away from the issuing jurisdiction. The proposed offset would cut off all SSI income. Losing this income will cause many people to become homeless, unable to meet their basic needs, much less resolve a warrant, a case of mistaken identity, or an error in the warrant database.

Completely cutting off SSI benefits will leave people with little recourse to resolve an outstanding warrant, representing a step backward in bipartisan efforts towards criminal justice reform. By relying on databases of outstanding arrest warrants, this proposal seeks to punish people by presuming their guilt, undermining the presumption of innocence that is the bedrock of our justice system.

The existence of an arrest warrant does not establish that any criminal conduct has occurred. Many arrest warrants are for minor criminal charges, or the charges are eventually dismissed. Even if an individual is charged and subsequently prosecuted, he or she is presumed innocent until proven guilty.

The proposed offset also has a disproportionate impact on people of color. People who are on probation are particularly susceptible to having an outstanding arrest warrant. Parolees and probationers are disproportionately people of color—in 2015, 13% of adults on probation were Hispanic, and 30% of adults on probation were African American.

Finally, the proposed offset could harm some of the very same children who we seek to help through home visiting. In any given month, approximately 27 million children are estimated to live with a family member who is a senior or adult with a disability who receives SSI. These children’s families are overwhelmingly the same types of families served by the MIECHV program: over 3 in 5 families with a SSI recipient age 18 or older had a family income below half of the federal poverty level, and SSI makes up on average about 40% of these families’ income. Cutting off SSI income would put families at a risk of being homeless, losing a roof over their heads, put food on the table, and meet other basic needs—including children’s and mothers’ health needs.

H.R. 2824 would also harm Social Security beneficiaries—since over half of SSI recipients who are elderly, and almost one-third of SSI recipients with disabilities, are Social Security beneficiaries.

In closing, we reiterate that although the MIECHV program has demonstrated beneficial outcomes, and reauthorization must be a priority, it should not come at the expense of cuts to SSI, which would harm seniors, adolescents and adults with disabilities, and their families, and should not be raised as a pay-for for an unrelated program. We urge the U.S. Congress to reject any proposals to offset the costs of reauthorizing the MIECHV program by cutting SSI benefits.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

AFL-CIO; AFSCME; Aging Life Care Association; Alliance for Children’s Rights; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Association of Retired Persons; American Psychological Association; Association of Jewish Aging Services; Association of University Centers
on Disabilities; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Center for American Progress; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Coalition on Human Needs; Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Social Security Task Force; Defending Rights and Dissent; Easterseals; Economic Policy Institute Policy Center; FedCURE; FORGE, Inc.; Gray Panthertine & Free; Disability Law Center, Massachusetts; Council on Human Rights; Disability Rights North Carolina; Disability Rights New York; Communities Actively Living Independent & Free; Disability Law Center, Massachusetts; Disability Law Center, Utah; Disability Policy Consortium of Massachusetts; Disability Rights Idaho; Disability Rights New Jersey; Disability Rights North Carolina; Disability Rights Wisconsin; Empire Justice Center; Friends in Deed; GetTogether Adult Day Health Care Center; Homeboy Industries; Hunger Action Los Angeles; IMPRUVE (Independent Movement of Paratransit Riders for Unity, Vehicles, Equality); Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles; Kentucky Protection and Advocacy; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County; Legal-CitC Gould; Latino Health Justice; Little Tokyo Service Center; MFY Legal Services, Inc.; National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter; Northern California ADA Project of Local Bar Coalitions; Personal Assistance Service Council; Public Counsel; PUEBLO People United For a Better Life in Oakland; Pushing Limits Radio (KPPA); Rubicon Programs; San Francisco Senior & Disability Action; Senior and Disabled Fund of San Bernardino County; Senior Services Coalition of Alameda County; Sonoma County Homeless Action; St. Anthony Foundation; St. Mary’s Center; UC Hastings Community Justice Law Clinic; Urban Justice Center; Western Center on Law and Poverty.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In addition, let me share with you the reality of this: Rosa Martinez, Yes, the Social Security Administration was doing this before, but they had to stop it. We are now reigniting it because Rosa Martinez filed a suit in 2008. She was a 52-year-old disabled woman from Redwood, California, who received a notice from SSA last December that she was losing her only source of income, her disability benefits, because of a 1980 arrest warrant for a drug offense in Miami, Florida.

Ms. Martinez had never been to Miami, has never been arrested, and has never used illegal drugs. In addition, she is 8 inches shorter than the Rosa Martinez identified in the warrant. Do you want this random, reckless cutting off of SSI benefits because of misidentification? Identity theft is rampant. So this bill is failed, it is a failure, and it has a number of Achilles’ heels that will not work.

The bill will cause mass incarceration. We should allow law enforcement to do their job. I don’t mind giving them the tools that they need, but I refuse to allow individuals to suffer because of abusive police. I kneaded on this floor because of injustice. This is a bill that is full of injustices. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792.

I oppose this bill for the following reasons: SSI is a needs-based program for people with limited income and resources. It will terminate essential benefits of poor people. It will deprive poor people of due process. It will increase mass incarceration. My amendment would have remedied these criminal justice defects in H.R. 2792, which struck the arrest warrant language because (1) it recklessly targets vulnerable and innocent individuals; (2) this bill deprives citizens of due process, particularly where many poor individuals are completely unaware of any pending warrant, and (3) there have been cases in which warrants were either decades old or, in many instances, it was a matter of a mistaken identity.

The bill amends the Social Security Act (SSA) to make certain revisions that limit payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the SSA, by prohibiting the payment of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments to individuals with an outstanding felony warrant or parole or probation violation.

"Almost none of the individuals who would be affected by this provision are actual fugitives from justice and most of the warrants in question are either decades old or, in many instances, it was a matter of a mistaken identity." The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities said in a letter to Senators who tried to implement this policy.
hungry. As the old adage says: "don't continue to do the same thing and expect a different result, that's insanity". Past experiences proved that this policy was detrimental then, and it is so now. It will further exacerbate the epic tragedy of mass incarceration, and the attendant costs incurred by taxpayers, particularly in the well-documented higher cost of incarcerating the elderly and those in poor health.

Even conservative coalitions like Freedom Works, American Conservative Union Foundation, Taxpayers United of America, and Taxpayers Protection Alliance agreed that mass incarceration is extremely costly to taxpayers.

In addition to tax dollars in litigation fees, incarceration cost taxpayers $407.58 per person per day and $148,767 per person per year.

Criminalizing poor individuals, depriving them of their social security income benefits, and increasing the incarceration rate in this fashion will NOT solve the fugitive problem this bill purports it will do.

In fact, this bill will expand existing problems of many of the very reasons they are increasing the likelihood for recidivism. Statistics show that incarceration does not serve as deterrence, nor does it keep our communities safe.

For the reasons stated above, I oppose this bill.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792, the misleadingly titled Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017, which would prohibit the payment of Supplemental Security Income benefits to anyone with an unresolved arrest warrant for an alleged violation of a condition of probation or parole or an alleged felony offense.

H.R. 2792’s title falsely claims to target fugitive felons. In fact, fugitive felons are already prohibited from receiving benefits under current law. If this bill were enacted, some of our country’s most vulnerable low-income seniors and disabled Americans, who are neither fugitives nor felons, would not be able to get their SSI benefits.

While proponents of H.R. 2792 continue to claim that the bill only targets violent fugitive felons, H.R. 2792 threatens many other individuals, like those who received arrest warrants because they were unable to pay court fines or fees. Just last week, the United States Commission on Civil Rights published a report, titled, “Targeted Fines and Fees Against Low-Income Communities of Color: Civil Rights and Constitutional Implications,” which found that many local jurisdictions rely on court fees or other fines to support their municipal budgets, including fees charged to those under court supervision.

Some of the people charged with these fees are elderly or disabled SSI beneficiaries who are unable to work and have no way to pay court costs. When they cannot pay, a warrant is routinely issued for their arrest. If this bill were enacted, these people would lose their SSI benefits, which is the only source of income for many of these low-income disabled individuals.

During the markup of H.R. 2792, I offered a commonsense amendment which would have limited SSI benefits from being cut off if the result would be the loss of benefits for individuals whose arrest warrants were issued for nonpayment of court costs. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues rejected the amendment, as well as all other Democratic amendments to this bill.

I stand united with over 119 national, State, and local organizations who oppose efforts to cut SSI benefits, and I urge opposition to the final passage of this bill.

Further, I would like to go on the record to say that we should have a clean reauthorization of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting programs. This program expires on September 30. The majority’s decision to tie home visiting to this harmful cut for our most vulnerable citizens only makes this harder to accomplish.

MIECHV programs are proven programs. Evidence shows these programs work. We actually should reauthorize these programs, but we should not tie it to this horrible bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the bill.

Resolved errors within the criminal justice system is a long process that typically must be done in the geographic jurisdiction of the court and necessitates legal costs.

The goal of H.R. 2792 is the same: raise $2.1 billion by cutting off benefits for tens of thousands of impoverished, elderly, and disabled people, be they cognitively impaired, victims of mistaken identity, facing homelessness, those who committed minor offenses, or those who are too poor to pay their court fees and fines.

Mr. Speaker, there are no protections in this bill. There is no reason, no rational benefit, but there are instances where individuals will be forced to suffer even more than they currently do, so let’s not cut off their Social Security Income benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the CUFF Act is commonsense. The American taxpayer should not subsidize individuals who are fleeing from law enforcement.

Because the Social Security Administration already possesses in place processes that will ensure due process and protect beneficiaries, claims about this bill are overblown and, quite frankly, they are wrong.

I am proud that this bill is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs’ Association.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 533, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. 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.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the
Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit the bill H.R. 3823 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 56, strike lines 6 through 13, and insert the following:

SEC. 506. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATES OF TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than $1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

SEC. 507. EXPENDING OF QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSES.

(a) In General.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 198 the following:

SEC. 198A. EXPENSING OF QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSEES.

(a) In General.—A taxpayer may elect to treat any qualified disaster expenses which are paid or incurred by the taxpayer as an expense which is not chargeable to capital account. Any expense which is so treated shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year in which it is paid or incurred.

SEC. 508. INCREASED LIMITATION ON CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) Indiviudals.—Paragraph (1) of section 170(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

SEC. 170A. QUALIFIED DISASTER CONTRIBUTIONS.

(i) In General.—Any qualified disaster contribution shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate amount of such contributions does not exceed the excess of 80 percent of the taxpayer’s contribution base over the amount of all other charitable contributions allowable under this section.

(ii) Carryover.—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation under clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(1)(A)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 5 succeeding years in order of time.

(iii) Coordination with other subparagraphs.—For purposes of applying this subsection and subsection (d)(1)(A), contributions described in clause (i) shall not be treated as described in subparagraph (A) and such subparagraph shall be applied without regard to such contributions.

QUALIFIED DISASTER CONTRIBUTIONS.

For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified disaster contribution’ means any charitable contribution described in clause (i) or (ii) of section 170A(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.
"(II) such contribution is made during the period beginning on the applicable disaster date with respect to the disaster described in subsection (a) and ending on December 31, 2011.

"(III) such contribution is made in cash to an organization described in subparagraph (A) (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(7)), or in the case of a nongovernmental organization described in section 501(c)(4), 501(c)(5), or 501(c)(6), the contribution is made by a member of the organization who is also an individual taxpayer.

Such term shall not include a contribution if the contribution is for establishment of a new, or maintenance in an existing, donor advised fund (as defined in section 1361(d)(2)).

(vii) Subparagraph (B) of section 170(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated in a manner similar to the term 'qualified disaster loss'.

(b) Corporations.—

(A) Subparagraph (A) of section 170(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(ii) the deduction for the taxable year for any disaster loss (as defined in section 165(h)(3)(B)), occurring during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016, and

(i) personal casualty losses.

"(C) Federally Declared Disaster.—For purposes of this paragraph—

(i) Federally Declared Disaster.—The term 'federally declared disaster' has the meaning given such term by subsection (1)(A).

(ii) Disaster Area.—The term 'disaster area' has the meaning given such term by subsection (1)(B).

(iii) Qualified Disaster Contributions.—Contributions described in section 170(b)(2)(F)(iv) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated in a manner similar to the term 'qualified disaster loss'.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disasters declared in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.


(a) In General.—Section 172(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(G) Certain Losses Attributable to Disasters.—(I) in the case of a taxpayer who has a qualified disaster loss (as defined in subsection (i) thereof), such loss shall be a net operating loss carryback to each of the 5 taxable years preceding the taxable year of such loss.

(ii) the term 'qualified disaster loss' means the lesser of—

"(I) the losses allowable under section 165 for the taxable year,

"(II) occurring in a disaster area, over

(iii) personal casualty losses.

"(C) Federally Declared Disaster.—For purposes of this section—

"(i) the term 'qualified disaster' means the lesser of—

"(I) the sum of—

"(II) the losses allowable under section 165 for the taxable year,

"(II) occurring in a disaster area, over

"(III) the losses allowable under section 165 for the taxable year,

"(II) occurring in a disaster area, over

"(III) the amount of such deduction by the amount of such deduction in the previous taxable year.

"(ii) the term 'federally declared disaster' has the meaning given such term by subsection (i) thereof.

"(iii) the term 'disaster area' has the meaning given such term by subsection (i) thereof.

"(iv) the term 'qualified disaster contribution' means the term 'qualified disaster loss'.

"(B) the date which is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(C) The amendments made by this section shall apply to disasters declared in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016, and in connection with disasters declared after such date.


(a) In General.—Paragraph (3) of section 134(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ‘‘before January 1, 2010’’ in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(1) of such paragraph and in the following paragraph:

"(I) the date which is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(B) the date which is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.
beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016".

SEC. 512. INCREASED EXPENDING AND BONUS
DEPRECIATION FOR QUALIFIED DISAS-
ASTER ASSISTANCE PROPERTY FOLLOW-
DISASTERS.

(a) In General.—Subclause (I) of section 168(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "before January 1, 2010" and inserting "during the period beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2011".

(b) Removal of Exception.—Section 168(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "and" at the end of subclause (I), by striking ", and" at the end of subclause (II) and inserting a period, and by striking sub-
clause (III).

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2011, with respect to disasters declared after such date.

SEC. 513. INCREASE IN NEW MARKETS TAX CRED-
IT FOR INVESTMENTS IN COMMU-
NITY DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES SERV-
DISASTER AREAS.

(a) In General.—Section (f) of section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) INCREASED SPECIAL ALLOCATION FOR
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES SERVING
DISASTER AREAS WITH RESPECT TO DISASTERS
OCcurring IN ANY OF CALENDAR YEARS 2012
THROUGH 2015.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of each calendar year which begins after 2012 and before 2016, the new markets tax credit limitation shall be increased by an amount equal to $500,000,000, to be allocated among qualified community development entities to make qualified low-income community investments within any covered federally declared disaster area.

"(B) ALLOCATION OF INCREASE.—The amount of the increase in limitation under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated by the Secretary under paragraph (2) to qualified community development entities and shall give priority to such entities with a record of having provided capital, technical, and financial assistance to businesses or communities within any covered federally declared disaster area or areas for which the allocation is requested.

"(C) APPLICATION OF CARRYFORWARD.—Paragraph (3) shall be applied separately with respect to the amount of any increase under subparagraph (A).

"(D) COVERED FEDERALLY DECLARED
DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'covered federally declared disaster area' means a disaster area resulting from any federally declared disaster occurring after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016.

(b) Removal of Exception.—Section 168(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) INCREASED SPECIAL ALLOCATION FOR
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES SERVING
DISASTER AREAS WITH RESPECT TO DISASTERS
OCcurring IN ANY OF CALENDAR YEARS 2012
THROUGH 2015.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of each calendar year which begins after 2012 and before 2016, the new markets tax credit limitation shall be increased by an amount equal to $500,000,000, to be allocated among qualified community development entities to make qualified low-income community investments within any covered federally declared disaster area.

"(B) ALLOCATION OF INCREASE.—The amount of the increase in limitation under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated by the Secretary under paragraph (2) to qualified community development entities and shall give priority to such entities with a record of having provided capital, technical, and financial assistance to businesses or communities within any covered federally declared disaster area or areas for which the allocation is requested.

"(C) APPLICATION OF CARRYFORWARD.— Paragraph (3) shall be applied separately with respect to the amount of any increase under subparagraph (A).

"(D) COVERED FEDERALLY DECLARED
DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'covered federally declared disaster area' means a disaster area resulting from any federally declared disaster occurring after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016.

(b) Removal of Exception.—Section 168(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "and" at the end of subclause (I), by striking ", and" at the end of subclause (II) and inserting a period, and by striking sub-
clause (III).

