



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

No. 155

House of Representatives

The House met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Pastor Dennis Jokela, Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Department, Kalamazoo, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Father God, we are grateful to be able to come into Your presence in a free country such as ours.

I ask that You bless this great Nation.

I ask You to pour out Your wisdom and revelation knowledge into everyone hearing the sound of my voice.

I ask You to let Your glory shine like a light emanating from this place, filling our entire country.

I speak unification of our country in our original, can-do, American spirit.

I speak life into those dead and dying places in our land, Lord.

For those places that are in need of Your restoration power, I ask that You pour it out on them.

I ask that You bless these proceedings today and bless the work of our hands.

I ask all of this in Jesus' mighty name.

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 one, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas 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 DENNIS JOKELA

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a proud son of Portage, Michigan, Pastor Dennis Jokela of the Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Department.

He has been a pillar of our community through his work as a small-business owner, a judge for the Michigan Vocational Education Society, and as a corporal and chaplain at the Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Department as well.

I know I speak for many as we thank, in particular, our first responders all across the country, sheriffs, and police officers, and pray to keep them and their families safe.

Pastor Jokela's dedication to public service runs deep as a seven-time decorated veteran of Vietnam and Cambodia—overdue medals my team was able to help him obtain—a pastor with the Michigan Boot Camp for Troubled Teens at Fort Custer, and his work with the homeless. His commitment to community and country are unquestionable.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Pastor Jokela for his service here and at home. We are all so honored to be with him today. I thank him for his kind words.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RECOGNIZING ERIEZ MANUFACTURING ON 75 YEARS IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Eriez Manufacturing on 75 years in business in Erie, Pennsylvania. Eriez has grown exponentially since the early days when Orange Fowler Merwin—or O.F., as he was known—sold equipment to grain millers.

His customers often complained about stray pieces of metal that found their way into the grain that the farmers brought to the mills for grinding. In 1942, O.F. devised a permanent magnetic separator in the basement of his home and sold it to a grain miller. Eriez was officially on its way.

Since those humble beginnings in that Erie basement, Eriez has expanded into the world authority in separation technologies with operations all over the world. Of course, it has always been headquartered in Erie and on Asbury Road since 1962.

Mr. Speaker, today, Eriez employs more than 300 Erie residents, between its two locations on Asbury Road and at its facility near Belle Valley.

The story of Eriez Manufacturing truly is a classic American Dream tale, and it has maintained local family ownership throughout its history. I congratulate them on this milestone.

PUERTO RICO NEEDS OUR ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Hurricane Maria hit the island of Puerto Rico. The damage on the island has been described as apocalyptic: buildings destroyed, a major dam at

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7537

risk of collapse, and millions of American citizens looking for help. But 1 week later, we still have not addressed this extraordinary crisis. Congress is not planning to vote on providing aid until next week.

President Trump tweeted about Puerto Rico owing money to Wall Street, as if that should be a priority right now. President Trump and my friends on the other side of the aisle who control Congress need to start treating this with the urgency it demands.

My district is home to more than 20,000 Puerto Ricans. Over the last week, they have told me that they don't understand what is going on in Washington. Why is this taking so long?

This President talks a lot about putting America first, but why isn't he doing more to help our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico?

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, bring a bill to the floor. Let's get this done, and let's address the humanitarian crisis that is besetting citizens in Puerto Rico.

THE 911 DISPATCHERS OF HARVEY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the inky darkness of night, during the hammering rain of Harvey, reservoirs released even more water with little notice to people downstream. Meanwhile, hundreds of first responders battled the incessant rain, rising floodwaters, and raging currents to rescue people from homes.

Inside the dimly lit call center, 911 dispatchers answered call after call after call, racing to keep up as tense thousands dialed in. Dispatchers like 26-year-old Erika Wells worked 20-hour stretches, then trying to grab a nap or two.

With phones constantly ringing, the dispatchers sent rescue teams to homes packed with people in need of escape, a woman in labor, and families trapped on their roofs. As the 50-inch rain kept pounding and floodwaters rose, the dispatchers answered, calmed, and helped those in need.

As the morning Sun finally broke through the Texas sky, the dispatchers emerged from their stations and finally checked on their own families, many of whom had their own homes flooded. These dispatchers are some of the Texas Proud that helped save others in the floods of summer.

And that is just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING NESTOR GARCIA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, at about 2 a.m. this morning, our HPD, Houston Police Department, faced a

tragic incident of one of our officers who was participating in a stop along with other officers on I-59 South. Unfortunately, a driver who paid no attention to the flashing lights and the work of these officers sped through and hit Nestor Garcia.

My last word was that he was in surgery, with his family, and that all of those who could be there—the chief and the mayor—were at the hospital with him.

So I simply stand to ask for prayers for Nestor Garcia and his family and indicate that we are well aware of the work of the outstanding police and fire departments during Hurricane Harvey and all of the time. I wish him the best and strongest recovery as a young man who just entered the police department and just graduated. I know that our prayers will help him and his family.

RECOGNIZING TANNER LEE JAMESON

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Tanner Lee Jameson, was just 13 when he died from cardiac arrest during a basketball game. His school had an automated external defibrillator, or AED, in a nearby office, but it was inaccessible when Tanner needed it most.

Since Tanner's passing, his mother, and my constituent, Rhonda Harrill, who is in the gallery today with her husband, has been a passionate advocate for increased AED access.

Early this year, I introduced the AEDs resolution, H. Res. 35, which would encourage schools to have AEDs and to provide annual AED training.

In 1998, I introduced, and Congress passed, the Aviation Medical Assistance Act, the law that requires, among other things, passenger airplanes and airports to have AEDs and flight crews to receive additional first aid and AED training.

Today, I am pleased to participate in this year's AED Hunt on the Hill, sponsored by my friend, Dr. PHIL ROE, and hosted by the Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to remember Tanner Jameson's life, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H. Res. 35 to hopefully help save lives in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman that references to occupants of the gallery are not permitted.

SICKLE CELL AWARENESS

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a topic very near and dear to my heart: sickle cell anemia.

Sickle cell disease is an inherited blood disorder that affects red blood

cells and rapidly destroys sickle cells in the body. During an attack, victims can experience acute chest pain, stroke, and damage to vital organs like the kidneys and liver.

This disease is personal to me because, growing up, I watched my sister suffer from it. She was always in and out of the hospital. Oftentimes, the only resources we had to treat her were our family's love and support. This was devastating. My sister lost her battle at age 26.

But this doesn't have to be the story of others. While medical treatment and research for sickle cell anemia has evolved, it is imperative to support Federal funding for additional research and treatment opportunities.

I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2410, the Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sickle Cell Awareness Day by not only supporting community efforts to treat patients with this disease, but by cosponsoring legislation that provides Federal resources to advance medical treatments for this disease.

FALLEN HERO BANNER DEDICATION

(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, this past weekend, I participated in the unveiling of the Bucks County Home-town Heroes Banners at Freedom Square in Doylestown. These banners hold the names and faces of the brave women and men of Bucks County who gave their life in service of our Nation after the terror attacks of September 11 and as part of the global war on terror.

It was a humbling experience to be surrounded by friends and families of those warriors, as well as a community committed to honoring their legacy. Even Freedom Square—a community-built memorial supported by the Travis Manion Foundation, the local chapter of the American Gold Star Mothers, and the Goldman Family—signifies our commitment to remember those who have served and sacrificed for our freedom. As always, I am proud of the patriotism and support shown by our community in Bucks County.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the 25 names of these fallen heroes in honor of their sacrifice, the sacrifice of their families, and in support of the Bucks County community.

Specialist Kristofor T. Stonesifer, U.S. Army.

Corporal Patrick R. Nixon, U.S. Marine Corp.

Specialist William J. Maher, III, U.S. Army.

Captain Brian R. Faunce, U.S. Army.

Specialist Tamarra J. Ramos, U.S. Army.

Specialist Maurice J. Johnson, U.S. Army.

Specialist Edward W. Brabazon, U.S. Army.

Corporal Barton R. Humlhanz, U.S. Marines Corps.

Lance Corporal Robert T. Mininger, U.S. Marine Corps.

Specialist Kurt E. Krout, U.S. Army.
Private First Class Nathaniel E. DeTample, U.S. Army.

Captain Scott E. Craven, U.S. Air Force.
Staff Sergeant Jae S. Moon, U.S. Army.

First Lieutenant Travis L. Manion, U.S. Marine Corps.

First Lieutenant Colby J. Umbrell, U.S. Army.

Sergeant Allen James Duncley, U.S. Army.

Private First Class Robert H. Dembowski, Jr., U.S. Army.

Sergeant First Class Shawn M. Suzch, U.S. Army.

Staff Sergeant Mark C. Baum, U.S. Army.
Special Operations Chief Eric F. Shellenberger, U.S. Navy.

Corporal Elliot D. Teisler, U.S. Marine Corps.

Master Sergeant Kenneth B. Elwell, U.S. Army.

Sergeant First Class Liam J. Nevins, U.S. Army.

Sergeant Daniel J. Warriner, U.S. Army.
Specialist Nicholas D. Roberts, U.S. Army.

URGE PASSAGE OF THE DREAM ACT OF 2017

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with the DREAMers, and I urge the passage of H.R. 3440, the Dream Act of 2017.

I know what it is like to leave your country of birth as a child through no choice of your own, and I know that those kids have grown up to become just as American as each and every one of us here.

Despite what their immigration status might say, this is their country; this is their home. We cannot stand by and allow their lives and well-being to be put in jeopardy. The country is on their side. Don't let petty politics get in the way of good policy.

The DREAMers are courageous young men and women who came forward to register in the DACA program, and now they are more vulnerable than ever. Mr. Speaker, I urge every one of my colleagues to support H.R. 3440. The clock is ticking. We must act to protect the DREAMers.

□ 1515

PUERTO RICO AND HURRICANE RELIEF

(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, it has been 8 days since Hurricane Maria slammed into Puerto Rico and impacted the lives of Americans there, who are now in dire need. Power and communications remain down; food, water, and fuel are scarce; infrastructure continues to crumble; and Americans are dying. Tackling recovery is urgent.

I was pleased to see that President Trump has asked Brigadier General Richard Kim to go to the island and seek to lead. Because of the island's topography and isolation, this isn't a Houston, this isn't a New Orleans or a Florida. Rescue and relief isn't as easy as moving a convoy of power company trucks down the interstate highway. Logistically, this is much more difficult.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time to set up a joint task force, with one person in charge, able to make decisions and not get "stuck on stupid," as one Army general famously said. That general, Russell Honore, turned around the government floundering after taking charge of Joint Task Force Katrina.

On the ground, the joint task force can coordinate all public and private relief efforts, starting with putting our National Guard to work, reopening the air tower, clearing the roads, and opening a chow hall.

I continue to pray for Puerto Rico, but each of us must understand our beloved island's crisis is very different.

IN SUPPORT OF DREAMERS AND THE DREAM ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, I also want to join my colleague from Houston in prayers for Houston police officer Nestor Garcia and his family, but I rise today in support of the 68,000 DREAMers that are in Houston, Harris County, Texas, and throughout our country, and call on congressional leaders to bring up the Dream Act for immediate vote.

DREAMers and young men and women who were raised in America know no other country and are an integral part of our schools, our colleges, our workforce, and our communities.

During the worst days of Hurricane Harvey, DREAMers helped rescue neighbors and save lives throughout Houston and the Texas Gulf Coast. DREAMers are now and will continue to be serving a key role in rebuilding our city.

President Trump's announcement this month to end the DACA program was a gut punch to DREAMers who are helping their families and communities recover from Harvey's destruction.

Congress has a moral obligation to honor the hard work and aspirations of the current and earlier generations of immigrants and DREAMers, and bring up the Dream Act for our immediate consideration.

IN SUPPORT OF 800,000 DREAMERS

(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 rise in support of 800,000 DREAMers aban-

doned by this administration. Any doubt about the administration's senseless cruelty was put to rest on September 5, when they chose to end DACA.

Immigrant youth and their families fuel our economy and help create a more dynamic society.

Terminating DACA is a heartless and vile act that will upend lives, ruin families, and disrupt local economies.

DREAMers are the embodiment of America's promise, the idea that no matter where you are from, the color of your skin, or the God you worship, if you come here, believe in our values, work hard, and contribute to our country, then you deserve a place here in the United States of America. That is what we are fighting for: to keep the promise of this great country.

To my Republican colleagues: you can't profess to support the DREAMers yet fail to support the Dream Act. It is time to put up or shut up. I call on my colleagues to sign the discharge petition and support a clean Dream Act.

IT IS TIME TO VOTE ON THE DREAM ACT

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition to force a vote on the Dream Act. I believe this legislation would pass today if the Speaker would put it to a vote.

Survey after survey confirms that a vast majority of Americans support DREAMers and believe they should be allowed to stay in the United States, the only country they have known since childhood.

Let's be clear: DREAMers' lives are not bargaining chips, DREAMers' future is not a real estate deal. DREAMers have started businesses, they have bought homes, they have mentored high school students, they have found work in nonprofits.

They give back to their community every day. They are teachers, they are nurses and doctors, they are our neighbors, our friends, and, for some of us like me, they are family.

Failing to extend legal protections for DREAMers would be a historic betrayal, a permanent stain on our country. If you have yet to sign the discharge petition, I urge my colleagues to do so now.

THERE IS MUCH CONFUSION ABOUT IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that there is much confusion about something that is near and dear to me. There is much confusion about impeachment, and so as to

give some degree of clarity, I have, in this hand, an article that is styled, "The Overcriminalization of Impeachment." It is dated August 7, 2017, by Gene Healy. He is with the Cato Institute.

I commend it to all who have any interest in impeachment, because this will give you a summary that will spare you a lot of reading in the Federalist Papers, reading many other articles. I commend it to you, and I will say more about it at a later time.

MUSLIM BAN 3.0

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage toward the latest travel ban proposed by the Trump administration again late on September 24. The administration issued a proclamation with new discriminatory travel restrictions on eight countries.

Let me be clear: no matter how many times this administration tries to repackage it and sell it, a Muslim ban is a Muslim ban. It remains hateful, discriminatory, and goes against our American values. We won't be fooled by the inclusion of North Korea and Venezuela.

This Muslim and refugee ban continues to be part of a dangerous and immoral agenda against a religion, people of color, and immigrants.

This administration and this ban is fanning the flames of fear and anger against groups of Americans and immigrants, with policies that clearly undermine the Constitution that I love and our American principles.

Dressed up or dressed down, this ban must not stand.

We must address terrorism, and it is not restricted to the Muslim population. We must address it here on the ground in homegrown terrorism as well.

PROTECTING AND DEFENDING OUR DREAMERS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protect and defend our DREAMERS.

Now that President Trump has failed all of us by rescinding DACA, Congress must now move immediately to protect these courageous, patriotic DREAMERS like my constituent and aspiring cardiovascular surgeon, Cinthya Moran.

Cinthya just wants an opportunity to contribute to her community, and in her own words: "We are only here to contribute to this amazing country."

Like Cinthya, all DACA recipients are our friends, they are our neighbors, they are soldiers on the battlefield, they are new homeowners, they are entrepreneurs, they are students.

I urge my colleagues to support our DACA constituents and pass legislation that protects these brave young people, and I ask you to do that as soon as possible.

AMERICA'S IMMIGRATION SYSTEM IS BROKEN

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I have been saying for years that the American immigration system is broken, and it is about time we fix it. We must pass comprehensive immigration reform. This will obviously require bipartisanship and a deliberative policy process to make it happen.