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2011, with respect to disasters declared after such date.

SEC. 514. SPECIAL RULES FOR USE OF RETIRE-
MENT FUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH
FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS
DISASTERS.

(a) In General.—Subclause (I) of section 168(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "before January 1, 2010" and inserting "during the period beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2011".


(a) In general.—Subclause (i) of section 402(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "before January 1, 2010" and inserting "during the period beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2011".

(b) Removal of Exception.—Section 168(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "and" at the end of subclause (I), by striking ", and" at the end of subclause (II) and inserting a period, and by striking sub-
clause (III).

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2011, with respect to disasters declared after such date.
adjusted to reflect the delay in the due date under clause (i) and any interest accruing during such delay, and
(iii) in determining the 5-year period and the term of a loan under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2), the period described in clause (i) shall be disregarded.

(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this paragraph—

"(1) Qualified individual.—The term 'qualified individual' means, with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during the period of a loan under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2), the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.

"(2) Applicable period.—The applicable period is the period beginning on the applicable disaster date and ending on December 31, 2016.

"(iii) Federally declared disaster; disaster area.—The terms 'federally declared disaster' and 'disaster area' have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

"(iv) Applicable disaster date.—The term 'applicable disaster date' means, with respect to a disaster occurring in calendar years beginning after 2011 and before 2016, or such later date as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) Effective date.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any amendment unless—

"(1) such earned income for the preceding taxable year, for
"(ii) in the case of a qualified individual with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during any calendar year beginning after 2011, if the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, the credit allowed under this section and section 24(d) may, at the election of the taxpayer, be determined by substituting—
"(A) such earned income for the preceding taxable year, for
"(B) such earned income for the taxable year which includes the applicable date.

(c) Special rule for determining earned income of individuals affected by federally declared disasters.

"(1) In general.—Section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding after the last sentence of paragraph (1) the following new subsection:

"(A) Additional exemption for certain disaster-displaced individuals.—
"(i) In general.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in any calendar year beginning after 2011, there shall be allowed, in addition to any deduction made under section 24(f), a deduction for each qualified disaster-displaced individual with respect to the tax year in the amount of $500 for each qualified disaster-displaced individual under the applicable period.

"(ii) Applicable period.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'applicable period' means the period beginning on the applicable disaster date and ending on the date which is 14 months after such date.

"(2) Other definitions.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(B) Federally declared disaster; disaster area.—The terms 'federally declared disaster' and 'disaster area' have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

"(C) Identifying information required.—An individual shall not be taken into account under paragraph (1) for a taxable year unless the taxpayer identification number of such individual is included on the return of the taxpayer for such taxable year.

"(2) Qualified disaster-displaced individual.—The term 'qualified disaster-displaced individual' means any individual who—

"(i) on the date of a federally declared disaster occurring in calendar years beginning after 2011 and before 2016 maintained such individual's principal place of abode in the disaster area declared with respect to such disaster, and

"(ii) was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of the federally declared disaster.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms 'federally declared disaster' and 'disaster area' have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

(d) Computation of housing.—No deduction shall be allowed under this subsection if the taxpayer receives any rent or other amount (from any source) in connection with the rent-free occupancy of such dwelling unit.

(e) Effective date.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

Sec. 515. Additional exemption for housing-qualified disaster displaced individuals.

(a) In general.—Section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) Additional exemption for certain disaster-displaced individuals.—
"(i) In general.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in any calendar year beginning after 2011, there shall be allowed, in addition to any deduction made under section 24(f), a deduction for each qualified disaster-displaced individual with respect to the taxpayer for the taxable year in the amount of $500 for each qualified disaster-displaced individual under the applicable period.

"(ii) Applicable period.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'applicable period' means the period beginning on the applicable disaster date and ending on the date which is 14 months after such date.

"(3) Individuals.—An individual shall not be taken into account under paragraph (1) for a taxable year unless the taxpayer identification number of such individual is included on the return of the taxpayer for such taxable year.

Sec. 516. Exclusions of certain cancellations of indebtedness.

(a) In general.—Section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding after the last sentence of paragraph (1) the following new subsection:

"(1) Discharge of indebtedness.—In the case of any taxable year after the disaster year, in the case of any taxable year beginning after 2011, there shall be allowed as a deduction the amount of any discharge of indebtedness made in connection with such disaster occurring in calendar years beginning after 2011 and before 2016, or such later date as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) Effective date.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

Sec. 517. Special rule for determining earned income of individuals affected by federally declared disasters.

"(1) In general.—In the case of a qualified individual with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during any calendar year beginning after 2011, if the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, the credit allowed under this section and section 24(d) may, at the election of the taxpayer, be determined by substituting—
"(A) such earned income for the preceding taxable year, for
"(B) such earned income for the taxable year which includes the applicable date.

"(2) Qualified disaster-displaced individual.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified disaster-displaced individual' means, with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during any calendar year beginning after 2011, if the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, the credit allowed under this section and section 24(d) may, at the election of the taxpayer, be determined by substituting—
"(A) such earned income for the preceding taxable year, for
"(B) such earned income for the taxable year which includes the applicable date.

"(3) Special rules.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(B) Applicable disaster date.—The term 'applicable disaster date' means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.

"(4) Other definitions.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) Federal disaster; disaster area.—The terms 'federally declared disaster' and 'disaster area' have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

"(B) Qualified disaster-displaced individual.—The term 'qualified disaster-displaced individual' means any individual who—

"(i) is a qualified disaster-displaced individual under the applicable period, and
"(ii) the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year shall be the sum
of the earned income of each spouse for such preceding taxable year.

“(B) Uniform Application of Election.—Any election made under paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to both section 24(d) and this section.

“(C) Errors Treated as Mathematical Error.—For purposes of section 6223, an incorrect statement of earned income pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be treated as a mathematical or clerical error.

“(D) No Effect on Determination of Cross-Examination.—As excepted otherwise provided in this subsection, this title shall be applied without regard to any substitution under paragraph (1).

“(E) Child Tax Credit.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) Special Rule for Determining Earned Income of Taxpayers Affected by Federally Declared Disasters.—For election by qualified individuals with respect to certain federally declared disasters to substitute earned income from the preceding taxable year.

“(F) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 518. INCREASE IN REHABILITATION CREDIT

(a) In General.—Section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 519. ADVANCED REFUNDINGS OF CERTAIN EXEMPT BONDS

(a) In General.—Section 149(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) Special Rule with Respect to Certain Natural Disasters.—

“(A) In General.—With respect to a bond described in subparagraph (C), one additional advance refunding after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and before January 1, 2018, shall be allowed under the rules of this subsection if—

“(1) the Governor of the State designates the advance refunding bond for purposes of this subsection, and

“(ii) the requirements of subparagraph (E) are met.

“(B) Certain Private Activity Bonds.—With respect to a bond described in subparagraph (C) which is an exempt facility bond described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 144A(a) (relating to qualified project bonds), if the date of the enactment of this paragraph and before January 1, 2018, shall be allowed under the rules of this subsection if—

“(1) the Governor of the State designates such bond for purposes of this section, and

“(4) such bond is issued after the date of the enactment of this section and before January 1, 2017.

“(C) Limitation on Amount of Bonds.—

“(1) In General.—The maximum aggregate face amount of bonds which may be designated under this section by any State shall not exceed $10,000,000,000.

“(2) Qualified Project Bonds.—No bonds shall be issued which are to be used for movable fixtures and equipment.

“(3) Treatment of Current Refunding Bond.—Subparagraph (1) shall not apply to any bond (or series of bonds) issued to refund a qualified disaster area recovery bond, if—

“(A) the average maturity date of the issue on or before which the refunding bond is issued is not later than the average maturity date of the bonds to be refunded by such issue,

“(B) the amount of the refunding bond does not exceed the outstanding amount of the refunded bond, and

“(C) the net proceeds of the refunding bond are used to redeem the refunded bond not later than 90 days after the date of the issuance of the refunding bond.

For purposes of subparagraph (A), average maturity shall be determined in accordance with section 147(b)(2)(A).

“(d) Qualified Project Costs.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified project costs’ means the cost of acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and renovation of—

“(1) residential rental property (as defined in section 1250),

“(2) nonresidential real property (including fixed improvements associated with such property),

“(3) a facility described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 1254(a), or

“(4) public utility property (as defined in section 168(k)(10)), which is located in a qualified disaster area and was damaged or destroyed by reason of a federally declared disaster.

“(e) Special Rules.—In applying this title to any qualified disaster area recovery bond, the following modifications shall apply:

“(1) Section 147(d) (relating to acquisition of existing property not permitted) shall be applied by substituting ‘50 percent’ for ‘15 percent’ each place it appears.

“(2) Section 147(c)(4)(C) (relating to exception from rebate for certain proceeds to be used to finance construction expenditures) shall apply in lieu of the requirements in clause (1) of such section.

“(A) 40 percent of such available construction proceeds are spent for the governmental purpose of the issue for the 2-year period beginning on the date the bonds are issued.

“(B) 60 percent of such proceeds are spent for such purposes within the 3-year period beginning on such date.

“(C) 80 percent of such proceeds are spent for such purposes within the 4-year period beginning on such date.

“(D) 100 percent of such proceeds are spent for such purposes within the 5-year period beginning on such date.

“(E) Repayments of principal on financing provided by the issue—

“(A) may not be used to provide financing, and

“(B) must be used not later than the close of the first semiannual period beginning after the date of the repayment to redeem bonds which are part of such issue.

The requirement of subparagraph (B) shall be treated as met with respect to amounts received within 5 years after the date of issuance of the issue (or, in the case of a refunding bond, the date of issuance of the refunded bond) if such amounts were received by the close of such 5 years to redeem bonds which are part of such issue.
applied by substituting ‘January 1, 2016’ for

‘(4) Section 57a(a)(5) shall not apply.

‘(f) SEPARATE ISSUE TREATMENT OF POR-

tions of an Issue.—This section shall not apply to the portion of an issue which (if issued under the same issue) would be treated as a qualified bond or as a bond that is not a private activity bond (determined without regard to paragraph (d), if the issuer elects to so treat such portion.

‘(g) QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA; FEDERALLY

DECLARED DISASTER.—

‘(1) QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA.—The term ‘qualified disaster area’ means any area determined to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Gov-

ernment under the Robert T. Stafford Disas-

ter Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by reason of a federally declared disaster oc-

curring during the period beginning after De-


‘(2) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.—The term ‘federally declared disaster’ has the meaning given to such term under section 165(i)(5).’.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part A of chapter 8 of sub-

chapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amend-

ed by inserting after the item relating to sec-

tion 146 the following new item:

‘Sec. 146A. Qualified disaster area recovery bonds.’

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments

made by this section shall apply to obliga-

tions issued after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 521. AMENDMENTS TO PROVISIONS ON LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT ALLOCATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 42(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation on aggregate credit allowable with respect to projects located in a State) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘(J) INCREASE IN STATE HOUSING CREDIT FOR STATIES DAMAGED BY NATURAL DISASTERS.—

‘(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified mutual ditch or irrigation company, paragraph (3)(E) of such section shall be applied without taking into account any income received or accrued during the applicable period.

‘(II) TREATMENT OF MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRI-

GATION COMPANIES IN CERTAIN DISASTER AREAS.—

‘(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account any income received or accrued during the applicable period.

‘(2) SEGREGATION.—The assets of the fund are maintained in a separate account or accounts segregated from other assets of the tax-

payer.

‘(3) INCOME.—The fund applies.

‘(4) DISTRIBUTION.—The manner prescribed by the Secretary, and

shall be treated as nonmember income in the year in which it is distributed or expended.

‘(II) QUALIFIED MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGA-

TION COMPANIES IN CERTAIN DISASTER AREAS.—

‘(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization’ means any mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization that shall be treated as nonmember income in the year in which it is distributed or expended.

‘(II) QUALIFIED MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGA-

TION COMPANIES IN CERTAIN DISASTER AREAS.—

‘(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization’ means

Any mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization that would be permitted to invest if it were a capital construction fund subject to the investment limitations of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 7518(b)(2).

‘(B) NATURAL DISASTER FUND.—The term ‘natural disaster fund’ means a fund meeting the following requirements:

‘(1) DESIGNATION.—The taxpayer designates

‘(2) SEPARATION.—The assets of the fund are segregated from other assets of the tax-

payer.

‘(3) INVESTMENTS.—

‘(A) The assets of the fund are maintained in one or more qualified accounts and are invested only in—

‘(i) deposits with banks whose deposits are insured subject to applicable limits by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or

‘(ii) in stock or other securities in which the fund would be permitted to invest if it were a capital construction fund subject to the investment limitations of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 7518(b)(2).

‘(C) IN GENERAL.—If a qualified taxpayer elects the application of this section, there shall be allowed as a deduction for any taxable year the amount of payments made by the taxpayer to a natural disaster fund during such taxable year.

‘(B) NATURAL DISASTER FUND.—The term ‘natural disaster fund’ means a fund meeting the following requirements:

‘(1) DESIGNATION.—The taxpayer designates

‘(2) SEPARATION.—The assets of the fund are segregated from other assets of the tax-

payer.

‘(3) INVESTMENTS.—

‘(A) The assets of the fund are maintained in one or more qualified accounts and are invested only in—

‘(i) deposits with banks whose deposits are insured subject to applicable limits by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or

‘(ii) in stock or other securities in which the fund would be permitted to invest if it were a capital construction fund subject to the investment limitations of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 7518(b)(2).

‘(B) ALL INCOME EARNED.—The fund does not accept any deposits (or other amounts) other than cash payments with respect to which a deductible amount is allowable under subsection (a) and (b).

‘(C) SUPPORTING THE FUND.—The fund does not accept any deposits (or other amounts) other than cash payments with respect to which a deductible amount is allowable under subsection (a) and (b).
"(5) PURPOSE.—The fund shall be deemed distributed in a non-
disaster fund ceases to meet the requirement of section (b) or a taxpayer who has a natural
disaster fund that was a natural disaster fund ceases to be used to pay with respect to property and business interruption insurance maintained by the taxpayer for the line of business to which the fund applies and that would cover losses resulting from a Federally declared natural disaster, and

"(B) the maximum loss under any insurance coverage that the taxpayer could reasonably expect to occur for the line of business in the case of a severe natural disaster.

"(7) INSURANCE.—The taxpayer property insurance maintained by the qualified taxpayer applies to 75 percent or more of the property and business interruption insurance paid for the benefit of the taxpayer with respect to costs, expenses, and losses described in clause (i).

"(8) NONQUALIFIED DISTRIBUTION.—The term ‘nonqualified distribution’ means a distribution from a natural disaster fund other than a qualified distribution.

"(9) NONQUALIFIED ACCOUNT.—The term ‘qualifying account’ means a fund or account that is treated as a qualified distribution under section 7518(g)(6) or to which an investment or a reduction in the balance of the fund is recorded in the financial statements of the fund in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and not as a current asset and the proceeds of which are limited to those permitted by footnote (b)(3) and no investments are made in a related person (as defined in section 381(c)(9)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).".
1986 is amended by striking: ‘‘4 years’’ and inserting: ‘‘5 years’’.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions with respect to disaster declared after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 526. WAGE CREDIT FOR SPECIFIED DISASTER-DAMAGED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45B of part D of subpart D of chapter I of subchapter A of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

‘‘SEC. 45B. WAGE CREDIT FOR SPECIFIED DISASTER-DAMAGED BUSINESSES.

‘‘(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of this section, all persons treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 118 of this Act, is amended by striking ‘‘and ending on December 31, 2015’’, and inserting ‘‘and ending on December 31, 2016’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions with respect to disaster declared after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 527. DISASTER-RELATED MEDICAL EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

‘‘(g) DISASTER-RELATED MEDICAL EXPENSES.—

‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of expenses directly related to an injury caused by a federally declared disaster occurring during the taxable year or the preceding taxable year, there shall be allowed a separate deduction under subsection (a) with respect to any individual which may be added to the deduction for individual medical expenses determined under section 213(b).’’

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 528. EXPANDING OF QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 186A(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 103 of this Act, is amended by striking ‘‘2012’’, and inserting ‘‘2016’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 529. LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 165(h)(3)(B)(i)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 103 of this Act, is amended by striking ‘‘and ending on December 31, 2015’’, and inserting ‘‘and ending on December 31, 2016’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to disasters declared in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 530. NET OPERATING LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 172(i)(1)(A)(i)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ‘‘In the case of a calendar year beginning after 2015’’, and inserting ‘‘In the case of a calendar year beginning after 2016’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2016.

SEC. 531. SPECIAL RULES FOR USE OF RETIREMENT PLAN FUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.

(a) WITHDRAWALS.—Section 72(p)(6)(C)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 103 of this Act, is amended by inserting ‘‘2011’’, and inserting ‘‘2011’’,.

(b) LOANS.—Section 72(p)(6)(C)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking ‘‘and ending on December 31, 2016’’, and inserting ‘‘and ending on December 31, 2017’’. 

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions with respect to disaster declared after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 532. ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR HOUSING LOANS FOR FEDERALLY DECLARED INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(f)(3)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 109 of this Act, is amended by striking ‘‘and before 2016’’, and inserting ‘‘and before 2017’’. 

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 533. EXCLUSIONS OF CERTAIN CANCELLATIONS OF INDEBTEDNESS BY REASON OF FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 108(j)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 110 of this Act, is amended by striking ‘‘and before 2016’’, and inserting ‘‘and before 2017’’. 

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 534. SPECIAL RULES FOR DETERMINING EARNED INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED BY FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32(n)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 110 of this Act, is further amended by striking ‘‘and before January 1, 2017’’, and inserting ‘‘and before January 1, 2018’’. 

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 535. QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA RECOVERY BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 146A(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 114 of this Act, is amended by striking ‘‘and before January 1, 2017’’, and inserting ‘‘and before January 1, 2018’’. 

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 536. ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT ALLOCATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 22(b)(3)(J) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 115 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by striking ‘‘In the case of calendar year 2015’’, and inserting ‘‘In the case of calendar year 2015’’,.

(2) in clause (ii) by striking ‘‘2015’’ and inserting ‘‘2016’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion to recommit on behalf of Ms. Velázquez. This is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

It is unfortunate that we are here today debating inadequate policies while our fellow Americans in Puerto
Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are hurting.

While I do not doubt the underlying bill was made with good intentions, it is not just inadequate for all the victims of the hurricanes, and it is insulting to the people of Puerto Rico. They are hurting. They have no food, no water, no power. They need our help.

Estimates suggest the storm caused $46 billion to $85 billion in insurance claims in the Caribbean, with 85 percent of those losses in Puerto Rico. Nearly all of the island is without power, and 85 percent of cell towers were knocked out. The hurricane ravaged 80 percent of the crop value in Puerto Rico—a $780 million loss. This will result in higher food prices at a time when Puerto Rico faces shortages.

These are only the initial estimates. Each day we learn more about the scale of devastation, and likely won’t know the measure of damage for some time.

FEMA has indicated that it has “provided over 1.5 million meals, 1.1 million liters of water, nearly 300 infant and toddler kits, and nearly 120 emergency supplies to the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico since Hurricane Maria’s landfall.” That is a quote from FEMA.

Yet the total population of American citizens in Puerto Rico is 3.4 million. The total in the U.S. Virgin Islands is over 100,000. It has been 7 days since the storm. The math simply doesn’t add up, and neither does the bill as it is written.

The motion to recommit would do more for the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands than the underlying bill. Unlike the underlying bill, this motion will give them funds to help them rebuild. The dollars are directed to Puerto Rico, to Florida, Louisiana, and our constituents, from New York, and politics out of natural disasters, all of them have come here boasting about the fact that they opposed a disaster relief package, yet they are willing to do so today. Why? To try to attempt to score political points.

I think that is wrong, and I can’t help but take it personally, because my constituents really need this help.

The people of Puerto Rico, by the way, the person they elected to this chamber, JENNIFER GONZALEZ-COLON, supports this legislation; STACY PRAK vorre the Virgin Islands, our colleague, put her name to this legislation as well; Chairman BRADY, whose constituents are trying to recover in the Houston area, is asking for passage of this legislation, yet people from other parts of the country are coming to this floor saying: No, that is not good enough for your constituents.

So if my constituents get nothing, I should tell them: That is right. Someone from elsewhere said that because this wasn’t good enough, you get nothing.

That is just wrong. This is an important first step that we have to take to help people in all of these jurisdictions, especially the people of Puerto Rico, because we know that the situation there is in no way comparable to anything that has happened on the mainland.

It is personal for me in that sense as well. Why guess what? When my wife’s family was exiled from Cuba, they went to Puerto Rico and they were welcomed there. My wife’s two elder brothers were born in Puerto Rico. My wife still has family in Puerto Rico, and I know that this legislation would improve their situation.

Can we do more? Should we do more? Should we work together to do more in the future? Yes, we should and we will, but that is no excuse to vote against this legislation, that is no excuse to lever age the suffering of these people to try to achieve a political objective or even to advance different legislation.

I respectfully ask all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, and I thank the 26 Democrats who stood with us on Monday, and I ask them to do it again today and for more to join us, to send a strong message of national unity for the people of Florida, Texas, Louisiana, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and yes, Puerto Rico.

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

Mr. CURBelo of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBelo of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I believe in bipartisanship, which means that oftentimes I am disappointed in this institution, but today I am not disappointed, I am shocked. I am shocked that some would politicize such a sensitive, desperate situation that so many Americans, from Texas to Puerto Rico, are dealing with right now.

My colleagues say they want to help the people of Puerto Rico, the people of the Florida Keys in my district, and others throughout the country. A lot of them have come here boasting about the fact that they opposed a disaster relief package, yet they are willing to do so today. Why? To try to attempt to score political points.

I think that is wrong, and I can’t help but take it personally, because my constituents really need this help.

The people of Puerto Rico, by the way, the person they elected to this chamber, JENNIFER GONZALEZ-COLON, supports this legislation; STACY PRAK vorre the Virgin Islands, our colleague, put her name to this legislation as well; Chairman BRADY, whose constituents are trying to recover in the Houston area, is asking for passage of this legislation, yet people from other parts of the country are coming to this floor saying: No, that is not good enough for your constituents.

So if my constituents get nothing, I should tell them: That is right. Someone from elsewhere said that because this wasn’t good enough, you get nothing.

That is just wrong. This is an important first step that we have to take to help people in all of these jurisdictions, especially the people of Puerto Rico, because we know that the situation there is in no way comparable to anything that has happened on the mainland.

It is personal for me in that sense as well. Why guess what? When my wife’s family was exiled from Cuba, they went to Puerto Rico and they were welcomed there. My wife’s two elder brothers were born in Puerto Rico. My wife still has family in Puerto Rico, and I know that this legislation would improve their situation.

Can we do more? Should we do more? Should we work together to do more in the future? Yes, we should and we will, but that is no excuse to vote against this legislation, that is no excuse to leverage the suffering of these people to try to achieve a political objective or even to advance different legislation.

I respectfully ask all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, and I thank the 26 Democrats who stood with us on Monday, and I ask them to do it again today and for more to join us, to send a strong message of national unity for the people of Florida, Texas, Louisiana, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and yes, Puerto Rico.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered;
Pursuant to H.R. 2792;
Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 227, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS—188</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aderholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agüero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to mark the return to the Chamber of our dear friend and colleague from Louisiana, Mr. STEVE SCALISE.

Our prayers have been answered. His bravery, his strength, have been such an inspiration to this House and to the people it serves. America is grateful for this moment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCALISE was allowed to speak out of order.)

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR SUPPORT DURING MY RECOVERY

Mr. SCALISE. Wow. Mr. Speaker, you have no idea how great this feels to be back here at work in the people’s House.

As you can imagine, these last 3½ months have been pretty challenging times for me and my family. But if you look at the outpouring of love, of warmth, of prayer, my gosh, Jennifer and I have been overwhelmed with all of that outpouring. It has given us the strength to have happened to get this and to get to this point today, and it starts with God.

When I was laying out on that ball field, the first thing I did once I was down and I couldn’t move anymore is, I just held my hands up to heaven and I will tell you, gave it me an unbelievable sense of calm knowing that at that point it was in God’s hands.

But I prayed for very specific things, and I will tell you, pretty much every one of my prayers was answered. There were some pretty challenging prayers I was putting in God’s hands, but He really did deliver for me and my family. And it just gives you that renewed faith and understanding that the power of prayer is something that you just cannot underestimate. So, I am definitely a living example that miracles really do happen.

The first place I want to go to thank true angels along the way starts with the United States Capitol Police. When I was elected majority whip, as you know, the elected leadership has a security detail, and if anybody ever wondered why we are assigned security detail, I surely found out that day.

Let me tell you, I want to specifically mention Crystal Griner and David Bailey. Crystal and David were assigned to my security detail that day. David Bailey. Crystal and David were assigned to my security detail, and if anybody ever wondered why, and I will tell you, saved my life.

Our prayers have been answered. His bravery and his family’s strength have been such an inspiration to this House.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Messrs. SERRANO and HUFFMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Voting Complete
overnowledgewe from the start was the outpouring of love and warmth and prayers. From southeast Louisiana, the district that I represent, we saw blood drives at St. Catherine of Siena Parish. We saw prayer groups at First United Methodist Church in Slidell.

But what we also saw were prayer groups and well-wishes being given from people that we never met before throughout all of your districts. You shared it with me, and it was one of those things that was hard for us to comprehend that you had people from all walks of life that had never met me before, and yet, they saw what had happened and they just wanted to offer prayers.

Let me tell you, to each and every one of you—and please convey it to your constituents, and I sure convey it to my constituents back home—that warmth and love gave us just incredible strength that you can’t imagine during some really, really difficult times. So that is just one more example of the power of prayer.

Something else I saw firsthand wasn’t a surprise to me, but it was the outpouring of love from you, my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat. After the shooting, we were practicing on the Republican side and the Democrats were practicing too—my colleague and friend, and sometimes archival in baseball from back home in New Orleans—unfortunately the game too many times—CEDRIC RICHMOND somehow figured out which hospital I was sent to, and he went there. He was probably the first person there on the scene, in his baseball uniform, to check on me.

So many others of you, again, both Republican and Democrat, reached out in ways that I can’t express the gratitude and how much it means to me, Jennifer, and our whole family. It really does show the warm side of Congress that we get to see. I want to thank each and every one of you for that. You don’t know how much it meant to me. When I came back into this Chamber here today, just seeing the faces of all of you, it just means more to me than you can imagine. So thanks for all of that love and support.

A lot of people ask: Did the event change you? And I think those of you who know me know I am an optimistic person. I am just a fun-loving person. I am from south Louisiana, and we believe you work hard and you play hard and joie de vivre.

Is an event like this really going to change that? The first thing I can tell you is, yes, it changed me, but not in the ways you might think. It has only strengthened my faith in God, and it has really crystallized what shows up as the goodness in people. I got to see that goodness in people.

While some people might focus on a tragic event and an evil act to me, all I remember are the thousands of acts of kindness and love and warmth that came out of this and kept me going through all of it and, again, just reemphasized just how wonderful most people are and how much compassion there is out there.

Finally, I want to talk about something that I guess hit me and probably struck me more than anything that I was not expecting, and that was the outpouring of love and support from world leaders, people I have met and have known. Benjamin Netanyahu and I have had some incredible conversations from the hospital. And Theresa May, King Abdullah of Jordan—leaders that so many of us have met—reached out. But other world leaders also reached out, people I had never met before.

That touched me in a different way because each and every one of us, we come here and we fight for the things that we believe in. I have passionate beliefs. For some reason, some of you don’t see all of those. But it is so important that we come up here. We are the people’s House. This is the place where these ideas are supposed to be debated, and we fight through those issues. But, ultimately, we come together. And the board shows it was 218. If you can put the majority together, that is what rules the day. It is so important that, as we are having those political battles, we don’t make them personal.

One of the things I saw—and I guess this is the thing that really kept coming back to me—is I tried to make sense of all of this. In comprehending the outpouring of love that I saw, it kept coming back to those world leaders. Why would leaders from around the world that I had never met before reach out and say: “Steve, we hope you can get back to work. We hope you can come through this.”?

And what it said is, sure, they cared about my wellbeing, but more than that, they saw this as an attack on all of us. They saw this as an attack on the institution of the United States Congress and our government. And they really count on us to be successful.

Look, we all know the United States is the leader of the free world. It is something that we have, frankly, had the honor as a country to hold as a distinction for generations. And yet, when you look at that title, what it really means is, is that there are people all around the world that want freedom, maybe that have freedom, but they know the United States being strong is critical to the rest of the world having the opportunity for freedom.

That is why I am so excited to be back because as we are fighting through the issues of the day, let’s just keep in mind that we are above the challenges of the day and understand that it is not just us and our constituents and the country, the United States, that is counting on our being successful. People all around the world who believe in freedom are counting on us as well, and we will deliver for them. That is why I am so honored to be back here in the House serving with you.

God bless each and every one of you, and God bless the United States of America.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to speak out of order.)

Answered Prayers

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I join you in thanking God for the return of our colleague, STEVE SCALISE, and to have him do so in such a strong way.

You were brief, Mr. Speaker. I will be even briefer.

Thank God, our prayers are answered.

I take great pride in Steve because we are both Italian Americans, and I think that is a source of some of his strength.

I, too, want to say how proud we are of Jennifer, Harrison, and Madison, of your staff, and of our first responders—our Capitol Police—who took such good care of you.

But if it is, as you said, an attack on you is an attack on all, then we all came through this magnificently because of your strength. So it is the power of STEVE SCALISE.

The day we came to the floor when you weren’t here, we were all Team Scalise. Today we are Team Scalise. Thank you for being so wonderful.

God bless you.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yes 264, nays 155, not voting 14, as follows:

{Roll No. 542}

YEAS—264

Aderholt | Carbaaj | Diaz-Balart |
Allen | Cramer (GA) | Donovan |
Amodei | Cramer (TX) | Duffy |
Arrington | Castor (FL) | Duncan (SC) |
Babin | Chabot | Duncan (TN) |
Bacor | Cheney | Dunn |
Banks (IN) | Coffman | Emmer |
Barr | Cole | Eshensee |
Barton | Collins (GA) | Forest-Hogg |
Bera | Collins (NY) | Faso |
Bergman | Comer | Ferguson |
Bilirakis | Connolly | Fitzpatrick |
Bishop (FL) | Crowley | Fitzpatrick |
Blackburn | Correa | Flores |
Blum | Costa | Foxx |
Boehlert | Costello (PA) | Frank (AZ) |
Brady (TX) | Cramer | French-Harris |
Brat | Crawford | Gabbard |
Bucks (AL) | Crane | Gaetz |
Brooks (IN) | Cuellar | Garret |
Brownsey (CA) | Cullerson | Gianforte |
Buchanan | Curvelo (FL) | Gilchrest |
Buck | Davidson | Gohmert |
Budd | Davis, Rodney | Gonzalez (TX) |
Burgess | Denham | Goodlatte |
Burgos | Gephardt | Gosar |
Byrne | DeSantis | Graves (GA) |
Calvert | Desjarlais | Graves (MO) |
CONTROL UNLAWFUL FUGITIVE FELONS ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON) was recognized to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 171, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—244

NAYs—171

September 28, 2017

Abraham, Clawson, A.
Adams, Chile, A.
Adams, C.
Adams, D.
Adams, G.
Adams, J.
Adams, M.
Adams, R.
Adams, S.
Adams, T.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
Adams, W.
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Pursuant to clause 1, rule 1, the Journal stands approved.

Privileged Report on Resolution of Inquiry to the President

Mr. Goodlatte, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 115-335) on the resolution (H. Res. 488) of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the removal of former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.
We should not forget the spirit that this floor had today. We should take that spirit into the days forward and continue it. We can disagree, but it takes an unbelievable terrible situation, at times, to remind us of the human spirit. I want to do my best to speak, and I want to make sure, even for myself, that I remember those moments in times of the most heated debates.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

And on Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Now, in addition, the House will consider H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, also, as I like to call it, “Miracles for Micah.”

Mr. Speaker, I spent some time on Tuesday with a young boy named Micah. Micah gave me this bracelet, “Miracles for Micah,” and I wear it because Micah was born premature at 20 weeks. If you look at a picture of Micah, he was the size of a bag of M&Ms. Today, he is happy, he is healthy, he is 5 years old, and no one would know the difference.

Mr. Speaker, all life is a miracle, and we have an obligation here to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. I look forward to the House passing this compassionate bill next week that will protect the lives of countless others just like Micah.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will take up the FY18 budget resolution. Our Republican budget balances within 10 years, provides for a strong national defense, eliminates burdensome regulations, and cracks down on waste, fraud, and abuse. Passing this budget will also enable tax reform, which is the key to economic growth and seeing that Americans take home more of their hard-earned dollars.

I thank Chairman BLACK and the entire budget Committee—and especially you, Mr. Speaker—for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information on the schedule to come.

I want to speak to two things that are not on the schedule. Mr. Leader, but I know that both of us are focused on this and realize that we need to move and we need to move quickly.