In the meantime, we ought to do what we can where we can agree to do it, and that is why I am working towards this effort to protect our DREAMERS now. This is why I signed the discharge petition to bring to the House floor a bipartisan, bicameral Dream Act which will permanently protect these people who were brought here as children, who are in school, who are serving in our military, who are working and contributing to our economy, that will permanently protect DREAMERS and offer them a path to earned citizenship.

At Fresno State University, we have 1,200 DREAMERS who are enrolled; at UC Merced, we have 600 DREAMERS who are enrolled. We have thousands of young people in the San Joaquin Valley who are impacted, and that is why we must change this law and that is why I am here today, calling on the House leadership to bring the Dream Act to the floor. It is the right thing to do. It is the American way in which we solve problems.

I will continue to do everything in my power to bring the Dream Act to the House floor to vote and to work for a comprehensive and a longer term immigration policy so that we don't have to continue to have the political posturing and the fight that has endured way too long. Let's fix this for the DREAMERS now.

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:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

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 27, 2017, at 1:35 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1866.
That the Senate passed S. 1028.

That the Senate passed S. 504.
That the Senate passed S. 1057.
That the Senate passed S. 870.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3823, DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 538

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House, without intervention of any question of consideration, 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 28, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the whole world is aware of a series of storms that have hit not only America's shores but those shores of so many of our territories, including the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

□ 1530

A series of these hurricanes over the past few weeks has caused great devastation in Texas, Florida, Georgia, Puerto Rico, and, of course, again, the U.S. Virgin Islands. These are people who are American citizens, and they are in these territories, and they are suffering from loss and devastation, and we have never seen an occurrence like this with two storms in succession.

While there remains much to be done and evaluated, this legislation takes important steps, I believe, that are necessary to begin providing relief to those individuals. We have had a lot of debate not only on this floor and not only at the Rules Committee, but certainly in the U.S. House of Representatives and the public media about what steps need to be taken, who needs to be there first, what FEMA's responsibility is, what the responsibility is for HUD, what the responsibility is for States, and what the responsibility is for citizens and their local communities. But the bottom line is that much of the evaluation, the undertaking of saving of lives, trying to work to save more property and to be there in support of people, is an ongoing project that will take a long period of time.

Specifically, this underlying legislation helps to address five targeted and meaningful tax provisions that provide relief and make it easier for people to recover and to return to their homes and to make long-term decisions from a money and tax perspective.

It will allow hurricane victims to keep more of their paychecks, deduct more of the cost of their expensive property damage, and provide more affordable and immediate access to retirement savings should people decide that they would choose to go that direction at this difficult time in their life.

This legislation also encourages more Americans—Americans who see what is happening—and companies to be able to donate, to donate to those who are in need by temporarily suspending limitations on the deductions for charitable contributions for hurricane relief efforts this year. This is an important step, and it removes obstacles that might be in the way for the public to get involved and to help their fellow citizens.

Taken together, these five tax provisions go a long way, we believe, in helping these people recover from these storms.

The rule also makes clarifications to ensure Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are treated equitably in all tax sections of this bill.

I spent time this week speaking with the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) in talking about not only their immediate needs, but also the long-term needs. Both were vigorous in not only their request for help, but also, equally, I think, balanced in their request for the legislation that would take place today.

They represent so many hardworking people, people who are proud people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and they are looking for a way to work through not only where they are, but, in looking forward over the long term, about how they are going to put their islands back together.

I have had many phone conversations with both of them over the last 48 hours. They have asked for our prayers, they have asked for our help, and I have pledged to do both. But I told them that I believe this House of Representatives would very carefully understand their special request at this time because the islands are under increased pressure simply to get planes that would land to allow not only the bringing in of emergency supplies, but also taking out people who would need to come ashore, for those that might be children, elderly people, or the sick.

In addition to the tax provisions of H.R. 3823, which addresses some of the frailties of the Flood Insurance Program, we have included important reform pieces that are pro-consumer and increase competition at a very difficult time now that these hurricanes have landed on our shores. This provides options for all Americans.

The language that passed out of the Financial Services Committee 58-0 and on the floor of the House last year 419-0 has now been placed in this bill, also. We believe it is another example of bipartisan support, not only by the gentleman from the Financial Services Committee, JEB HENSARLING, but also his ranking member, MAXINE WATERS, who very carefully, last year, in preparation probably for what would lie ahead in the future, to provide a free market opportunity for more people to receive flood insurance. It is part of this package. It passed here last year 419-0. It is an integral part of what might be an answer maybe only for a few people, but it is an option and an opportunity, and I appreciate Chairman HENSARLING and MAXINE WATERS for being a part of passing that last year out of the Financial Services Committee 58-0.

This bill also reauthorizes the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration, for 6 months, their funding levels, which would, I believe, be most important to all areas of the country. This is a bipartisan bill.

This is an opportunity for people who live in rural areas and people who live

in urban areas to note that the FAA, day in and day out, 24 hours a day, is a vital part of the important transportation component of landing planes, bringing people to and from work and back safely. It also is a part of our families who travel the system, and the Federal Aviation Administration, the FAA, needs this money and needs the operational capacity to move forward.

It also comes at a critical time when the radar system that is in Puerto Rico has failed, and it is necessary that we continue to fund the programs at the FAA so that they can get these systems back up and online to increase traffic to meet the needs of the islands and to make sure that this is done safely.

Now is not a time to play games with an essential program, and I believe that this is very important for each of the Members to understand. This is a vital part of this package.

Finally, the underlying legislation extends several expiring health programs that would be finishing at the end of the year, including the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program and the Special Diabetes Program for Native Americans.

I do want to note that this package is focused on health programs that are expiring, and Chairman GREG WALDEN from Hood River, Oregon, who is the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, has every intent to make sure that he will move legislation extending funding for CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, because we know that it expires soon. The chairman has looked into this and certified back to me that the money that is necessary to keep this program going is not in jeopardy and that he looks forward to a time when he can move CHIP not only to where it is considered on the floor, but to the Rules Committee, where it can be equally and fairly debated.

Before concluding my opening statements, I just want to affirm to the people in my home State of Texas and other areas affected by these disasters that this is the second of a series of responses to these natural disasters. On September 8, this body, the United States House of Representatives, passed initial emergency response legislation, providing \$15.3 billion in aid.

To provide some historical context, in 2005, Hurricane Katrina hit the United States in August, followed by Hurricanes Rita and Wilma in September and October. The House responded by passing an initial response in September to provide immediate emergency relief; then, after some evaluation, determined the actual needs on the ground, that is, by an analysis that took place, and that is when the House passed a more comprehensive package that included many of the provisions that are in here that we are doing, but they did that in December.

There was some debate yesterday at the Rules Committee about the timing,

about delay, and I assured the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is a distinguished member of our committee, that, while I did not know the exact timing or delay, what might be a delay in that timing, that I believe that that is forthcoming; that, as there is a broader evaluation, as time moves on, as we go from saving people, trying to do recovery, to where we then move to the next phases of this opportunity, we will then know more specifically the needs of programs, the work that needs to be done by this Congress, and the help that we can provide to these areas.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) not only for his vigorous, what I believe, support of making sure that people—albeit they might be in Florida, but where they were a part of these storms, I felt Mr. HASTINGS' care and concern for them, to make sure that what the House of Representatives did was well managed, and I appreciate his feedback.

This body has every intention of providing further relief to our fellow Americans. We also understand that the Federal Government, while it has responsibilities, it does so by working with the States. It is done through FEMA.

I have been personally very pleased not only with the actions of President Trump and this administration, but I want to add that I am proud of the House of Representatives. I believe the leadership that PAUL RYAN has provided not only by being on the ground and looking at these areas, but also staying up to date on a day-to-day basis means that the House is nimble and able to move forward as we need to.

What we are talking about today is targeted tax relief for those in need, ensuring the FAA can continue its functions allowing planes to land in Puerto Rico, and continuing our emergency responses.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, extending the Federal Aviation Administration's authority is traditionally something that gets bipartisan support. That hasn't been the case this time, as we saw on Monday when a prior version of this bill failed on suspension. It contained several extraneous provisions, but it didn't include some of the most important priorities that we face.

September 30 is nearly upon us. That is the deadline to reauthorize programs that the American people depend on. That includes things like the Perkins student loan program, which helps low-income students to finance their education.

There are 500,000 students across the country, including nearly 50,000 from New York, relying on it right now, but the Perkins Loan Program isn't anywhere in this bill.

The bill also does nothing to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program created in 1997 with broad bipartisan support. More than 9 million children get their health insurance through this program. Without continued Federal funding, States are going to begin running out of money to take care of some of the most vulnerable kids, and they can't wait until the end of the year for us to act.

Community health centers have also been left out of the bill, and they have told us that they will have problems from day one. If we don't extend their funding, an estimated 9 million people would lose access to healthcare.

These are essential bipartisan programs, Mr. Speaker, and what does it say about the majority's leadership if they are not extended by the deadline? It does not bode well for our ability to fund the government later this year, to raise the debt ceiling, extend the Flood Insurance Program, or reauthorize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

This bill is an incredibly important one. No one in this Chamber or anywhere that I know of in the world wants the FAA program stopped and their employees furloughed or airport projects brought to a halt. We should work together and get it right.

This package, however, has not been negotiated on a bipartisan basis. It didn't go through regular order. Committees have been shut out of the process, and Democrats, who represent half the population in the United States, didn't get a say.

We are all glad to see provisions included here to provide some tax relief for victims of the recent hurricanes. With regular order and a more open process, this could be a more comprehensive package of extenders that provide more tax relief for victims to recover and to rebuild. After all, the Democrats did suggest 21 bipartisan tax provisions which were included in previous relief legislation after previous disasters.

□ 1545

But none of those, except five, I think, are included in this bill. That is a shame.

We have said it before. This is, I think, the 44th closed rule this session, and that is just about all the bills we have done. This bill could either have been bipartisan extending the FAA authorization, or a comprehensive package of extenders that provided the tax relief necessary for hurricane victims to recover and rebuild. The bill before us is neither. I doubt many of us have had time to review the changes that were made last night.

I have often said that a bad process leads to a bad product, and, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that is what we see with this bill. Another opportunity for bipartisanship has been turned into another political fight.

I, regretfully, reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle press forward with their partisan gimmicks, 800,000 young people are still holding their breath. With time quickly running out, they are wondering what their futures look like without DACA.

Will they lose their jobs? Will they have to drop out of college after they have already paid tuition? Will they live in fear that ICE will be waiting for them at any corner?

All these fears could be eliminated if Republican leadership allowed a vote on the bicameral, bipartisan Dream Act. Instead of living in fear or losing their job, the Dream Act would allow them to continue working and add \$22.7 billion annually to our U.S. GDP. Passing the Dream Act will help our country reach the goal of 3 percent economic growth.

The Dream Act would allow them to continue improving themselves and their education. In the process, they would add \$728 billion cumulatively to our economy over a decade, due to an "education bump." The Dream Act would allow current teachers, nurses, soldiers, engineers, high school and college students, and hundreds of thousands of others to continue contributing to our economy and our country.

I call on my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and, instead, bring the Dream Act forward for a vote. We have the votes, and the urgency of passing the Dream Act is real.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the honorable and distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), my friend.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill has fundamental problems. Number one, the flood insurance provisions that are in this legislation are provisions that are related to flood insurance. The current program expires on December 9.

Why are we dealing with this one component right now?

I agree that this bill passed the House unanimously previously, but it has fundamental problems advancing in a vacuum outside of the larger reform. And mark my words: this provision is going to result in the insolvency

of the Flood Insurance Program much faster. It is going to increase the debt of the United States. Watch. I promise this is going to happen, and I am looking forward to talking about this more later.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, explain to me the difference between a flood victim in Texas, a flood victim perhaps in Florida, and one in Louisiana. Explain to me how those are any different.

We had a 1,000-year flood in my community just last year. We introduced legislation to provide this same tax relief to our citizens.

Why are Texans better?

I don't understand that.

Now, look, I want to be clear. I think that Texas deserves—the hurricane victims absolutely deserve tax relief, there is no question, as do the victims in Florida, Puerto Rico, and elsewhere—the victims of Harvey, Irma, and Maria. But I don't understand this discrimination, and I certainly can't go back home and explain it or defend it.

This is absurd. It is absolutely absurd that we have been waiting for 13 months for this exact same tax relief, yet the victims of the other hurricanes get it within weeks. I would love for somebody to explain or justify that to me. You can't do it.

Mr. Speaker, look, I will say it again. The FAA absolutely needs to be extended. If this Ross-Castor bill was so great, after it passed the House unanimously, the Senate would have taken it up; but they didn't because it shouldn't be done in a vacuum. It needs to be part of the larger reauthorization that expires on December 9, where we can incorporate it into there.

The reason this is being done is because it is trying to artificially increase National Flood Insurance Program rates. It is trying to artificially expedite the insolvency of the program.

Think about this for just a minute. We are getting ready to have one of the greatest demands upon the National Flood Insurance Program for claims from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, yet we are diverting the revenue stream.

Why in the world would you do that? Where is the money going to come from to pay the claims from people who flooded?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to say that there are some things in here that matter. The FAA needs to be extended. We need to provide disaster tax relief without question.

This is a fundamentally flawed piece of legislation. We should be sending a clean FAA extension to the Senate and address these other things elsewhere.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the previous speaker made a very important statement, that we should treat all Americans alike.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to rescind DACA has brought fear to hundreds of

thousands of DREAMers and their families.

They are DREAMers like Saul Jimenez, who teaches special needs students in Los Angeles, and is just one example of how DREAMers contribute and add value to our country and our communities.

DREAMers are American in every way except for their immigration status. To send DREAMers to a country they have never known would be tragic for them and our Nation, which will lose their valuable contributions.

The American people overwhelmingly oppose deporting our DREAMers, and our faith-based community and business leaders are imploring Congress to pass the Dream Act. Yet the Republican leadership is ignoring their wishes and refusing to allow us a vote on this bipartisan, bicameral bill.

To my Republican colleagues who say they want to protect our Nation's DREAMers: If that is true, this is your chance. Vote "no" on the previous question so we can vote on the Dream Act and put our DREAMers on the road to the security and future they have earned in the only country they know, the United States of America. The time to pass the Dream Act is now. Vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because there are nearly a million young men and women known as DREAMers who are depending on Congress to take action to protect them so they are not deported.

DREAMers were brought to this country as children. Many barely remember their birth country. They are our teachers, our nurses, and our doctors. They are our neighbors, our friends, and for some of us, like me, they are our family.

They also contribute to our economy. The Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce estimates that DREAMers in Los Angeles County alone contribute \$5.5 billion annually to California's economy. Across the country, DREAMers would add billions to GDP over the next decade.

Americans overwhelmingly want Congress to take action, and the vast majority of Members would support legislation to protect DREAMers.

Let's not wait another moment. Let's bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote so that we can protect these young men and women. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can bring the Dream Act to the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentlewoman, my colleague, that I have one more speaker left, so she may run down the time as she chooses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber must act to protect DREAMers now in limbo because of President Trump's decision to end the DACA program.

DACA recipients are rigorously vetted. They are high-contributing young people who were brought to this country as children. They are cherished members of communities across the country, and they are as American as any of us in all but their paperwork.

President Trump's decision to end the program means that these inspiring young people stand to lose their futures. Soon they will be forced out of work and school, faced with the specter of deportation to nations many of them have no memory of. The President has created a moral emergency for our country.

This House must allow a vote on a clean Dream Act. It is a bipartisan bill that gives these young people a real opportunity to get right with the law and earn a path to legal permanent residence.