First of all, I want to speak of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Mr. Leader, and I think Speaker, were scheduled to try to go to Key West and to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands this weekend. I am not sure that that is going to be able to happen, given some of the logistics on the ground, but whether that happens or not, Mr. Speaker, I know the leader and I are going to work very hard on this.

There is a humanitarian crisis that has swept through the Virgin Islands, Key West, at least you can drive to Key West still, and we can get relief to Key West and to Florida and to victims of Harvey. Obviously, our fellow Americans who are residents of two islands, or actually more than two islands, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, are in life-threatening distress.

I talked today to Dr. Price, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, about the availability of dialysis on the island. There are people who have already died because they were not able to get to dialysis centers, and those centers don’t have all the electricity they need, so there is a humanitarian crisis, as I pointed out. Mr. Speaker, and I know the leader appreciates this.

Mr. Leader, I know we don’t have anything on the floor with reference to additional resources that might be and are necessary to meet this humanitarian crisis in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but I would urge the majority leader, as I have done and I think he has done, to be in contact with the administration, be in contact with FEMA.

In particular, I was pleased to see that General Kim has now been appointed, as General Honore was for New Orleans and Katrina, to coordinate activities. We have extraordinary resources in the Armed Forces of the United States, and I would urge the President, as Commander in Chief, and the Department of Defense to allocate every resource necessary to get the American people who live in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to a point where they can get dialysis, and we have extraordinary resources that might be necessary to help our fellow Americans.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring up an act which although not the crisis that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, in particular, confront us with, as did Harvey and Irma in Texas and in Florida, but Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Dream Act is not a part of next week’s schedule.

The leader and I have discussed the Dream Act, along with Speaker RYAN. I know that the President has said, if we pass the Dream Act, he has said publicly that he would sign the Dream Act. He is obviously concerned with security at the borders. We share that concern about security at the borders.

But this is an item that, now, one-sixth of the time that was available has run, and we have 5 months left to go.

I will tell the majority leader that I am very hopeful. I know the majority leader and the Speaker have formed some task forces to look at this issue, but I am very hopeful, Mr. Speaker—and I ask the majority leader to perhaps comment on this—that before the end of this work period—there are another 14 days left after this week in this work period—that we might be able to bring the Dream Act to the floor.

A discharge petition has been filed. I hope that the discharge petition not be necessary for either the rule or for the Dream Act itself. The discharge petition on the Dream Act itself will be matured this week, and I expect a discharge petition to be filed on that, as well. But I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that that will not be necessary.
Given the fact that the President has said that he thinks DACA was issued beyond the authority of President Obama, we disagree with that conclusion. But whether that conclusion is correct or not, the President observed that it was time to look at this legislatively.

So my question to the majority leader is: How soon does he believe that we could address this issue in regular order?

We continue to pursue a discharge petition, Mr. Speaker, and we believe, frankly, for the Ex-Im Bank, which, when it was called to the floor, had over 300 votes in favor of it, including the majority of the majority party voted for that bill.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, strongly, that if the Dream Act is brought to the floor, which over 8 in 10 Americans agree with, frankly, we believe large numbers on both sides of the aisle agree that these young people are not to be sent home.

Lastly, let me just quote Senator ORRIN HATCH, who is a senior Member in the United States Senate and the chairman of the Finance Committee. He said: "I've urged the President not to rescind DACA. 

He did, and gave us 6 months to solve this, this, this.

Senator HATCH observed that if DACA were rescinded, it would be "an action that would further complicate a system in serious need of a permanent, legislative solution."

He was referring then, Mr. Speaker, to a comprehensive immigration reform.

"Like the President, I've long advocated for tougher enforcement of our existing immigration laws. But we also need a workable, permanent solution for individuals who entered our country unlawfully as children through no fault of their own and who have built their lives here. That solution must come from Congress."

And, "I strongly agree that decision must come from Congress."

Rush Limbaugh said—and I don't usually agree with statements that Mr. Limbaugh makes: "Nobody's gonna win anything by deporting a bunch of kids that we let in, whoever did, Obama, whatever. If we can get the strict enforcement of our existing immigration laws . . . then the DREAMer thing may be an acceptable payoff," he went on to say.

I don't think this is a payoff. This is responding. And that is why the overwhelming majority of the American people support the Dream Act. As I say, over 8 out of 10 Americans.

So I ask the majority—and I know that was a relatively long statement. This is a critical issue, however, as I have expressed in private to the majority leader, because we have but 5 months left to go.

Hopefully, we could do this in this work period to allay the fears that these young people have, who are making such a positive contribution to America, to their communities, and to their families. So I am hopeful that we could resolve this issue as soon as possible.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I first want to applaud Speaker RYAN for forming a working group on this important issue. The gentleman and I have met numerous times on this, and I have talked to the President about it, as well. He has been very clear, and I agree with the President's position, courts have shown that the past was unconstitutional, and that just means the House has to do their job and the Senate. The one thing I would hate to happen here is that we only do the job halfway, and then we have this problem come back to us.

The President has asked us about border security, as well. I believe we can find a solution here, together. I look forward to working with Mr. HOYER.

The President has challenged this Congress to find a solution, and I believe we can. We are going to work to make sure we have a comprehensive one like to do it sooner than the timeframe the President has given us.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the majority leader's thought that he wants to do it sooner rather than later. I will support him, of course, in that effort.

I would say on his comment, Mr. Speaker, with reference to a comprehensive solution, we are for a comprehensive solution. We would like to see that because that is the only way we will stop this from coming back.

The Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill 3 years ago. We have not seen that on the floor as of yet. Again, we think that that would have a substantial vote and, perhaps, I think, a majority vote. I am not as confident of that as I am with the Dream Act, which I think clearly would enjoy the majority of the House's support.

But I am glad that he wants to move this quickly. We will work with him to get that, I would hope, as I said, by the end of the work period, to allay the great fears and anxiety.

Very frankly, we have had some young people thinking of going back to a land they do not know, a language they do not necessarily speak, and a culture they have, as adults, never been exposed to and don't know.

This, for all intents and purposes, in anything other than having the paper that says so, is their country. They have gone to school here, they work here, and they have been positive citizens here. And, hopefully—as the President said, he loved these children—and could relieve their fears and, in effect, redeem the American Dream for them.

There are other issues, obviously, with which we have to deal, and I would urge the majority leader, as well, at some point in time, to make sure we get done, and as a result, we will have is the comprehensive immigration reform, because it is a system we all agree is broken and needs to be fixed and is part of the problem.

Two more issues, Mr. Speaker. The majority leader mentioned the budget would be coming to the floor. This is the 2018 budget. This is obviously late, but, nevertheless, it is being brought to the floor, and we will be able to consider it.

Can the gentleman tell me: Will this include reconciliation instructions and, if so, what those reconciliation instructions will deal with?

I yield to my friend.

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

I expect reconciliation in this budget. I leave it up to the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee when they produce it, but on this floor, I believe there will be reconciliation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, will it assume the repeal of the ACA in fiscal year '17 or fiscal year '18, either one of those years, which clearly has not seemed possible at this point in time?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

If the question is have I given up on repealing ObamaCare, the answer is no. So, yes, this is the budget for the rest of the year. We know the harm that ObamaCare has brought to many Americans. The lack of insurance, when you look at the number of counties, 40 percent of all of the counties in America only have one provider, some have none. We watched premiums go up.

We want a healthcare system where people have choice, that, actually, the price is lower and the quality is better. That is something I will never give up on, so, yes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for that observation.

Obviously, we disagree, as he knows, on the success or failure of the ACA. As a matter of fact, every health organization in America, every major health organization in America opposed the repeal, a bill that came to the floor.

Senator MCCAIN, I thought, gave a very powerful exhortation to all of us when he said, on July 25, we ought to do this in a bipartisan way.

We found, now, three efforts to repeal by the majority party, who control all three—the Senate, the House, and the Presidency—an inability to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe—and I would hope the majority leader would pursue efforts, and we would do the same on our side. We believe the ACA has been working.

We believe that 20-plus million more people are insured under the ACA than were insured before the ACA.

We believe people with preexisting conditions were able to get insurance. We believe seniors saved substantial money in purchasing prescription drugs as a result of that.

We believe that people did not have—well, they don't have the specter of being canceled because their expenses in any one year were above a limit and that their lifetime limits
would not be imposed when they get a serious critical illness.

So we think it worked.

The majority has tried to repeal it. They have not succeeded at this point in time, but they have created, Mr. Speaker, great anxiety and uncertainty in the marketplace.

And to the extent, for instance, that premiums have risen in our State, the head of Blue Cross/Blue Shield, the largest insurer in our State, said the reason for at least 50 percent was the uncertainty that had been created by the administration and by the debates that have occurred in this House and the proposals that have occurred in this House, which have undermined the market.

I talked to him the other day, and he said, in fact, if there were stability, he believes rates would come down significantly because insurance companies, providers, would have an opportunity to have a stable environment in which they could assess the cost of health insurance.

Did the majority leader want to say anything?

I yield to my friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, the only thing I want to say, and I know we have debated this many times—we can always put an endorsement somewhere and we can always go back and forth, but I will just tell you for my own district—I don’t know why anybody would ever say they are making a decision based on something when our bill carries it out another 2 years even, so I don’t believe that to be true.

But I know what is true. Currently, 30 percent of the people who are on the exchange in my district just had somebody pull out; and they had that health insurance, Anthem, so now they don’t.

They have to go find something else. They had doctors who they loved, and they were promised that they were going to be able to keep them. Well, they couldn’t.

I just look at numbers; and I take Republican, Democrat, I take whatever name is across from it. Almost twice as many people pay the penalty or take a waiver as actually make a payment for ObamaCare.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on. I promise, all day, and our friends who want to do a 1-minute or a Special Order would not be happy with us, and they are maybe not happy now, but the fact of the matter is that this is a critically important issue to our country. When he talks about providers, the providers said they didn’t like any of these bills.

We have had three opportunities: one that was offered but not put on the floor; then one that came to the floor and passed this House and then went to the Senate, and the majority of the Senate has not agreed with any of the three alternatives; plus the alternative that Senator GRAHAM brought forward along with the Senator from Louisiana.

The majority in the Senate has not agreed, and, Mr. Speaker, what that has done is provided the insurance industry, providers, doctors, medical authorities with total lack of confidence on what is going to happen tomorrow. Nobody in business believes that you can have pricing for you do not know the context in which you are pricing your product. So, yes, there has been a disruption.

What we ought to do, as Senator McCAIN said is come together and make sure a system works. We believe the ACA is working—not working as well as it should right now, it is not working as much for the small market or people on the exchanges as it should. It can.

Almost every medical provider and the majority of the American people over these last 8 months has changed from not liking the ACA and not thinking it is good for the people to think the majority of the American people now support it, and 7 out of 10-plus want the ACA fixed, not repealed.

So in that context, it seems to me it is both good politics and good policy for us to come together and to create a system that works for the American people. We believe that is by fixing the ACA, and to that extent, we reflect the majority of the American people.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the last issue I want to bring up are two items that were not included in the FAA bill, but which are important programs. One is the Perkins Loan Program for students. We know that the cost of education has skyrocketed and that we need to extend that act. That bill, by the way, Mr. Speaker, has 226 cosponsors, so it is not as if there is not a majority of the House that already supports that extension.

The second thing that needs to be done: we need to deal with a comprehensive health system in our communities, the Community Health Centers. We need to deal with the teaching hospitals. We need to deal with the disproportionate number of hospitals.

So there are many things that we did not include in the bill that we passed today that need to be addressed and need to be addressed immediately. They are not on the schedule for next week.

Can my friend give me some idea when we might consider those, which, of course, expire on September 30?

So September 30 will come and go before we start next week’s schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

You raised a couple issues there. When it comes to teaching hospitals, and the minority voted against twice this week on the floor. So that has been taken care of.

When you are talking about SCHIP and the extension of that, Chairman WALDEN actually postponed a markup not because he wanted to, but because it was requested by the Democrats. So he postponed the markup this week in continuing bipartisan negotiations.

This is something I would like to get done. I know Chairman WALDEN has now scheduled a markup for next week, so I am very hopeful that we will get this done very soon. I am a big supporter of SCHIP and a lot of the work that they do and what it moves forward for our healthcare in the future, especially for the health clinics out there. So I look forward to working with you.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate that.

You mentioned SCHIP. Can you refer to the Perkins Loan Program? Does the gentleman know whether that is also moving forward?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

I apologize. You did mention the Perkins Act. I do not have that scheduled at the current time, but I will keep you abreast when I do.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that SCHIP is on the committee’s agenda for next week. Hopefully, that can be brought to the floor before we leave in this work period, perhaps just before or just after the Dream Act is brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that today could be the very last time that Margarita Curtis provides a message to us on this floor.

We would like to thank Margarita Curtis. From a very grateful nation, thank you for your service. Many times the American people see your voice, but also the power of what you bring back and forth to make this democracy work. We want to thank you for your service, and we wish you all the happiness in retirement.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Margarita Curtis has been a longtime employee of the United States Senate and, as a result, an employee of the people of the United States.

Margarita, you have always done your work with great ability and clarity. We very much appreciate your service to the Senate, but also to this country, and to the American people. They are grateful for all you have done. God speed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, clerk, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2266. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2017, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017

Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 2, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

There was no objection.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Suicide Prevention Month to call attention to this tragedy that is so prevalent and important throughout our Nation.

Suicide is the tenth leading cause of death in the United States, and, on average, there are 121 suicides per day. Far too many Americans, about one in five, are suffering from some form of mental illness, a problem that has disrupted too many families, caused too much violence, pain, and cost too many lives.

In Congress, we are working together on a bipartisan basis to bring needed reform to our mental health care system through the passage of the 21st Century Cures Act and the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act.

The Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System, led by Dr. Margie Scott, is one of nine systems nationwide currently involved in the Clay Hunt pilot program.

This program gives our VA employees the necessary tools to reach out to high-risk veterans and offer guidance while providing essential suicide prevention services. Dr. Scott and Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System have made over 200 community connections throughout Arkansas to assist our veterans.

We all must work together and continue to move forward in addressing the issue of mental health and mental health access, and do what we can to save the lives of all American citizens and reverse this deadly trend of suicides.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS AND CHILDREN’S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM WILL EXPIRE ON SEPTEMBER 30

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I can’t believe Congress has closed legislative business for the week without addressing a critical deadline that will impact the health of our country. On September 30, authorization for the Community Health Centers and the Children’s Health Insurance Program—CHIP—will expire.

Well, it is September 28, and we just closed legislative business. That means funding for this critical program will lapse and the health of millions of Americans will be in jeopardy.

Our Nation’s Community Health Centers have served low-income, rural, and underserved communities for more than 50 years. In that time, they have increased the number of patients they serve and the services they offer so that they are now the primary healthcare option for millions of people.

CHIP is another program that Congress will allow to lapse. No matter how big the differences between Republicans and Democrats, when it comes to healthcare, we have always come together to ensure our Nation’s children do not go without the care they need, yet here we are leaving D.C. and abandoning the 9 million children on CHIP and the millions more at the Community Health Centers.

I ask that we come back into session and that we extend these critical programs.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAJOR GENERAL TIM LOWENBERG

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and memory of Major General Timothy Lowenberg, former Adjutant General of the Washington State National Guard.

After attending law school, Tim served on Active Duty at McChord Air Force Base before joining the Washington National Guard as a Judge Advocate Staff Officer.

He was promoted to Adjutant General, honorably serving Washington State and our Nation. He stood up for our citizen soldiers, worked to ensure that the National Guard had the resources it needed, and oversaw multiple deployments to the Middle East.

In addition, Tim established the Washington Youth Academy, providing an education and opportunity for at-risk youth across the State.

As a member of the Washington legislature, I was pleased to work with him on this, a cause that he was very passionate about, and was able to see his vision become a success.

Upon retirement, he continued to serve his country and community. He will be missed by many, but his legacy of determination, kindness, and dutiful service to Washington and these United States lives on.

Please join me in remembering Major General Timothy Lowenberg, my friend.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the anniversary of the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

Tomorrow, the program we know as SNAP—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—turns 40. We also know that before the implementation of SNAP, families couldn’t afford healthy meals and kids were going to school on empty stomachs.

Today, thanks to this program, over 18,000 families in my district on the central coast of California count on SNAP benefits to put food on their tables at home and help their children feed their minds at their schools.

In my district, the number one industry is agriculture. We ship our fresh fruits and vegetables all over the country and to even other parts of the world. As a representative of this area, it is my goal and it is my responsibility to make sure that the families in my district have access to the same nutritious produce that is grown in our backyard.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of Chairman Conaway, I look forward to working on the 2018 farm bill with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle so that we can support strong investments in SNAP. By doing that, we will support stronger families and a stronger future.