We all know that if this bill were put on the floor, it would pass. The bill deserves a vote. There is no doubt about the public support.

Recent polls from CNN and ABC show that 82 to 86 percent of the American public supports Dream Act-type legislation; 82 to 86 percent. There is almost no issue we work on that has that much support from the American public.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with an urgent plea to my Republican colleagues. Not included in this legislation are the Children's Health Insurance Program, Community Health Centers, and Teaching Health Centers, whose authorization expires on September 30, this Saturday, after this House adjourns.

They have known for 2 years about this date, yet, with no time left, the Republicans spent precious hours today debating among themselves a plan to cut taxes for the richest of Americans.

Nine million children rely on CHIP for their healthcare. Twenty-three million Americans rely on Community Health Centers. That is 1 in 15 Americans, and they rely on the doctors that are trained at those centers.

If making sure that every child in America has access to healthcare, if that is not a priority, what is?

This is a real crisis that still can be averted in just a few minutes of time now and not later. Families are waiting anxiously while their health security is hanging in the balance. It is time to vote now before it is too late.

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

I appreciate the distinguished gentlewoman bringing this up. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, she was not in the body on the floor earlier when I brought up

what I believe is an answer to this CHIP—Children's Health Insurance Program—reauthorization.

I talked specifically with the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, GREG WALDEN, who is very excited about the opportunity to move the CHIP bill. The opportunity to do this is not dire or urgent. As a matter of fact, there is money in the bucket right now to fund, as it has been, the program to continue.

Chairman WALDEN indicated that, while he does understand that the program is scheduled to run through September 30, that the analysis from the nonpartisan Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission shows that States have enough funds remaining in their accounts through the end of this year.

□ 1600

Chairman WALDEN is interested in looking at it again and gaining information about it to see what sorts of changes, additions, or updates that we choose to do. He intends to do that in and through the committee providing information on a bipartisan basis. I trust not only what GREG WALDEN said, but I also know of his desire to deal effectively in this manner.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for bringing up this important question, and I want to provide a timely answer to her, and I appreciate her very much.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend.

I appreciate the information that the gentleman just gave us. We have been told the community health service will be in trouble from day one.

Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the gentleman whether he has the same kind of information about them?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, responding to the gentlewoman, I do not, but I will talk to Chairman WALDEN immediately, and I will come and find you during the vote, or as we end here, and I will let you know.

I appreciate, once again, Mr. Speaker, that the gentlewoman is very concerned, as is her committee, about children's programs, women's programs, and she would expect me to respond accordingly, and I will talk to Chairman WALDEN and get back to her with an answer.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that because millions of people use the community health services, and the children, we cannot let them go unattended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been 3 weeks since

President Trump announced he would be ending DACA; 3 weeks of fear in homes, classrooms, and offices where DREAMers wonder if they still have a future here in the only home they have ever known; 3 weeks for Congress to answer President Trump's request for a bill that would stop him from executing his own cruel order.

Here is that bill. Members from both parties have said they want to do something to protect DREAMers. Here is that something. Over 80 percent of Americans believe DREAMers who live, work, contribute, and follow the law should stay here. Here is our chance to show we are listening.

We must pass the Dream Act because of people like Jose Antonio Vargas, an immigrant from the Philippines, who never knew he was undocumented until he applied for his learner's permit. But being undocumented didn't stop his pursuit of the American Dream. He worked hard and became a journalist, ultimately winning the Pulitzer Prize for his articles.

Let's act to bring DREAMers like Jose out of the shadows. Let act to encourage more to achieve what he did. Let's right this wrong, stop the cruel end of DACA, and finally pass the Dream Act today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is full of provisions that could pass in regular order, and I am afraid of using the FAA reauthorization, running out of time, again, because the planes can't fly if controllers are not in the air.

The FAA bill contains a lot of important provisions that our constituents are crying out for. Among them, airplane noise, which is ruining communities across the United States. A study of the health impact of that noise is as important as DACA, which we should pass, and I think could pass. And there are other provisions which would pass on regular order.

The FAA reauthorization bill is not the bill to fool around with. We have had too many near misses by letting these short-term extensions pile up on us. Pass a straight FAA reauthorization bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership. I thank my fellow Texan on this effort.

I am not on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, but I do be-

lieve the FAA should have this extension. I do believe I should advocate for the many employees and consumers of aviation needs, that the air traffic controllers should not be privatized. And I understand that this particular bill does not have that provision.

The focus should be on extending a number of these health matters that are very important to us, and particularly, the inspiring health programs dealing with the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education Program, the Special Diabetes Program for Indians, and the Medicare Intravenous Immune Globulin Demonstration project, a number of these.

I do take concern with the diminishing of the Medicare Improvement Fund by \$50 million and, frankly, I believe that we should move forward on these emergencies, particularly as it relates to hurricane victims or areas.

Let me, however, focus on what is of devastating need in the areas of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and make mention of the fact that the U.S. Virgin Islands is included in these tax benefits, and Puerto Rico, agreed to by the Members representing that area.

It is important that people do not have a penalty on their account tax provisions. I hope this can move quickly through the Senate. The employee retention credit for employees: the bill provides a tax credit for 40 percent of wages, up to \$6,000 per employee, paid by a disaster-affected employer to an employee from a core disaster area.

Charitable deductions: the bill suspends limitations on charitable contributions.

In our community, there are people who don't have the gap to survive. They are working. Their job is closed down because of Hurricane Harvey. I imagine in other areas they may be receiving charitable moneys. Those who give the charitable contributions need to be helped.

The disaster-related personal casualty losses and the special rule for determining the earned income tax credit is extremely important.

We want more. We are desperate, and we need more, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we will be able to work together to get more for those who are desperate from these hurricanes.

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

A good bit of the dialogue that is occurring today has been an active discussion for a long period of time in the Financial Services Committee—JEB HENSARLING from Dallas, Texas, the chairman of that committee.

One of our bright young stars is from Tampa, Florida, and his name is DENNIS ROSS. And Mr. ROSS has heard the debate going on and came down here. He has been an active part of not only understanding the needs of communities, but, more importantly, how we are going to have a fix and answer in a long-term way to look at this flooding problem and the Federal flood program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years, the only game in town for flood insurance has been the Federal Government through the National Flood Insurance Program. That means that for over 50 years, if you want flood insurance, your best bet is to go to the Federal Government, which, by the way, especially after these two successive storms that have just hit Texas and Florida, is going to be over \$30 billion in debt.

If we don't do something to save the taxpayers of this program that cannot actuarially support itself, we are doing a total disservice to our constituency and to our country. So what is part of the underlying bill that this rule will allow is the Market Parity and Modernization Act that will allow consumers to have a choice between the existing Flood Insurance Program, which is significantly in debt, or to have the private sector bring in their flood insurance programs to insure those risks.

In Florida, back in 2004, we had successive hurricanes that came through my district, and we had billions of dollars paid by FEMA, paid by NFIP, but we had \$39 billion paid by the private sector because we had private wind-storm insurance. The private sector does a much better job of doing business and managing risks than the Federal Government.

What I am asking for this body to accept, what the American people are craving for, is competition in the products they seek to have to protect them with their valuable assets. It is kind of like the Flood Insurance Program is a boat, and after 50 years of plugging holes, it is taking on water more and more.

One of the suggestions is, let's just keep bailing. I submit to you that to any logical person, the first step would be to plug that hole. We are going to continue to bail. We need to continue to bail, but we need to plug that hole so we don't get deeper and deeper in debt.

So the underlying bill, the FAA reauthorization, has the Ross-Castor bill in there for a reason, so that we can invite a private market to come to the rescue of those consumers out there who need to not only be able to have options greater than what the National Flood Insurance Program provides, because they don't provide business interruption. They don't provide temporary housing, but the private sector will. More importantly, the private sector will mitigate and will manage that risk.

There is no mitigation program that is effective in the Federal Government right now. It is a flowing of dollars to say: Here, do this; or, do that.

Private risk management will help consumers mitigate, lessen their risks, have more resilient homes.

What I am suggesting to you is that this is a paradigm shift for this coun-

try. That if we are going to say that the business of the United States should be left to business, and government should do what government should do, then this is a move in that direction because government should not be in the business of insurance. It is in the business of relief.

There is no question about that, but relief is post-event help. Insurance is pre-event. It is calculating that risk. It is managing that risk. And that is what the private sector does so well. We owe it to our consumers and we owe it to our taxpayers who are bailing out the NFIP, that we give consumers this choice.

I would just submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we have a chance to finally make a paradigm shift when we take the burden of bailouts off the shoulders of taxpayers and allow those who do best what they do best in managing capital and managing risk, do so for the benefit of the consumers, that this underlying bill and the FAA reauthorization allows for that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the previous speaker that my understanding is the fallback provision on flood insurance came to the Federal Government because the private insurers didn't want to do it.

If we can get them to take it over, I think everybody would be relieved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say in the strongest possible terms that this body must do what the majority of the American people want and pass the Dream Act. The Dream Act is smart policy that combines American values of compassion and humanity with what is best for our economy and our society. This bill will protect 1.5 million undocumented Americans from deportation.

Every day that we fail to act is another day that 800,000 DACAmented young people live with an unshakable fear that they will lose their ability to live without fear of deportation, be able to support themselves and their families, to know that they can plan for the future, whether that be attending school or buying a home, or a car, or starting a new business.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, this bill will help all Americans regardless of legal status. Nationally, the cruel end of this program will cost \$460 billion in GDP over the next 10 years; whereas passing the Dream Act would actually bring \$22 billion in income to our country every year.

Mr. Speaker, this is about more than economics. It is about human lives, and I urge my colleagues to do what is right. Pass the Dream Act. Let's help these young people.

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

Mr. Speaker, this discussion that we are having here on point that we have now had two speakers from my side,

Mr. ROSS and Mr. GRAVES, who have come down to talk about the debate that has been well alive across the country, about how we deal with emergencies, how we deal with flooding, how we deal with the opportunity for States, and communities, and citizens, the free enterprise system, and what I would say FEMA, or the Federal Government, to get closer in understanding the needs of communities, and the answers to long-term decisions that take place.

What you heard Mr. ROSS talk about was a bill that he worked on with the gentlewoman, a Democratic colleague from Tampa, and they worked on this piece of legislation, got it passed 58-0 out of the Financial Services Committee, 419-0 on this vote. We need to pass—we need to include this. We need to put this as part of the options, an option that would be available for people back home, no matter where that is, to have a chance to have more control of their own lives, to work in their own communities.

□ 1615

I really appreciate the gentleman, Mr. ROSS, coming to talk to us today. The hard work that he and KATHY CASTOR, the gentlewoman from Tampa, did on a bipartisan basis comes to play. Even though they did it a year ago, it would be in play today, and it will be in play 1 year from now, when storms come back, as an option and opportunity. Instead of us searching for answers, it would be one of the answers available.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this is a country that was built on dreams. Our country was founded to protect not just the right to life and liberty but also to pursuit of happiness.

Sadly, the dreams of the thousands of young DREAMers who were brought here as children have been put on hold by President Trump's decision to end the DACA program and Congress' inaction to pass the Dream Act. These young DREAMers have created a life for themselves here in the U.S., and many know no other home other than the U.S.

Today, I want to tell you about one special DREAMer from my district. Jose is an extremely intelligent young man. He works 6 days a week and still finds time to volunteer in his community. His parents, unfortunately, did not tell him that he was undocumented, in an effort to protect him. He didn't find out about his status until it was time to apply for college. He was extremely upset, but he didn't give up. His dream is to go to college and study business. He has so much to contribute to our country.

These young people have become part of the American quilt, a quilt that reflects the diversity of our history, our

culture, and heritage of this great country. We can't just throw them and toss them out of our Nation.

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

They say that success has many fathers, and you could say many mothers. Success is, many times, in the eye of the beholder. But when lots of people see it, they can get better prepared, and then people see that as a model.

I would like to take just a minute, if I can, and talk about a model of success that I use. Back home, I have an opportunity to meet with a number of subject matter experts on issues and ideas. One of them is a man named Bill Dewey. Bill Dewey is an air traffic controller at DFW Airport in Dallas, Texas. Mr. Dewey and I take time to sit down and understand the intricacies of his job, the FAA air traffic controller—safety, planes.

DFW is home to American Airlines. Mr. Dewey handles traffic that goes to Dallas Love Field, home for Southwest Airlines.

What Mr. Dewey has done with me is given me, from a working professional relationship that he has as not only a former member of the United States military as an air traffic controller but real live in the tower at DFW Airport, day after day, seeing how important the FAA is.

We should remember, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just money and time that we are doing here. We are patting the employees of these agencies. The FAA has so many dedicated employees—just like Bill Dewey, my dear friend, who is at DFW Airport. This also is a support for those employees to let them know that we are going to fund their programs and we are going to take care of them. So we should, at the same time we do that, say “thank you” to the men and women who are there 24 hours around the clock to provide safety.

We have now been a number of years where we have not had a plane crash with a fatality, and we are lucky. Part of it goes to the safety of the system at the FAA.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's decision to end DACA was one of the most callous and cruel acts of his Presidency so far—and that is saying something.

Mr. Speaker, ending the DACA program means betraying our Nation's promise to protect 800,000 young people who are in America right now and American in every way except on paper, including many thousands who have served in the military. It means exposing them to deportation from the only home they have ever known and robbing our Nation of their exceptional talent, work ethic, and patriotism.

We cannot allow this President to play politics with so many young lives. Congress must pass the Dream Act now

and as soon as possible to protect these outstanding young people, offer them the chance to become citizens, and empower them to give back to the country they know and love.

Vote “no” on the previous question so that we can end this Republican obstructionism and bring this critical bill to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are, once again, reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what a shock it is to see the President attacked when he is the one who is going to make sure, by challenging Congress, that we get this issue done.

Mr. Speaker, there was a question the gentlewoman, my dear colleague, Ms. SLAUGHTER, asked. The question is timely and important, and I would like to respond back to her. She asked about the health center program, and the answer I have gotten back from the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WALDEN, the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon, who is a phenomenal leader to this conference, is that it will not have to access mandatory appropriations until early December, and that Chairman WALDEN understands and appreciates that the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, has asked a question, and he thanks you for asking that. He understands that we do have a timing issue and is preparing quickly to address this issue. He wanted me to thank the gentlewoman for bringing that up at this time.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN for that message.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the chairman for giving me that answer, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is our 44th closed rule for this session of Congress which prevents Members from offering amendments to the floor. This has put this Congress well on its way to becoming the most closed Congress in modern history. Democrats have been routinely unable to do the job we were elected to do and amend bills to represent the concerns of the people of the United States which we are both privileged and obligated to serve.

Despite his promises, Speaker RYAN has shown a complete disregard for regular order since assuming the gavel. Bills routinely come before the Rules Committee that haven't even been considered by the relevant committees. The majority even moved a healthcare repeal bill through this Chamber earlier this year without a score from the nonpartisan experts at the Congressional Budget Office.

This measure would impact one-sixth of our Nation's economy and tens of millions of people if it became law.

This is no way to run the people's House. The public expects more, and it is high time that we heed those calls.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question, the rule, and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank my colleague not only for this long week that we have had at the Rules Committee, but I also want to thank her other members, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), for not only their vigorous debate and conversations that we have had, but actually trying to prepare us at the Rules Committee for that which we believe would lie ahead.