THE 2018 FISCAL YEAR

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday is new year’s day, the start of the Federal Government’s 2018 fiscal year.

Several weeks ago, Congress passed and the President signed a temporary spending bill to carry the government through December 8. This temporary bill was necessary because, although the House passed its spending bills, the Senate did not.

One of the more glaring problems with the CR is that it continues the years’ long practice of shortchanging...
our defenses and the men and women in our military. Defense spending and defense policy are frozen, and the changes this House has insisted on in both the Defense Authorization Act and the Defense Appropriations bill are stalled, to the detriment of our defenses and our men and women in uniform.

Secretary Mattis has written, "Long-term CRs impact the readiness of our forces and their equipment at a time when security threats are extraordinarily high. The longer the CR, the greater the consequences for our force.''

The risks are real, Mr. Speaker. We see threats growing daily from North Korea and Iran. The fight continues against ISIS and against terror in Afghanistan, and now we need to deploy urgently needed resources to Puerto Rico. There is no need to wait until December 8 to get a full-year Defense Appropriations bill. I call on the Senate to act promptly next week even and get our troops funded.

ASSETS NEEDED IN PUERTO RICO AND THE U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

(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 am glad President Trump listened to Secretary Clinton and deployed the U.S. Naval Ship Comfort to Puerto Rico, even though it was 7 days after Hurricane Maria destroyed the island. But President Trump must do more and do it now.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has a moral and legal duty to protect the well-being of our citizens. That is why today, right now, the President must order the Department of Defense to deploy all available assets to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to prevent this catastrophe from getting worse.

The thousands of Puerto Ricans and all of the Virgin Islanders I represent deserve to know that our Nation’s priority is their well-being, their families’, their friends’, and their fellow citizens’ as well—American citizens.

LETTER CARRIER DONTE COTTON IS A HERO

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to welcome STEVE SCALISE back to this House floor. The strength of his message shows why he is such a hero to us all.

I also want to tell the story of another hero, one from my congressional district in Dayton, Ohio.

On April 5, 2016, letter carrier Donte Cotton was driving a returned car that had collided with a pole. The driver told Donte her child was inside the car. Acting on immediate instinct, Donte crawled through broken glass to rescue the baby from the car. Both the mother and the child were taken to the hospital and treated for minor injuries.

In August of last year, Donte again found himself in the right place at the right time; again, on his letter carrier route.

While on his normal mail delivery route, an elderly woman, whose home had just been invaded, ran up to Donte seeking help. Donte drove the woman to a nearby police cruiser, ensuring her safety.

His courage is being rewarded this week by the National Association of Letter Carriers, which has given Donte its 2017 Central Area Hero Award.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Donte for his acts of true heroism in our community.

PASS THE DREAM ACT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Josue Fuentes was brought to Hawaii from El Salvador when he was 13 years old, where he was escaping rampant gang violence and domestic abuse at home.

He went to high school in Honolulu, made friends, got a job. But no matter what he did, he couldn’t escape the dark shadow cast on his future because of his immigration status.

Josue describes DACA as a weight lifted from his back. He was empowered to apply for college. He bought a home and pursued opportunities that any of us would want for our children.

Today, he is a small business owner. He owns a landscaping company, he volunteers at his local church, and continues to give back to the Kanoeho community that he calls home.

I urge my colleagues to sign a discharge petition to bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote so we can pass a permanent solution for Josue and millions of DREAMers across the country. Our Nation made a promise to these young men and women. We must uphold that promise.

CERTIFY THAT IRAN IS IN FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE JCPOA

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon President Trump to certify that Iran is in full compliance with the JCPOA, otherwise known as the Iran nuclear agreement. To decertify at this time will destabilize the ability of the United States to engage in international agreements, especially those we initiated ourselves.

Our credibility is on the line, especially given the fact that the IAEA and the United Nations and the United States Government have certified that Iran is in compliance. It is in compliance on its centrifuges, enriched uranium, the production of the plutonium reactor itself.

We want to make sure that we don’t have a second nuclear front by decertifying Iran. It is important to the United States’ interests, to the security of the world, and the security of Israel that this agreement be certified as in compliance.

HONORING CHINESE GENERAL SUN LI-JEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Chinese General Sun Li-jen. He was known as the ever-victorious general, and fought with valor against Axis forces in Burma during World War II.

General Sun’s strategies on the battlefield were a combination of traditional Chinese military theory and American military training. He was an important ally for the United States and a popular figure among his people.

He was born in Anhui, China, and was the son of a Confucian scholar. He moved to the United States to attend Purdue University on a Boxer Indemnity Scholarship, and graduated with a degree in civil engineering.

As China fell deeper into political upheaval and war, General Sun believed he could be more useful as a soldier than as an engineer. He went on to attend the Virginia Military Institute, where he faced prejudice from other cadets.

When he returned to China, he advanced to the rank of colonel. In one of his earliest battles in World War II, he led troops to the defense of Shanghai and was wounded while leading his own men to safety.

After recovering from his injuries, he established a military training camp in southern China. The men at the camp were trained in both Eastern and Western military strategy.

General Sun is internationally renowned for his extraordinary service during the Battle of Yenangyaung in 1942. He saved the British First Burma Division by leading a regiment in a flanking maneuver. His bravery protected Allied forces from encirclement by the Imperial Japanese Army.

During this battle, General Sun was also given command of a small group from the British Second Royal Tanks, making him the first Chinese officer to command British troops. For recognition of his victory in Burma, he was knighted by the United Kingdom and awarded the Legion of Merit by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was a friend of American Generals MacArthur and Eisenhower.

In the year of his death, General Sun was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor by President Kennedy.

On January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.
When General Sun returned to his native country, he implemented training practices that would assist in modernizing and preparing China for the challenges of the 1930s and 1940s. During those eventful decades, General Sun received international attention as a leader of the Chinese Nationalist Army during the Second Sino-Japanese War, the China-Burma-India Theater, and World War II. In the latter conflict, he has been credited with reclaiming Burma from the Japanese. For his leadership in the China-Burma-India Theater, Sun was knighted Commander of the Order of the British Empire by King George VI and awarded the Legion of Merit by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the general's and his official portrait are exhibited in the VMI Museum where they are seen by 40,000 visitors annually. Over the years, generations of Chinese students have been inspired by the story of General Sun; many have followed his example and attended VMI.

General Sun's legacy lives on through his family, including California Assemblyman Kansen Chu. I am pleased to introduce Kansen Chu and his wife, Daisy Chu, who have joined us here today with his family and our honored guests in the House gallery.

The district that Assemblyman Chu and I represent are some of the most ethnically diverse areas in our country. General Sun valued diversity. He found greater strength as a leader by combining Eastern and Western ideas. He led soldiers with different ethnicities and religions. His accomplishments demonstrate that we are better when we embrace diversity.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage Congress to remember the contributions and legacy of General Sun and their importance to the people of the United States, of China, and those of Chinese-American ancestry.

I want to end on this note. Several of us went a few days ago to the Library of Congress where Graham Allison was speaking. He has this theory of the Thucydides Trap, which argues that two powers—when one power is rising and another power is established—often are likely to face conflict and war. He said that Xi Jinping in China is familiar with Thucydides Trap.

I would submit that General Sun's story is a reminder for why the United States and China can be allies and not adversaries. We often forget that China and the United States are critical in the United States' efforts in winning World War II, and General Sun's story is a reminder of that and an inspiration for us in this new century in finding common ground between the United States and China to help create a more peaceful world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid references to occupants of the gallery.

TRAVELING BY PRIVATE JET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, is Donald Trump running a Cabinet or a country club?

Because every day it is getting harder to tell. Not only is the President spending vast sums to ferry himself to and from his various golf courses, but now it turns out that top leaders in his administration have developed a special fondness for traveling by private jet.

The Treasury Secretary used a taxpayer-funded plane to hop down to Fort Knox to see the eclipse, for example, and he has also asked to use one for his honeymoon in Europe.

Trump's EPA Administrator, Scott Pruitt, spent another $58,000 on private jets. But the worst offender is HHS Secretary Price, who, in his brief time in office, has already chalked up an astonishing 400 grand in flights on private aircraft. He flew down to Tennessee for all of 6 hours, much of which was spent having lunch with his son. That is nice. He also jetted off to an island off the coast of Georgia for a trip that apparently featured far more recreation than government business.

Clearly, when it comes to travel on the taxpayers' dime, the price does not matter to Tom Price. Ethics and personal responsibility doesn't matter to Tom Price. Doing what is right doesn't matter to Tom Price. Why is he needs to resign immediately.
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Now, don't take my word for it. Here is what President George W. Bush's top ethics official, Richard Painter, said about Price's travel habits: "To use a charter flight on something that combines personal and government business, I think, is highly unprofessional and really inappropriate." Those are strong words.

But, Mr. Speaker, you know who summed up best how terrible it is for someone to use private jets? Tom Price. In 2009, he described government officials taking private planes as "just another example of fiscal irresponsibility run amok." I couldn't agree more, Mr. Speaker.

Price spent nearly $25,000 to fly from D.C. to Philadelphia and back for one 8-hour day. He somehow flew last minute, $725 to get there on United Airlines, or $133 to get there on Amtrak.
Mr. Speaker, I just checked, on my phone, that an Uber to Philly right now, back and forth, would have cost Mr. Price about $450 round trip. That means that, for the price of his private jet, he could have ordered individual cars for himself and his 54 staff members. Every American who works and pays taxes should find this totally appalling.

Amtrak was good enough for the Vice President of the United States, Joe Biden, but, somehow, it is beneath the Treasury Secretary and HHS Secretary to ride the train. Riding the train is apparently even beneath the EPA Administrator.

Here is a good rule of thumb, Mr. Speaker: If you are spending more on private jets than most American families make in 1 year, you are spending too much on private jets.

Tom Price has plenty of time to go jetting around the country, but not enough time to help people sign up for health insurance. Most Americans who work and pays taxes should find this totally appalling.

Secretary Price says he needs to fly around on his jet to connect with ordinary citizens. I am not kidding. His press secretary told reporters that these outrageous junkets were about “getting outside of D.C., making sure he is connected with the real American people.”

Mr. Speaker, here is how you really connect with your fellow Americans: don’t take a private plane; fly a middle seat in coach.

Of course, we should have seen this coming. News reports earlier this year revealed that, when he was a Member of Congress, Price was guilty of introducing bills to benefit his own personal investments. Even more egregious, he traded more than $300,000 in healthcare industry stocks based on insider information.

There is no question Secretary Price needs to resign right now, and, if he doesn’t, President Trump needs to fire him.

Donald Trump claims that he loves firing people. He once said: I love doing it if someone really, really, really deserves it.

I am fed up, and so are the American people. Let’s bring back government to the people, for the people, instead of government for the powerful friends of Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California (Mr. Ted Lieu).

Mr. Ted Lieu of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman Gallego for that terrific presentation. We are also joined today by Congressman Raskin and other Members who will be part of our dialogue as well.

Today is Thursday. That means we all need to ask: Why does Jared Kushner still have a security clearance? He already submitted two false security clearances. He’s not even one of the three other problems in the White House, one of which is Secretary Price.

To my left is a picture of the private jet that Secretary Price flew on at taxpayer expense. But in addition to Secretary Price and Price, we have Secretary Mnuchin, who flew on a government jet with his wife to Kentucky in order to watch the eclipse. Now, I get that was a pretty cool thing to do, but you shouldn’t be using taxpayer funds to do that.

And then we have got EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, which, according to media reports, spent $58,000 on non-commercial flights to go to different places. With $58,000, you can do a lot with that. Yes, but it release today saying that with $58,000 you could hire a VA spinal cord specialist at the Syracuse VA, a nurse for 1 year. Then Secretary Price spent over $400,000 of your money, and that is a lot of spinal cord specialists.

So we are talking about raiding the public funds and raiding the public trust. That is why I have introduced the SWAMP FLYERS Act, and what this act will do is stop this from happening to prohibit senior Cabinet officials from using non-commercial flights, unless they certify, under penalty of perjury, that no commercial flights were available.

So in this case, you had Secretary Price, for example, flying from here to Nashville. I guarantee you there were lots of commercial flights. There was no reason he had to take a noncommercial flight.

In addition to what we are seeing with these three Cabinet officials, we do have sort of this culture of corruption that really needs to stop because this flows from the top. With the President, what we have now is the President staying at all these properties, private properties that are his or owned by his family, and then he comes with this massive entourage of Secret Service and other folks, and they are paying money to these properties to stay there, to eat there, and all of that money flows back to the Trump organization. So the President is enriching himself and his family at taxpayers’ expense. It is no wonder that we have got these three Cabinet officials doing these insane things with taxpayers’ funds.

Now we have got a Republican Congress unwilling to do oversight on this. You have got Speaker Ryan recently going on TV saying that he thinks that the present administration is doing great. Well, you can’t have this kind of taxpayer waste when you have got the public trust at issue.

We also have responses from these departments that are deeply troubling. Secretary Price, for example, in response to what Secretary Mnuchin was doing, in addition to his noncommercial travel to Kentucky to watch the eclipse, he also asked if the Air Force could fly him and his wife on their honeymoon. The answer is no, you can’t do that.

Now the response from the Department was, well, he needed to have secure communications. Well, that was the wrong response. I can guarantee you there are other ways of getting secure communications other than to have the Air Force fly you around on your honeymoon.

With Secretary Price, again, the Department gave the wrong response. They said, well, Secretary Price needs to go around meeting Americans, and he shouldn’t be waiting 4 hours at the airport. Wrong response. Yes, he should be waiting 4 hours at the airport because that is what other Americans do. And I can guarantee you no American flies for $25,000 to meet other Americans. Again, the wrong response from that Department.

What we need is to have these three Cabinet officials apologize. I joined with Ruben Gallego, as well as Jamie Raskin and other Members yesterday in a letter to ask for Price to resign, and all of us are also coauthors of the SWAMP FLYERS Act.

What we need now is really for the public to get engaged because what we are seeing is fraud, waste, and abuse with multiple members of the Trump Cabinet.

Mr. Gallego. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the good gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Raskin).

Mr. Raskin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this important question of public integrity. I also want to salute my colleague from California (Mr. Ted Lieu), who has been a leading voice in demanding real financial accountability in the administration.

I want to underscore some of the things that my colleagues have said. Mr. Speaker, if there are any Americans out there who love to fly wherever
they want, whenever they want, at taxpayer expense, then we have got the perfect job for you in President Trump’s Cabinet. Now, of course, only billionaires and millionaires need apply for these jobs, but if you have a taste for fancy chartered air travel, paid for by hardworking Americans across the country, this is undoubtedly the job for you.

My friends, while millions of desperate Americans are suffering in the sweltering conditions of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Florida, Texas, and Louisiana, we have got Cabinet Secretaries who should be doing everything in their power to save our people but are, instead, looking out for something far more important, apparently, than other Americans’ mere survival. They are focused on their own first class, private charter, airplane flights to cushy destinations, paid for by hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money. We kid you not.

This week, it comes out that Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price is less interested in health and human services than he is in wealth and valet services. Despite the fact that he blasted the use of government jet travel on CNBC just a few short years ago, he seems to have come down with a severe and chronic case of swamp fever, billing you and me and millions of other Americans for 26 customized, deluxe, premier, first class, private charter, airplane flights at taxpayer expense, at an extraordinary estimated cost of more than $400,000. That is just one Cabinet Secretary.

Now, I can’t blame him for one of the trips that he took in August to the beautiful and secluded St. Simons Island in southern Georgia, and another trip that enabled him to get to his condo in Nashville and to have lunch with his son. You can hardly blame him for wanting to get out of town and to see his family. After all, it is not that hard here in Washington, D.C., as the climate change sets in across America and the world. But as we say on Capitol Hill: “It’s not the heat, it’s the stupidity.”

And look at what our Secretary of Health and Human Services did, and here I will read from Politico, September 26, an article entitled “Price’s private-jet travels included visits with colleagues, lunch with son.”

“From the Washington, D.C., to book a private airplane to do it?” Politico asked the same question. Here they said:

“Like some of the other 26 flights that Price took on corporate jets since May identified by a Politico review, the trip appears to have occurred despite the existence of multiple commercial flight options. The trip to Georgia, while less direct, also could have been accomplished with a routine connecting flight through Atlanta’s main international airport.

“On August 4, Price flew a Dassault Falcon 2000 twin jet from Raleigh, North Carolina, where he had given a speech to a flu vaccine manufacturer, to Brunswick Golden Isles Airport, which is about a half-hour drive from St. Simons Island. As the same plane that had shuttled him between five States in four days, one that HHS had chartered through Classic Air Charter for more than $60,000, according to Federal contracts.