Today, you heard the gentlewoman ask about several important issues. Part of our job is to kind of pitch and catch, and that is to catch the things that come our way. But she is using her vision to look ahead, and I admire that. I do owe her answers, and her background and experience would tell her, let's get moving on these things if we are going to get them done. I hope that I have provided her with feedback from the gentleman, Mr. WALDEN, saying exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, as the hurricane was still over Houston, Texas, dumping 50 inches of rain, I received a conference call from a number of people in Houston as they were preparing to reestablish not only their own communities within Houston, but also the livelihood of the business community, and to be prepared.

I got a conference call from a group of gentlemen, Mr. Tom Singletary, Mr. Kevin Hedges, Mr. Steve Kessler, Mr. Wallace B. Livesay, and Mr. Steve Raben from Houston. They called me and said: We need, as quickly as we can, to get information about taxes, about people pulling money out of their IRAs, and what the rules and regulations would be for that.

Mr. Speaker, part of my job is to respond to people, to listen to them, and to listen to their needs. I will tell you that the Houston delegation, on a bipartisan basis, up and down the coast, going down to BLAKE FARENTHOLD in Corpus Christi, all the way up to GARRET GRAVES who is in Louisiana, felt the fury of Mother Nature. But it didn't mean that it had to divide us or to defeat us.

I have seen nothing but resolve that has come from not only those in Texas but also those in Florida, our two colleagues, Jenniffer Gonzalez who is located in Puerto Rico, and STACEY PLASKETT who is a fine young Delegate out of the Virgin Islands. They have asked for help. They have asked for the things that would be necessary.

But our ability to effectively listen and turn around in the form of legislation, our ability to be able to schedule meetings and, on a bipartisan basis, be able to talk and sometimes agree and sometimes disagree but to get our work done is an amazing part of this experiment that we are engaged in.

I, myself, Mr. Speaker, want to thank you for not only your hard work of being here today but being a part of this process. As all of us work together, we can make this process work and give confidence to the American people. That confidence is expressed with what we do today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 538 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry,

asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

FAIR ACCESS TO INVESTMENT RESEARCH ACT OF 2017

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 327) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 327

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 "Fair Access to Investment Research Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR FOR INVESTMENT FUND RESEARCH.

(a) EXPANSION OF THE SAFE HARBOR.—Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall propose, and not later than the end of the 270-day period beginning on such date, the Commission shall adopt, upon such terms, conditions, or requirements as the Commission may determine necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, and for the promotion of capital formation, revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that a covered investment fund research report that is published or distributed by a broker or dealer, other than a broker or dealer that is an investment adviser to the fund or an affiliated person of the investment adviser to the fund—

(1) shall be deemed, for purposes of sections 2(a)(10) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(10), 77e(c)), not to constitute an offer for sale or an offer to sell a security that is the subject of an offering pursuant to a registration statement that is effective, even if the broker or dealer is participating or will participate in the registered offering of the covered investment fund's securities; and

(2) shall be deemed to satisfy the conditions of paragraph (1) or (2) of section 230.139(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor provisions, for purposes of the Commission's rules and regulations under the Federal securities laws and the rules of any self-regulatory organization.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFE HARBOR.—In implementing the safe harbor pursuant to subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) not, in the case of a covered investment fund with a class of securities in substantially continuous distribution, condition the safe harbor on whether the broker's or dealer's publication or distribution of a covered investment fund research report constitutes such broker's or dealer's initiation or reinitiation of research coverage on such covered investment fund or its securities;

(2) not—

(A) require the covered investment fund to have been registered as an investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) or subject to the reporting requirements of section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)) for any period exceeding the period of time referenced under section 230.139(a)(1)(i)(A)(1) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(B) impose a minimum float provision exceeding that referenced in section 230.139(a)(1)(i)(A)(1)(i) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations;

(3) provide that a self-regulatory organization may not maintain or enforce any rule that would—

(A) prohibit the ability of a member to publish or distribute a covered investment fund research report solely because the member is also participating in a registered offering or other distribution of any securities of such covered investment fund; or

(B) prohibit the ability of a member to participate in a registered offering or other distribution of securities of a covered investment fund solely because the member has published or distributed a covered investment fund research report about such covered investment fund or its securities; and

(4) provide that a covered investment fund research report shall not be subject to section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)) or the rules and regulations thereunder, except that such report may still be subject to such section and the rules and regulations thereunder to the extent that it is otherwise not subject to the content standards in the rules of any self-regulatory organization related to research reports, including those contained in the rules governing communications with the public regarding investment companies or substantially similar standards.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as in any way limiting—

(1) the applicability of the antifraud or antimanipulation provisions of the Federal securities laws and rules adopted thereunder to a covered investment fund research report, including section 17 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77q), section 34(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-33(b)), and sections 9 and 10 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78i, 78j); or

(2) the authority of any self-regulatory organization to examine or supervise a member's practices in connection with such member's publication or distribution of a covered investment fund research report for compliance with applicable provisions of the Federal securities laws or self-regulatory organization rules related to research reports, including those contained in rules governing communications with the public, or to require the filing of communications with the public the purpose of which is not to provide research and analysis of covered investment funds.

(d) INTERIM EFFECTIVENESS OF SAFE HARBOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From and after the 270-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, if the Commission has not adopted revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as required by subsection (a), and until such time as the Commission has done so, a broker or dealer distributing or publishing a covered investment fund research report after such date shall be able to rely on the provisions of section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, and the broker or dealer's publication of such report shall be deemed to satisfy the conditions of paragraph (1) or (2) of section 230.139(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, if the covered investment fund that is the subject of such report satisfies the reporting history requirements (without regard to Form S-3 or Form F-3 eligibility) and minimum float provisions of such subsections for purposes of the Commission's rules and regulations under the Federal securities laws and the rules of any self-regulatory organization, as if revised and implemented in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

(2) STATUS OF COVERED INVESTMENT FUND.—After such period and until the Commission has adopted revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, and FINRA has revised rule 2210, for purposes of subsection (c)(7)(O) of such rule, a covered

investment fund shall be deemed to be a security that is listed on a national securities exchange and that is not subject to section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)).

(3) COVERED INVESTMENT FUNDS COMMUNICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), communications that concern only covered investment funds that fall within the scope of section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)) shall not be required to be filed with FINRA.

(B) EXCEPTION.—FINRA may require the filing of communications with the public if the purpose of those communications is not to provide research and analysis of covered investment funds.

(e) EXCEPTION.—The safe harbor under subsection (a) shall not apply to the publication or distribution by a broker or a dealer of a covered investment fund research report, the subject of which is a business development company or a registered closed-end investment company, during the time period described in section 230.139(a)(1)(i)(A)(1) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, except where expressly permitted by the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Federal securities laws.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term “affiliated person” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)).

(2) The term “covered investment fund” means—

(A) an investment company registered under, or that has filed an election to be treated as a business development company under, the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) and that has filed a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) for the public offering of a class of its securities, which registration statement has been declared effective by the Commission; and

(B) a trust or other person—

(i) issuing securities in an offering registered under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) and which class of securities is listed for trading on a national securities exchange;

(ii) the assets of which consist primarily of commodities, currencies, or derivative instruments that reference commodities or currencies, or interests in the foregoing; and

(iii) that provides in its registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) that a class of its securities are purchased or redeemed, subject to conditions or limitations, for a ratable share of its assets.

(3) The term “covered investment fund research report” means a research report published or distributed by a broker or dealer about a covered investment fund or any securities issued by the covered investment fund, but does not include a research report to the extent that the research report is published or distributed by the covered investment fund or any affiliate of the covered investment fund, or any research report published or distributed by any broker or dealer that is an investment adviser (or an affiliated person of an investment adviser) for the covered investment fund.

(4) The term “FINRA” means the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority.

(5) The term “investment adviser” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)).

(6) The term “research report” has the meaning given that term under section 2(a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C.

77b(a)(3)), except that such term shall not include an oral communication.

(7) The term “self-regulatory organization” has the meaning given that term under section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(26)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering S. 327 today, the Fair Access to Investment Research Act.