“The plane arrived in Brunswick at 4:02 p.m. the afternoon before the start of the two-day Medical Association of Georgia retreat and roughly 40 hours before Price addressed the group, according to airport records.”

“At about the same time, there were connecting commercial flights from Raleigh to Brunswick via Atlanta that would have gotten Price to St. Simons Island that evening.”

My friends, you can go back and you can look. In all of these cases, for example, Secretary Price chartered a plane for $25,000 of government money from Dulles Airport to Philadelphia, a distance of a mere 135 miles. That charter flight left 5 minutes after a regular flight, commercial flight, flew, from Dulles for a few hundred dollars. So he paid $25,000 and left several minutes later than he could have left had he just taken the commercial flight.

He also could have taken, of course, the Amtrak, which is what most people do when they are going to Philadelphia from the Washington area, for a mere $72. Even the first class Acela would have been cheaper than the British Airways—they go there—whose slogan is: “To Fly, To Serve.” I guess that is not quite right.

Or he could have taken Southwest Airlines. Their slogan is: “Low fares. Nothing to hide.” I see that wouldn’t have fit. Maybe JetBlue, “You Above All.” That could have worked.

But no, instead, he had to book the private jet and fly for $25,000 from here to Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, this is an old Washington story. The people who say they are coming to drain the swamp have themselves become the swamp. And this is not something that affects just one Cabinet Secretary. Several Cabinet Secretaries are doing this, as my colleagues have pointed out.

With Secretary Price, who seems to be the captain of the swamp flyers; Secretary Pruitt, who is a frequent swamp flyer himself; and Secretary Mnuchin, another swamp flyer, we have a serious staph infection spreading throughout the Trump administration.

And why not, the President seems to have evolved a whole new model of government in the 21st century. Government is a money-making operation for specific families and specific tiny groups in the society. And that is the message that pervades the Trump administration today.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass the SWAMP FLYERS Act, which is very funny and says that this is who have the honor and the privilege of coming to serve the American people here in Washington, D.C., should use regular commercial air flights unless it is a matter of national security, or unless there is not a commercial flight that will get them to where they need to go.

But the idea that you have Cabinet Secretaries who have already taken dozens of flights, paid for with hundreds of thousands, or millions of dollars, of taxpayer money when a commercial flight would have done is an absolute scandal. Now, it hasn’t gotten much attention yet because on the second day, the swamp is a very small one. But it is a dramatic and vivid illustration of what is going on here.

The people who said they were going to drain the swamp became the swamp. And now, the swamp pervades everything. Every Cabinet member, all of the Secretaries, the entire government is engulfed in this kind of corruption.

The right wing, the people at the top, where President Trump has continued to collect hundreds of thousands, or millions, of dollars in foreign payments at the Trump Hotels, at the Trump office tower, and the Trump golf courses around the world from foreign governments, and has not once come to the U.S. Congress to ask for our permission and consent as is required by Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution, which forbids the collection of presents, emoluments, offices, and titles from foreign governments by any person who serves under the United States, who holds an office under the United States.
This President is not only collecting rampant, extreme amounts of money through his businesses from foreign governments, he is not even asking us for our permission or our consent. We have got to pass the SWAMP FLYERS Act.

I commend Mr. Lieu for writing this immediately when the news broke about this rampant abuse of current regulations. We need to take a stand as a Congress on a bipartisan level. Unanimously, we can pass this to say that government officials should not be flying at taxpayer expense for dubious reasons. We should be using coach like everybody else, flying commercial like everybody else.

If you have got to fly first class, fly first class; but fly commercial unless it is a matter of national security, or unless there is not a commercial flight that will get you there. Is that something that we can agree on, on a bipartisan basis?

I just want to say, earlier today we saw a magnificent example of real public service and public dedication by our distinguished colleague, Mr. Scalise, who has returned, thankfully, to this distinguished colleague, Mr. Scalise, who has returned, thankfully, to this body. He demonstrates and embodies what is the worst in public service.

Let’s pass the SWAMP FLYERS Act immediately.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. GALLEGO. Representative Lieu, how often do you fly back, and where do you fly back to?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. I fly about three times a month, and I generally fly from Dulles back to LAX in my district, and fly commercial.

Mr. GALLEGO. How long is your flight?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. It is about 5 hours to 5 1/2 hours, depending on the wind.

Mr. GALLEGO. You and I have been Members of Congress since 2015. At any point in any of your flights to and from your work—I am sorry—from here to your home, have you ever used a charter plane?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. No.

Mr. GALLEGO. Would you even be able to, by law, use a charter plane according to the funds we are allowed to expense?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. No. If I did that, I would be the subject of an immediate congressional ethics investigation.

Mr. GALLEGO. So what makes Mr. Price think that he is somehow above the law, that he is allowed to do this, considering that he knew, as a Member of Congress, that was not allowed and that somehow he can just take advantage of the situation now that he has suddenly moved up after only just a few months of being in Congress, to be the Secretary of Health and Human Services?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a great point because what Secretary Price, and Mnuchin, and EPA Administrator Pruitt, and Carano—especially when you look at what is the worst in public service.

Please stop using taxpayer funds for luxury jet travel.

Mr. GALLEGO. So what makes Mr. Price think that he is somehow above the law, that he is allowed to do this, considering that he knew, as a Member of Congress, that was not allowed and that somehow he can just take advantage of the situation now that he has suddenly moved up after only just a few months of being in Congress, to be the Secretary of Health and Human Services?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a great point because what Secretary Price, and Mnuchin, and EPA Administrator Pruitt, and Carano—especially when you look at what is the worst in public service.

Please stop using taxpayer funds for luxury jet travel.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative Lieu.

Mr. TILDIEU of California. Let me again conclude by thanking Congressmen Gallego and Congressman Raskin for highlighting this issue with me today. This really is an issue about the public trust. Taxpayer funds should not be used for luxury private jet travel. It is a very simple issue.

Please join us in supporting the SWAMP FLYERS Act. Please join Congressman Gallego and us in calling for the resignation of Secretary Price.

As Abraham Lincoln said: “Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed.”

Help us change public sentiment and help us tell the Trump administration: Please stop using taxpayer funds for luxury jet travel.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gallager). The Chair would remind Members to direct all remarks to the Chair and to formally yield and reclaim time when under recognition.

DYNAOMIC SCORING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Schwegler) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designatee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, my hope is that you find this as entertaining as I did putting some of this together. Actually, let’s put these boards up. We are going to actually do something that, with the rollout of the tax reform mechanics—and I apologize to everyone. Some of this is going to be a little geeky. But I wanted to try to put some things in perspective because I have heard some and read some crazy stuff the last couple of days.

We are going to actually do some dynamic scoring 101. And, actually, at that moment, I think I just heard thousands, if not tens of thousands, of C-SPAN watchers just turn their television off. But this is actually important, because every time we are heading towards major tax reform or other types of programs that actually have big, bold policy built within them, we get into this sort of debate.

What are the effects? What are the effects on society? What are the effects on tax revenue? What are the effects on labor participation? What are the effects on our entitlement programs?

And there is sort of this intellectual duplicity around this body. I know that is a little harsh, but we have got to be honest about it. If it were the stimulus package from President Obama several years ago, we had lots of Members on this side who actually talked about, supported, and thought the dynamic scoring models were great.

But when we actually talk about something within the Tax Code, rewriting the Tax Code, well, then dynamic scoring is just unacceptable. So I am going to ask everyone to open up your minds and first understand, when we talk about scoring, what we really mean. And we are going to touch on a handful of things, and this is going to be very elementary, sort of basics. So we are going to walk through a number of these.

And then I have a number of slides that we will get to in a moment that are more about examples of what math means when looking at it. And the fact of the matter is, there are such things as tax cuts that do not pay for themselves, but there are such things, actually, as tax policy that do pay for themselves.

You have to just choose and be willing to work through the math, and the history of math, and stop being afraid of data around this place.

I get behind this microphone quite often and run this joke that this is sort of a math-free zone. And I am working...
really hard to drag my brothers and sisters on both sides to understand that sometimes the folklore we believe in is correct, but a lot of times it just isn’t.

First off, before we do some of the slides, I want to walk through some of the terms. How often do you hear us talk about the budget deficit? I think it was last March and then again in June, all of a sudden the numbers have changed? That is a case where the world did not stay static. We didn’t create a number a year ago, and that is what the world stayed.

Remember, we went through this really ugly, uncomfortable thing this year, where, in just a few months, the deficit actually grew dramatically to where we are almost borrowing $700 billion this year. And if we went back a year and a half, we thought this year we might be as low as $500 billion, $550 billion. So if we had stayed static, we would still be just pretending that we were at that number.

We recalculate constantly. But it is not just calculating, hey, here are the tax revenues. It is also, hey, we see this trend in number of people signing up for entitlement benefits. So understand, we already, for years, and year-and-a-half years, have lived in a dynamic scoring sort of model right now, and we call it our baseline.

I also want us to try a couple other things. I want us to think about dynamic scoring as not that number that is given to us but as a way of ranking decisions. So if I came to you right now and said, “Hey, we have these things in the tax policy, and here are the effects we believe we see as we have the information today,” think of it as a tool for making judgments that that number is the same number that it is going to actually produce 10 years from now.

With the best data and information we have today, if you as a policymaker—if you are blessed to be one of those folks quoted in the press and others saying their own views about dynamic scoring. But those are some of the very same people who actually stood in this same well and promoted the immigration reform and the dynamic scoring that was built into the reform. They are the same folks who actually promoted the dynamic scoring that was built in the stimulus bill several years ago. But they are also the same folks who actually believe things like global warming being a problem, which are built on a dynamic scoring model, are the absolute facts of math.

You can’t have the intellectual duplicity of saying: I believe in this sort of modeling math for things I am ideologically comfortable with, but things I am ideologically not comfortable with is not true.

It is math. Let’s try one more time because if we are going to come to policy decisions, we have got to stop living in sort of a math-free zone.

I am doing this as more of an example. None of this is actually policy in the tax reform that those of us on the Ways and Means Committee are so incredibly blessed to be working on. It has been the most interesting year of my life grinding out this math. I can’t tell you the number of times that I thought I had a brilliant idea, you work it out, and you find out that the really smart people around you had all figured out all sorts of ways to get around your Tax Code changes.

So sometimes you have got to be humble and just understand, that what we are doing is tough. It is complicated. If you make one change over here in the Tax Code, then it turns out it affects over here and creates leakage over here. So that is why you have to do this unified theory.

Just so we see this conceptually, if I came to you right now and said, Hey, we have this much money—I think in this model it was $70 billion or $60 billion. The actual dollar amount isn’t that important.

If I came to you right now and said, “You have this much money, you have got to make a Tax Code change with that money.” If we did a static score, then the model says it costs you that much money. If you spent $60 billion on the social safety net over 10 years, then it costs $60 billion. Then when we do the dynamic scoring, it turns out that not all tax changes produce the same amount of economic growth, even though it may have
promote fairness, it may promote simplicity, and there may be some things we haven’t calculated.

So on this one, if we take a look over here, this was actually something we took from the Tax Foundation’s website. I think you would all agree you go there. It is a nonpartisan group, and it has some really interesting modeling.

If we functionally doubled the child care tax credit to a couple thousand dollars, it turns out the model over 10 years, it actually yields almost nothing to GDP growth. Now you will want to try to model it saying: Does it change birthrates? As you know, we are in a societal crisis right now where our birthrates are falling so low that mathematically, in about 20 years, we are going to have some real difficulties having enough taxpayers moving into society’s workforce to actually pay for our pay-as-you-go entitlements.

Social Security and Medicare are pay-as-you-go entitlements. Today’s workers pay for today’s retirees, but also for the next generation of economic growth so that economy in the future can be simpler and fairer, but we also have to work hard to try to go through some that are a little more entertaining.

There are certain things out there that do not pay for themselves. That is why we have this whole discussion of how you find balance if you are working for fairness, if you are working for simplicity, but knowing we must have that economic growth if we are going to keep our promises here. This is just one more example.

When you actually see something like this, this first one is as if we were actually to change depreciation tables, that function. It ends up taking about $308 billion out of GDP if we dynamically score it.

Each one of these tax policies costs $32 billion. That is actually the idea. This costs $32 billion to the taxpayers. So, if I came right now and said we need to raise $32 billion and we intend to do it in a change in the Tax Code, and then we go out there and say, all right, let’s change depreciation tables to business and we take in $32 billion of
additional money, what did we just do to the economy?
In a static score, it says, hey, you just got $32 billion. If you do a dynamic revenue estimate, which actually does have some macro effects in there, we actually just lost $38 billion, because business is down.
But if you do the dynamic scoring of what it does over 10 years to the economy, that $32 billion of hopeful tax revenue actually shrunk the U.S. economy by $300 billion. When they build this model, they are using data going back to the 1950s.
But we have an example on the other side. If you go to the far side, what if you were to disallow half of State and local taxes as a deduction? It turns out you would say that we are getting $32 billion because that is what it is written at. You end up bringing in about $20 billion, but you only shrink the economy by $19 billion.

Policywise, statically, they both say $32 billion in taxes, but they both have dramatically different effects on the economy. When we actually talk about the dynamic scoring, it is both actually on the tax-raising side as much as the tax-cutting side.
The same sort of concept here, but what if we did it the other direction? Actually, the same slide we just did, what does that mean in the percent of GDP, if anyone is sort of thinking in that fashion. Then we can see while we actually changed the depreciation tables, we took away the ability of businesses—particularly, smaller business—to depreciate. It ends up shrinking the U.S. economy almost two points over those 10 years. State and local taxes are actually less than, I think, 0.16 of a percent of GDP over those 10 years.
So when you actually hear the phrase “tax cuts don’t pay for themselves,” or, “you don’t get the revenues expected,” that is actually true, except for properly designed and properly targeted.
This is actually the flip side of what we just did. Remember, we just did two boards that showed both the revenues and the actual percent of GDP we raise taxes. How about now if we do sort of the exact same thing but we do it as a tax cut?
Once again, you are going to actually see—and I am sorry. I put additional notes to make it understandable—that not all tax cuts are the same. In this case, I am going from one end to the other side.
So let’s say we go to the full end and we did full expensing. So instead of a depreciation table where, over the 7 years, this is this piece of equipment, or 10 years, whatever it may be, what if you could take the value of that almost immediately? In a dynamic model, it is adding a couple hundred billion dollars to the size of the economy.
But if those same dollars, the same amount was spent on, let’s say, over here, we cut the bottom tax rate, that might be the appropriate thing to do for societal fairness. But we have to be cognizant, when we are calculating, what that means in GDP growth. You can see the blue here in the end, and the blue here is positive, but barely. That is over 10 years.

This is because, so often, the very tax policies that are good for us in our relections may not actually be best for what is good for society and its opportunity for jobs and economic growth.
This is new sort of the exact same slide, but in the percentages and sort of understanding, when we doubled the child care tax credit or we lowered the individual brackets, maybe doubling the child care tax credit actually has an effect on birthrates. That would be terrific for society, and particularly for the future of our ability to pay into our entitlements, but if you are looking for GDP expansion and economic growth, it is marginal.

The expensing or the corporate tax cuts, when you see those on there, you actually see we have substantially more of what they call capital stock. That is the money that is used to buy new equipment to get more productive, to hire more, to raise their salaries, and for all of us to have more opportunity.

I think we are going to make this our last one. This is the easiest one to sort of get our heads around, and it is the crisper of the ones in.
Say you are a fellow Member of Congress and I come to you and say we have $70 billion, over 10 years, that we can plug into on the Tax Code, we have that much capacity. Where do we put it that is best for our society?
The initial instinct is to have that discussion of, well, what if we were to cut the bottom Federal tax rate? It is wonderful for our hardworking brothers and sisters who are at the lowest tier, but is that necessarily fair. How about if we put that into expanding the child care tax credit, expanding that? How about if you put that money into expensing?
If you get in front of an audience and we did an audience vote, what do you think we would get?

The fact of the matter is, when you look at the models, what we have learned from the dynamic scoring, some get almost no economic expansion. What you do is take our legislation, which is a laudable goal. But, ultimately, over the next decade, I need my brothers and sisters in this country to have more job opportunities, more ability to be employed, putting that money into expensing so we get more productive as a society in buying new plants and equipment and machinery to make us more productive so we can pay people more, so we have the ability to save for education, for their retirements. That actually has over 5 percent additional expansion of the size of our economy.

These are the types of issues that those of us on the Ways and Means Committee have been struggling with over the last year and are going to struggle over the next month as we try to find that balance of what is simplicity, what is fairness, but also what maximizes economic growth.

Just as a couple of little last pieces here to sort of understand this.
I am begging for those of us who are going to be in this sort of battle, debate, that we do our best to sort of be intellectually honest about what we are talking about.
A good example is the number of dollars we are talking about right now in rewriting the Tax Code is, I think, 1 percent or so of GDP, maybe less than that. The stimulus from several years ago was 7 percent of GDP.
We have had some folks who are criticizing this over here and saying you intend to dynamically score that, but were almost giddy about spending and scoring actual spending over here that we learned later did not allocate well.

There is a concept, if I had a dollar, where would it be spent best to grow society. If I gave it to you as an individual, as a businessperson or an entrepreneur, saying: Where would you put this dollar and do something with it that grows the economy?
Or we have the other side over here. When government spends it, we have this bad habit of spending money on things that are often driven and that don’t necessarily have the same type of economic expansionary effects. It is this thing called price theory, where money gets allocated into society. Who is better at allocating that dollar?
I will make you an argument that individuals in the market actually have a long history of doing it much healthier, much better.

As we finish what we will call Dynamic Scoring 101, what did we learn?
The scores are incredibly important in making decisions about how you allocate resources, both on raising taxes, lowering taxes. Where does it have the most impact? Where does it do the most damage? Where does it do the most good?
Dynamic scoring is actually a ranking mechanism, because the ultimate number, we are never going to have enough information to be perfect, but that is the right way to allocate things that are often politically driven and that don’t necessarily have the same type of economic expansionary effects. It is this thing called price theory, where money gets allocated into society. Who is better at allocating that dollar?
This makes it hard because, so often, we have had some folks who are allocating resources, both on raising taxes, lowering taxes. Where does it have the most impact? Where does it do the most damage? Where does it do the most good?
Dynamic scoring is actually a ranking mechanism, because the ultimate number, we are never going to have enough information to be perfect, but that is the right way to allocate things that are often driven...
The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, this has been a day that answered a lot of our prayers seeing our good friend STEVE SCALISE here, and it brings to mind part of the story of that tragic morning that I haven't heard told anywhere else.

One of our Members, Georgia Congressman BARRY LOUDERMILK, was there, and he was—the shooter started from behind the third base dugout and hit STEVE SCALISE right away. It was so deeply touching to hear Steve's words today. It is just rather emotional seeing our prayers answered, seeing STEVE return to the House.

That morning, BARRY was saying that he was behind a little closet area, and as the shooter was moving toward the first base side continuing to shoot, Matt Mika had already been shot and was down, and BARRY realized that he had no place to go. He looked for places to run, and there was no place to run. Open and could see there was no place to go for a while, perhaps 9 or 10 minutes at that point. Capitol Police Officer Griner was there. She and David Bailey, the other Capitol Police officer, were using their suburban for cover and shooting at the shooter. The leftist who felt it was a good idea to kill as many Republicans in Congress as he could.

It was gratifying to hear that admission from our friend from Maryland, their majority leader HOYER, that it was hateful. He was full of hate. He was a leftist who had supported BERNIE SANDERS. It is not BERNIE'S SANDERS' fault. You don't hear Republicans blaming a party or a candidate that a hate-filled leftist who felt like it was a good idea to kill as many Republicans in Congress as he could.

It was gratifying to hear that admission from our friend from Maryland, the majority leader HOYER, that it was hateful. He was full of hate. He was a leftist who had supported BERNIE SANDERS. It is not BERNIE'S SANDERS' fault. You don't hear Republicans blaming a party or a candidate that a hate-filled leftist who felt like it was a good idea to kill as many Republicans in Congress as he could.

As I learned yesterday, when we were role-playing the truth, the smile of our brothers and sisters who desperately do not want us to have a win decided that zero was a tax hike. I just beg of everyone for at least on this issue, if we can sort of pull our partisan rage away and just sort of focus on the working population of our society and how we help and also how do we help for the future so my 2-year-old daughter, so your children, so my family that may be heading towards retirement, everyone has a fair chance. And that fair chance can only happen if we really start to grow this economy and start to grow it fairly dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
smug and proud vote against any effort to repeal, even partially repeal ObamaCare?

You make promises like that knowing that, without those promises, you would not get elected. People count on your promises because they really are hurtling, they need the medicine that they are not getting under the new Medicaid, they don’t have the doctor that was providing so much help under their insurance before ObamaCare took it away. And an almost cheerful breaking of the promises, it really is tragic. It is simply tragic.

It is really unfortunate that they don’t have the millions, like some Senators, to get whatever healthcare they want, that they make—they could suffer less, perhaps be cured if Republican Senators all kept their promises.

□ 1400

It is just tragic. But despite that, this has been a week where if the House has done what we can under reconciliation. We sent a bill to the Senate. They didn’t have to pass that bill, just something so that we could have a conference bill to give Americans the help they needed. We have done what we can there, so we are taking up tax reform. And if we do the right thing by Americans, they will have more money in their pockets. If we pass the bill that has just been proposed—I don’t have all the details but the framework certainly looks like something we can really work with that will put a lot more money in middle class pockets.

It is interesting. I hear some people, especially at the other end of the hall in the opposite party, opposing party, who make efforts to tax the poor in order to reward Republican rich friends. We saw back in 2008, there were apparently a whole lot more rich people on Wall Street that supported Barack Obama than supported the unfortunate losing candidate of the Republican Party that year.

Yeah, the rich people on Wall Street, more of them supported Barack Obama. That kind of goes against what is thought to be conventional wisdom that the Republicans are rich and the Democrats are poor when the reports we have to file annually indicate that some of us came here without anything and we sacrificed virtually everything we had to run, to try to make a difference in this country, and we haven’t become rich by being here; whereas, there are an awful lot of millionaire Democrats here in the House and in the Senate.

But if you look at what has been proposed, the lowest tax rate in America right now is 10 percent. And it appears, we are told, it should be everybody paying 10 percent right now should end up paying no tax. Well, personally, I would rather see us have everybody pay something. The idea of income tax, pay something, the lowest rate possible—whether it is 6, 7, or 8 percent, maybe 7 percent, something—so that every single American pays an income tax so they understand how important it is to have a frugal government and not just constantly be handing out welfare, especially in cases that involve fraud.

If you had really been telling me there in Tyler, Texas, that she used to, every spring, work for H&R Block in helping people prepare their tax returns. She said she finally had to give it up. People would come in and they would tell her, they wouldn’t go over that number. They would have tax ID numbers.

Now, why would they have tax ID numbers? Well, even though the law says that you are not supposed to be filing tax returns if you are not supposed to be working if you don’t have a Social Security number, the IRS assumed—and we know what that means, they assumed—that, gee, if we give people a tax ID number, then they will pay income tax, and that will bring in more money to the coffers.

But, according to this lady, the reason she couldn’t do it anymore was she was becoming a nervous wreck because so many people were coming in with tax identification numbers, no Social Security numbers, and they would have a list of things that they would want her to put in their tax return. And they always had, she said, a number of children listed that they wanted to claim that would ensure that they got more money back from an earned income tax credit than they even paid in.

Since she was a senior citizen on a fixed income, the little extra help that she made helping people prepare tax returns, she gave it up. It was driving her a bit crazy to help people get back more money than they paid in over and over and over again when she understood the law. That is not supposed to be what happened.

So a lot of people say, hey, folks that are illegally in the country—and we are not talking about any particular place, just people illegally here from wherever they are—when they file a tax return, they get back more than they paid in, in some cases. And if you don’t pay taxes, if you are not quite as some represent, oh, gee, they pay so much money in income tax, they are good for the country.

Well, we know an awful lot of hard working people who we have seen—illegal aliens. I hear contractors say: I found out one of my best workers is not here legally.

But it brings us back to the point: Why are such hardworking people especially coming from south of the border into the United States? Well, obviously, for those type of folks—they came in and they are hardworking— they came to get jobs.

But the other question: Why are they having to come to the United States to get jobs? They are hardworking. Why wouldn’t they find jobs in Mexico or El Salvador or Guatemala? Why wouldn’t they find jobs in these other Central American countries or Mexico? The answer is obviously very clear: it is because of all the corruption.

Even though I understand the President of Mexico recently claimed there were no drug cartel murders going on at the very time when there were an enormous number that happened within the few days of him saying that, we know there is murder, there is corruption and it is from drugs.

And the gangs and the coyotes that bring people into the United States illegally, they answer to the drug cartels. It is the Border Patrol that told me that—over the inch of the U.S.-Mexico border is spoken for by some drug cartel; and if you cross into the United States without paying an appropriate price or dues to that drug cartel, then you are not going to last very long because they feel they have to make an example of you.

I saw one estimate of $70 billion or $80 billion, somewhere around there, estimated to have come from the United States into Mexico, to the drug cartels, for illegal drugs. Well, if we border all where they feel they and we totally secure our border 100 percent, then that $70 billion, $80 billion that is used for the drug cartels in their corruption of the Mexican cities and federal government and state government that drug cartels. And, if we could help dry up the $70 billion to $80 billion to $70,000 or $80,000 for illegal drugs, then, finally, we would help Mexico—as the best neighbor Mexico could ever dream of having—to become one of the very top economies in the world.

They ought to be one of the top 10 economies now, maybe top 5. All the massive natural resources that Mexico has, they are actually in a better location for trade than the United States. They are between two continents, North and South America. They are between two oceans like we are, the Pacific and the Atlantic, with, of course, the Gulf of Mexico in between. They ought to be a top 5 economy, they are not because of corruption from the drug money that illegally crosses the U.S. border into Mexico. We cut that off.

And then you have all these hardworking people who just want to help their families. They don’t want to have to flee the country they love to find a job. The jobs would be abounding all over Mexico. Isn’t that what a friendly, caring neighbor would do for a neighbor? Shouldn’t we want to help Mexico stop the corruption? Of course we do.

And any Mexican-elected official who says that there is no corruption, that there is no drug cartel influence, or that there is nobody being killed by the drug cartels, well, a statement by a Mexican-elected official that those things are not going on is an indication that that elected official is either completely ignorant of what is going on in his or her country or they are, as one would suspect, under the finger of the drug cartels themselves. Of course, that is.

So I am hopeful we are going to be able to get a wall where we need it. President Trump and Attorney General
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Sessions are both doing everything they can to help secure the border. We need a Secretary of Homeland Security, and I am sure that will be coming quickly. The Democrats will probably try to block whoever it is for as long as they can. We need a Secretary of Homeland Security; and we need our border secured not merely to help us, but as being the best possible thing we could do as a caring neighbor of Mexico.

Our Republican Conference we had in the House yesterday seemed very productive. We had a good discussion about the proposed tax reform, and, as I was mentioning earlier, you will have people who have been paying 30 percent will go to paying nothing. Some that are paying much higher taxes will be cut down to 12 percent, and brackets indicating that there is going to be an awful lot more money in the pockets of people who are working, that will be fantastically when we leave more money in the pockets of those who have actually earned it; it gets the economy going.

People, whom I have immense respect for, such as Stephen Moore, Larry Kudlow, it is very clear to them, when they run the numbers, we could never adequately tax our way out of bankruptcy the direction we are headed. We couldn’t. We cannot tax enough. If you put on too much tax, then people quit working. But the way to make Social Security solvent and to make Medicare solvent is if we get the economy growing not at the 1.8 percent—I believe that was the average during the Obama administration—but for the good of everybody. People keep the money in their pockets. That allows them to spend it, and it causes the economy to grow.

I know, during the Obama administration, they saw 3 percent growth in the economy as just being virtually impossible; and I can understand, because their idea was tax, tax, tax, and that kills an economy. Whereas, if you allow people to have more of their own money, they spend more of their money. That allows more jobs to be created, and there are more people paying taxes. They begin making more, so they are paying higher taxes, even though it is at a lower rate. That helps stimulate the economy.

But the way to make Social Security solvent and to make Medicare solvent is if we get the economy growing not at the 1.8 percent—I believe that was the average during the Obama administration—but for the good of everybody. People keep the money in their pockets. That allows them to spend it, and it causes the economy to grow.

I know, during the Obama administration, they saw 3 percent growth in the economy as just being virtually impossible; and I can understand, because their idea was tax, tax, tax, and that kills an economy. Whereas, if you allow people to have more of their own money, they spend more of their money. That allows more jobs to be created, and there are more people paying taxes. They begin making more, so they are paying higher taxes, even though it is at a lower rate. That helps stimulate the economy.

I was really hoping that President Trump’s number of 15 percent corporate tax would work out to be our number for corporate tax. I was hoping that would be for regular C corporations, as well as a pass-through subchapter S corporation, because President Trump and others confirm that if it is a 15 percent corporate tax, then we would get back most of the manufacturing jobs, which fied America because of our massive 35 percent tax. Actually, by the time you add in all the others, it is well over 40 to 50 percent tax on corporations.

The reason some of us say the corporate tax is one of the most insidious taxes there is is because the government defrauds Americans into thinking they are not paying the corporate tax. These evil, rich corporations are paying those taxes. They are saying: “We are not paying them. Make the evil corporations.” Whereas, anybody that is going to go out and say that it would have to say: “Well, the truth is, yeah, it is actually a pass-through from the customer, because if the corporation doesn’t pass on that massive tax they are paying, they go out of business.”

So it is actually an additional tax on the little guy. So the middle class, lower-income folks are paying the big corporate tax. It is not the wealthy. It is the customers that are paying all that extra corporate tax.

So if you got the tax rate for corporations down to 15 percent, those companies start coming back, the manufacturing jobs come back.

As I mentioned to the President one time: “Mr. President, understand it because of your great business acumen, and I understand it from studying history, but any major nation that cannot manufacture what they need in a time of war will not be a major nation after the next war.”

The President wants those jobs back. It is not 15 percent being proposed. It is 20 percent. But that will bring back jobs. Not as many as if we had a 15 percent corporate tax, but it will bring back jobs.

I know there are those who say: Oh, we have evolved in America. We are more of a service economy. We don’t want to be a manufacturing economy with those dirty jobs.

Yes, we do. We need to have those manufacturing jobs. Those are good jobs. We have requirements that you have to be concerned about the health of Americans. And by doing that, we bring back the jobs, we help our economy, and we actually save Social Security and Medicare.

I see my friend, Dr. HARRIS, is here.

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

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is absolutely right. An important thing happened this week. We announced that the American public is going to get a tax cut.

As I go around my district, as I am sure Members when they go around their districts, one thing they rarely hear is: You know, Washington spends their money very efficiently. They do everything just right. So why don’t you tax me a little bit more?

We don’t get a tax cut.

What we hear is that hardworking Americans want to keep more of their paycheck. They look at what the Federal Government takes out of their paycheck. They don’t think they are getting their money’s worth. Honestly, Mr. Speaker, once you are around here a while, you realize they are probably not getting their money’s worth.

That is what we are going to do. We are going to follow the President’s lead. The President has said that what he wants is a tax reform bill that cuts taxes in America so that businesses come back to America, that our job creators get tax relief, and that hard-working middle class American families can keep more of their paychecks. And that is exactly what the tax reform outline has laid out for the American public this week.

Now, from the naysayers, you will hear the same old lines: tax cuts for the rich, blah, blah, blah.

The bottom line is that we are going to relieve the tax burden on American since taxes will bring jobs back to this country.

Mr. Speaker, if you look over the past 35 years of what has happened, from 1980 to 2015, the corporate tax rates, back in 1980, the top line of this graph was the U.S. marginal corporate tax rate, which was around 50 percent at the time. It was just about the same as what the worldwide average was.

In the 1980s, the last time we had major tax reform under the leadership of President Reagan, we dropped the corporate tax rate to under 40 percent, and at that time, it was right in the middle of where the corporate taxes were worldwide. So the companies had no advantage over their businesses and move it overseas in order to save taxes.

But something very interesting happened. If you look at the line here, since 1980, our corporate tax rate has stayed at right about 40 percent. It is now 39.6 when you add in both the Federal taxes and the State corporate taxes, but the worldwide averages have fallen.

Mr. Speaker, other countries around the world have figured out that businesses will go to countries and they will create jobs in those areas where the taxes are lower.

So what has happened?

If you look at what the corporate taxes look like now and what the corporate tax rates are around the world, these are the 35 leading nations, our competitors in the world. The United States now has the highest corporate tax rate at 33.9 percent combined. Again, the Federal plus the State tax rate. France and Belgium, 34 percent. Germany, 30 percent.

But if you look at where we are losing our business to, it turns out that all the low corporate tax countries have gone down at the bottom, years ago lowered their corporate tax rate to 12½ percent. And what happened?

We moved businesses to Ireland.

When I worked in the operating room—and still do a few days a year—I would pick up what is called an endotracheal tube. It is a tube we use when...
we breathe for a patient. It goes into their windpipe and they breathe through it. I would pick it up—and this happened 15 years ago—look at it and say: “Wait a minute. This is made in Ireland. How in the world are medical items like this made in Ireland? And I would look at other items in the operating room, and they were made in Ireland.

I didn’t know at the time that the reason was that Ireland lowered its corporate tax rate, and literally many things that used to be made in the United States, like those endotracheal tubes, like other medical devices, were now made in Ireland; not by Americans, but by people in Ireland. We lost those jobs over there, and it was as a result of our corporate tax rate.

So our other competitors, you know, we look at car manufacturers, Korea, 24 percent corporate tax rate. Again, ours is at 38.9 percent. We look at other places around the world. The United Kingdom is one of our largest trading partners and one that certainly competes with us for businesses, whether it is the pharmaceutical industry or whether it is other businesses, they are at 19 percent. We are at 38.9 percent.

So what does this tax plan do?

This tax plan says that for those corporations that are moving businesses around the world based on a tax rate, we can’t have the highest tax rate in the world, because what we have seen is the emptying of American manufacturing to places around the world where the tax rate is lower.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer that if you or I invented something today and we looked to manufacture it somewhere, where would we go? Would we stay in the United States with a 38.9 percent combined corporate tax rate? Or would we go to Ireland, where it is 12½ percent, where, for every item we make, our company can make more money, invest that back in the company and take profits from it?

Of course we would go to Ireland.

So what do we have to do?

We have to address that. The President has said this is one of his top priorities, because this will bring back the jobs that have bled from the United States.

When we looked at what is called a corporate inversion, where a company looks to place its headquarters overseas, it is doing it for tax purposes.

Why should that happen? Why shouldn’t we be attracting these companies to the United States? How do we do it?

We do it by lowering the corporate tax rate. The plan, the outline that we have put forward to the American people this week lowers the corporate tax rate to 20 percent. Again, from 35 percent, which is the Federal rate, to 20 percent. It lowers it to the lowest among our competitive countries. Now, not as low as I would like to see it go, not as low as the President would like to see it go. The President thinks we need to be way down at the bottom of that chart. That is how we need to attract businesses back.

Mr. Speaker, to be honest, if we lower the tax rate just to be competitive in the world, companies will bring their business back to the United States for the reasons that a lot of businesses originally were in the United States: we have a highly trained workforce, we have the rule of law, we have a lot of benefits for business that are very attractive.

Now, if Congress agrees, if we can come up with this reform plan, we are going to be seeing businesses fighting each other to come back into the United States because they realize this is the place they can do business best.

Mr. Speaker, only a minority of jobs are actually produced by those large corporations, what we call C corporations, the ones that paid the “corporate income tax.”

So the President said he also wanted to emphasize what we need to do is lower the tax rate on our small businesses because, as you know, almost two-thirds of the jobs created in this country are created by small businesses.

So the Unified Tax Reform Framework, our tax plan, limits the maximum tax rate for small and family-owned businesses to 25 percent. Mr. Speaker, today that tax rate is 38.6 percent. Again, this will allow these small businesses and our family-owned businesses to take the money, invest it; and then when their businesses make money, when they hire workers and they make money, they are allowed to keep more to put back in those businesses, to hire more workers. This is how we get our economy going again.

If you talk to, again, these small businesses and these family-owned businesses, or the larger businesses, there are two things that these businesses say they need in order to succeed. One is they need a regulatory environment that is reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, the last administration was strangling American businesses through overregulation. So the first thing the President did when he came into office, to his credit, is say: We have to have only reasonable regulations. We can’t overregulate our businesses. We are stifling them.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that over the past 100 years, the average growth in what we call the GDP—the gross domestic product—in the United States, the average growth in GDP is 3.3 percent over 100 years.

Now, over the last administration, of course, you know it has the dubious honor of being the first administration where there was never a year of 3 percent growth. In fact, the average growth was under 2 percent. The mood was so bad in America, the way our economy was and the American psyche, so bad that the economists who would predict how the economy was going to operate have actually lowered their expectations of GDP growth to under 2 percent for the year near future. That is not the America we know.

The America we know leads the world. When we see 6, 7, and 8 percent growth in China, why would we be satisfied with under 2 percent growth?

There is no need to be satisfied with that.

So we have to go to, again, our small businesses and our other businesses and ask them: What do you need to grow and produce jobs, to bring jobs back to this country, to put Americans back to work?

And the answer is: One, relieve us of the regulatory burden.

And from day one, that is what the President has done.

But there is another thing they say. We need relief from our tax rate. Again, the tax rate was the highest in the industrialized world. Our tax rate, the highest in the industrialized world.

Our tax rate on small businesses was even higher. 39.6 percent was the highest marginal rate. That is not an environment where businesses thrive.

The President is actually doing to a large extent, of relieving the regulatory burden, the over-regulatory burden, that exists for American businesses.

Now Congress needs to turn its attention to the second leg on that stool, which is the tax problems. So the reform framework does that, and it does exactly the right way. It says we agree with the President.

Americans are waiting for these jobs to come back. They don’t want to see the back end of the moving van leaving American companies and bringing them overseas anymore. They don’t like that. I can’t blame them. There is no reason why more things can’t be made here, more businesses can’t thrive here.

So we need to take those steps, but that is only one part of this plan. The President said the other thing we need to do is return more dollars into the pockets of hardworking middle class taxpayers. That is exactly what this plan does. It does it by simplifying the Tax Code, by doubling the standard deduction and lowering all the rates.

The naysayers will say: Well, you know, if you lower the rates, you are lowering our debt and our deficit. In fact, if you turn on the TV right now, that is what all the talking heads are complaining about. How could those Republicans suggest a plan that will increase our deficit?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you ask some people over at the Congressional Budget Office what happens to revenues if you increase the tax rate to 200 percent of income, they will say: Oh, it goes up 200 percent.

Well, that is ridiculous. At some point, overtaxation suppresses economic activity, and revenues go down. Conversely, both with the tax cuts under President Kennedy in the 1960s
and the tax cuts with President Reagan in the 1980s, what we saw when we lowered rates was, in fact, the rejuvenation of the American economy, a stimulation of our GDP, a stimulation of our economy, leading to, in fact, increased revenue in both of those instances.

But in both of those instances, the naysayers said: You can’t do this. If you are going to cut your taxes, your deficits will go up. That just plain doesn’t happen.

So, yes, if you assume, all else being equal, that if we lower tax rates that revenue will go down, that would be true. But we know what happens when the American people feel the economy is going well, when they are fully employed, when we bring good-paying jobs back to this country and we lower the tax burden directly on hardworking middle class Americans. We know what happens. The economy grows. With more money in their pockets, people make the decision to buy a car, to buy a house, to buy the new washing machine, to spend money on things that they have been afraid to spend money on because of the stagnant economy over the past 8 years.

We know growth like we haven’t seen since the 1980s, when, in response to the Reagan tax cuts, we had GDP growth not of 3 percent, not of 4 percent, but of 5 and 6 percent after that tax cut. So, in fact, tax cuts stimulate the economy, which lifts all boats, and it increases revenue.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to tackle this challenge.

Now, we know there are a lot of special interests there because, when you simplify the Tax Code, what happens? All the lobbyists come knocking on our doors, and they want to maintain their little piece of this Tax Code. And the Tax Code runs to thousands and thousands of pages. Very knowledgeable, proven to fill out that form, and how you have to do it.

Well, when you get to that situation, you have gone way too far, and, Mr. Speaker, that is where we are. We are at that situation that a reasonable American can’t even fill out their own taxes. It has become so complicated.

So, and part of this framework, if we can simplify it the way this framework says, 90 percent of Americans will literally be able to fill out their taxes on something the size of a postcard. That is what we want to get back to, that kind of simplification.

But again, the road won’t be easy because we will have all the special interests here in this town, and we know there are a lot of them. We will have all of those special interests knocking on our doors, saying: Please preserve our little carve-out.

But every little carve-out makes the Tax Code more complicated. Every complication means that hardworking Americans have to pay much more tax, much more tax in their pockets, and that is what we have to solve. We have to solve this problem. It has been getting worse now.

Again, the last time we dealt with the Tax Code in a comprehensive way was 30 years ago. To its credit, at the time, we reduced rates, we stimulated the economy, but we really didn’t simplify the Tax Code as much as we would like to at this point.

So it is going to be hard, it is going to take months, and it is going to take a lot of people looking past the naysayers, past the people who say this can’t be done, past the people who say the sky is falling, because we have heard this all before.

I am old enough to have heard it in the 1980s. That is when I started working. That is when I started bringing home a paycheck. That is the time when I started realizing what Federal taxation was.

I always tell the story of my oldest daughter, who trained to become a nurse, and she went and got hired. The first time she brought her paycheck—a real paycheck, a full-time job paycheck from the hospital—home, she said: Dad, what is going on here? I thought I was making this amount of money, and this is the amount I bring home.

We all know what happened. You saw all those lines. The Federal tax taken out; the State tax taken out; the local tax taken out; the Social Security tax taken out; the Medicare. You saw all the taxes that were taken out.

So what we have to do is we have to simplify the Code, bring those tax rates down. We get our money in the pockets of hardworking middle class Americans. We owe them that. Part of that is simplifying that Tax Code. Now, once we do this and we stimulate the economy, we get the economy going again, our deficits will come down.

Look, we have to control spending. There is no question about it. Spending in this town is out of control. There is no question about it. Our deficit will exceed $700 billion a year.

To put that in perspective, that is 20 times the size of my State’s entire budget, and that is the amount that we are going to borrow this year.

When people say that we need money for this and we need money for that, every time we ask that question, you know, can we afford it, we have to ask: Can we afford passing this debt on to future generations?

I have five children, now, six grandchildren. My children will never pay off this debt. Those listening at home, if you believe me, go, and look at the Federal Budget website and look at the projection of Federal debt. It never goes to zero. It never, ever goes to zero—ever—not in my children’s lives, not in my grandchildren’s lives, not in my great-grandchildren’s lives. That is just not the way we ought to run a government.

So once we tackle this tax reform, once we get our economy booming again with businesses vying to come into this country—not to go to some other country, but to come into America to do business—then we have to turn our attention to securing the future for future generations, to making certain that our Social Security system, which our seniors depend on, will not only be here for the seniors now, but for when my children and grandchildren reach their old age; that the Medicare system, which is scheduled now to be bankrupt in 10 years, that the Medicare system that our seniors depend on will not be there just for my generation, not just for my children’s generation, but for my grandchildren.

We have to make sure the country remains the strongest, most powerful country on Earth, a force for good and freedom throughout the world. We have to restore our defense budget. This President, to his credit, has called for that.

But as we restore our defense budget, we do have to redefine our spending priorities, because we don’t—or, I guess, maybe we do, print money here, but it is not the right thing to do. We shouldn’t be borrowing from future generations to take care of these priorities.

We have to get our economy going, make sure our revenues increase, and then turn our attention to making sure those revenues are spent wisely and that we define the future for our children and grandchildren, a future that they can be proud of in a country that remains, as Majority Whip SCALISE said on this floor today, standing at this podium, a country that the world has looked toward for leadership, the country that, for now over a century, the world has looked toward for leadership. We have to be what President Reagan called the “shining city on the hill.” Mr. Speaker, we do that by restoring the health of our economy.

We took a big step toward that this week with our tax reform framework. We are setting the country up for an economic rejuvenation, for a restoration, for those companies that have gone overseas to come back home. Let our great American workers make their products. Come back home to the greatest country this world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, that was a big step, but it is only the first step. We have weeks and months of work to get that done, a big job, an important job, but the first step was taken this week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

☐ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 4 p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


Hon. Paul D. Ryan,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 28, 2017, at 3:07 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3823.

With best wishes,

Karen L. Haas.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 4, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor relating to information furnished in response to a request for research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 1141. An act to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

S. 1886. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o’clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 2, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

2694. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, furnishing the Department’s interim rule on personal property in designated counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate (Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0033; SC17-922-1 IR) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2695. A letter from the Chairwoman, Nuclear Weapons Council, Department of Defense and Department of Energy, transmitting a certification that the amounts requested for the National Nuclear Security Administration in the President’s budget for Fiscal Year 2018 meet nuclear stockpile and stockpile stewardship program requirements, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 178(t)(1); Public Law 99-661, Sec. 3357(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1039; (126 Stat. 1297); to the Committee on Armed Services.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the Speaker’s table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2017, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 2, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.
proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 115th Congress; jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 488. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the removal of former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey; with an amendment (Rept. 115-335); adversely. Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 1107. A bill to promote conservation, improve public land management, and provide for sensible development in Pennsylvania and for other purposes (Rept. 115-336); Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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:

H.R. 3861. A bill to reform the Federal Insurance Office of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require Internet-based, real-time responses to requests to verify taxpayer income for legitimate business purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3861. A bill to reform the Federal Insurance Office of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BEN RAY LUKAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3862. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the National Health Service Corps program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. NOEM, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 3863. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 to include sex trafficking victims in the transitional housing assistance grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. GABRAID, Mr. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLUM):

H.R. 3864. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CAS-
H.R. 3874. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to enhance care for women veterans with cardiomyopathy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of students to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3876. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the official travel of any senior political appointee of any private air carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 3877. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide that $500 per month may be used to promote financial literacy among elders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H.R. 3878. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide that $500 per month may be used to promote financial literacy among elders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H.R. 3879. A bill to limit the use of Federal funds for the official travel of any senior political appointee of any private air carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 3880. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide that $500 per month may be used to promote financial literacy among elders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H.R. 3881. A bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 3882. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to publish a final rule to provide for the screening, testing, and treatment for sleep disorders of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 3883. A bill to provide for enhanced penalties for certain offenses relating to controlled substances containing fentanyl, and for other purposes; 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.

H.R. 3884. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish guidelines for a model elder abuse registry and to provide grants to States for establishing and operating such a registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3885. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish guidelines for a model elder abuse registry and to provide grants to States for establishing and operating such a registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate and gift tax and to simplify the estate and gift tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3887. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect health care consumers from surprise billing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3888. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide that $500 per month may be used to promote financial literacy among elders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to the National Identification Child Assistance Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3890. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to the National Identification Child Assistance Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units to investigate and prosecute cases of Medicaid patient abuse and neglect in any setting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
By Ms. MATSUI:  
H. Res. 546. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Gardening Awareness Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.  
By Mr. POE of Texas:  
H. Res. 547. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 3, 2018, as “United States Missing Persons Day”; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.  

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT  
Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.  

By Mr. MCHENRY:  
H.R. 3860. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution.  
By Mr. DUFFY:  
H.R. 3861. 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. BUTTERFIELD:  
H.R. 3862. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.  
By Mrs. HARTZLER:  
H.R. 3863. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. PEARCE:  
H.R. 3864. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: “The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.”  
By Ms. SPEIER:  
H.R. 3865. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:  
H.R. 3866. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. RUDD:  
H.R. 3867. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr.vette:  
H.R. 3868. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. RAYAN of New Mexico:  
H.R. 3869. 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. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:  
H.R. 3870. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. HALLERAN:  
H.R. 3871. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.  
By Mr. O’HALLERAN:  
H.R. 3872. 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. FLORES:  
H.R. 3873. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.  
By Mr. DELBENE:  
H.R. 3874. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. PASO:  
H.R. 3875. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.  
By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:  
H.R. 3876. 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. TED LIEU of California:  
H.R. 3877. 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. GRISHAM of New Mexico:  
H.R. 3878. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.  
By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:  
H.R. 3879. 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. LUJÁN of New Mexico:  
H.R. 3880. 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. LUJÁN of New Mexico:  
H.R. 3881. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8.  
By Mr. PASCARELL:  
H.R. 3882. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.  
By Mr. BERKLEY of California:  
H.R. 3883. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.  
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:  
H.R. 3884. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.  
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:  
H.R. 3885. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:  
H.R. 3886. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. SMUCKER:  
H.R. 3887. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Clause 3 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.  
By Ms. TENNEY:  
H.R. 3888. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. VALADAO:  
H.R. 3889. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.  
By Mr. WALBERG:  
H.R. 3891. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.  
By Mrs. WALORSKI:  
H.R. 3892. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8.  
By Mr. YOHO:  
H.R. 3893. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8, c.l.7.  

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS  
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:  
H.R. 36: Mr. COOK  
H.R. 113: Mr. GOTTTHRIMER and Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
H.R. 154: Mr. FALLOWS.  
H.R. 173: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. FLORES.  
H.R. 246: Mr. SCHNEIDER.  
H.R. 392: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 564: Mrs. DEMINGS.
The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 3 by Mr. GARRETT on House Resolution 458: Mr. Palazzo.