This is the Senate companion to my bill, H.R. 910, that I had the pleasure of working on with my friend from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) in this Congress and our colleague in the last Congress, now Governor Carney of Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, occasionally on this floor, we don't compliment our colleagues in the upper Chamber at the other end of the building, but we have to say today “thank you” to Senator CRAPO and Senator BROWN for advancing a number of securities-related bills in the last few days which we appreciate seeing coming back to the House, including S. 327.

□ 1630

This bill contains the same language as H.R. 910, which passed the House in May with overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 405-2.

S. 327 also includes some Senate amendments that add some additional clarifications to the bill:

First, it clarifies the conflict of interest provision by precluding dealers from issuing research on affiliated exchange-traded funds.

Second, it carves out closed-end funds, including business development companies.

Finally, it includes a specific definition of “affiliated person,” which matches the definition of an “affiliated person” in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Since starting an investment firm back in the late 1990s, I have watched exchange-traded funds grow amazingly. ETFs have grown from about 100 funds, in the late 1990s, with over \$100 billion in assets, to now over 1,700 funds with over \$3 trillion in assets. Exchange-traded funds can average 30 percent of the trading volumes by value on any given day on our markets.

Yet, despite their growing popularity and increasing importance to retail investors, most broker-dealers do not

publish research on ETFs. This is due to anomalies in our securities laws and regulations. S. 327 tackles those anomalies.

Given the importance of ETFs to investors, and particularly retail investors, steps to facilitate research on exchange-traded funds are long overdue.

The Fair Access to Investment Research Act is simple. It directs the SEC to provide a safe harbor for research reports that cover ETFs so that these reports are not considered offers under section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933. This allows ETF research to be issued just like stock research on a corporate issuer.

This commonsense proposal, which mirrors other research safe harbors implemented by the SEC, would clarify the law and allow broker-dealers to publish exchange-traded fund research, thereby allowing investors to access that very useful and needed information in this rapidly growing and occasionally complex market of choices.

This bill also holds the SEC accountable to follow Congress' direction. The bill requires the SEC to finalize the rules within 270 days, and if the deadline is not met, an interim safe harbor rule will take effect until the SEC's rule is finalized.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not unfamiliar to the Commission, as this proposal has been raised both by the Commission and by industry many times over the last two decades. With close to 6 million U.S. households holding ETFs, investors need access to this important research.

Having worked in the banking and investment industry for the past three decades, I appreciate Chairman HENSARLING and the Congress' efforts to promote capital formation, reduce unnecessary burdens, and grow jobs and the economy. S. 327 is another step in that process.

I also want to thank my friend, Mr. FOSTER of Illinois, for working on this legislation, and our colleague in the Senate, Senator HELLER of Nevada, for working with me on this bipartisan, commonsense fix that we worked on together for over 2 years.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for his years of bipartisan work that went into this bill.

I am proud to support this bill today because I believe that it will strengthen the ability of investors to make informed decisions. Exchange-traded funds are valuable and popular tools for investors to diversify risks and returns through a single security at low cost. This bill will help investors understand the various ETF choices on the market.

I was proud that the House passed our bill, H.R. 910, earlier this Congress by a vote of 405-2. This bill is essen-

tially the same bill and incorporates, among other things, an amendment by Senator ELIZABETH WARREN to reiterate that the safe harbor will not be available to affiliates of the ETF, including the fund's registered investment adviser. I am really proud of the bipartisanship that went into this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I do appreciate the work in the Senate that improved this bill.

I think it is important to note that this will make this research flow, and in no way will it, I think, confuse investors; in fact, it enhances their investment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for working with us on this bill over the past years and look forward to it now being sent to the President's desk and signed into law.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 327.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REDACTION AUTHORITY CONCERNING SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3229) to protect the safety of judges by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information contained in their financial disclosure reports, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3229

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF REDACTION AUTHORITY CONCERNING SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION.

Section 105(b)(3)(E) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking "2017" both places it appears and inserting "2027".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3229, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As chairman of the Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet Subcommittee, I recognize the importance of judicial security needs.

Federal judges hear cases involving hardened criminals on a regular basis. Although not everyone threatens a Federal judge and not everyone is a gang member, many are. Federal judges and their families should not be at risk for simply doing their jobs.

Congress provides funding for a variety of judicial security needs by building secure court houses, staffing metal detectors at entrances, and so on, but there is a simple way to address security needs without extending taxpayer dollars. One method is to redact specific information from judicial financial disclosure reports done by the judges and other key employees. If they are to be targeted, we cannot have a judge's home address or other information that allows tracking by a criminal to, in fact, be a source of their demise.

The redaction authority has been in place since Congress began, in 1998, to allow for this, and it has been extended and expanded, in a number of cases, to include family members. The redaction process requires input and agreement from the U.S. Marshals Service.

The legislation that my colleague from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) and I introduced would extend the redaction authority for an additional 10 years, until December 31, 2027. There is no financial impact from this, and it serves to put judges and their families in a position they have historically been in since 1998: less at risk by this information being disclosed.

I not only urge the House to support this legislation, but after careful consideration and research, we find that this authority has not been abused, it has been properly used, and the Federal judges have earned the absolute right to this limited redaction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3229, which will extend for 10 years the soon expiring authority for Federal judges and judicial officers to redact from financial disclosure forms sensitive personal information that, if revealed, could compromise their safety and security.

An independent judiciary that is free of coercion is fundamental to our constitutional democracy, fundamental to

the principle of liberty and justice for all, and fundamental to the principle of equal protection under the law. Unfortunately, in this country, there are some who seek to compromise the integrity of the judicial branch through threats, harm, and harassment.

According to the U.S. Marshals Service, in fiscal year 2017, there has been an increase in every major recorded statistical category regarding the targeting of members of the Federal bench and judiciary employees. Failure to extend this authority will create grave security risks to judges, judiciary employees, and their families.

Each year, only a very small percentage of the financial disclosure reports filed contain an approved redaction of information. Redaction only occurs if there is a clear nexus between a security risk and the information for which redaction is sought.

Federal judges and other employees of the judicial branch routinely interact with disgruntled litigants or dangerous defendants and others who may seek to do them harm.

For example, in 2016, a disgruntled defendant was convicted of a diabolical plot to kidnap, torture, and murder U.S. District Judge Andrew J. Guilford, who presided over that defendant's wire fraud conviction.

In March of this year, the FBI reported that U.S. District Judge Derek Watson, who issued a temporary retaining order against the President's travel ban, has subsequently been the target of repeated violent threats.

In April, Jason Springer, an ISIS sympathizer, was indicted on a charge of threatening to murder U.S. District Judge Elizabeth Kovachevich by flying an explosive drone into her window.

The need to extend the redaction authority is a time-sensitive security matter, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, Subcommittee Chairman ISSA, and Ranking Member NADLER of the subcommittee, for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3229, which would extend an important tool in protecting the safety of judges and their families.

Each year, Federal judges and certain other judicial employees are required to file financial disclosure reports which are made available to the public. These reports serve a vital function in promoting transparency, particularly of any potential conflicts of interest.

By their nature, however, they also disclose sensitive personal information like a home address or family member's place of business. In the hands of a disgruntled member of the public

seeking retribution or of an otherwise disturbed individual, this information could put judges and their families at great risk.

□ 1645

Under current law, the Judicial Conference may redact information from a financial disclosure form if publishing such information could endanger the safety of the filer or a member of the filer's family. Unless Congress acts, this redaction authority will expire on December 31 of this year. This commonsense bill simply extends the redaction authority for 10 years.

Unfortunately, many Federal judges face threats to their safety merely for doing their jobs, and according to the Judicial Conference, the number of threats against them are increasing. For example, an Ohio man recently pleaded guilty to arranging a murder-for-hire plot against a judge; an alleged ISIS sympathizer who was attempting to learn a judge's address was indicted a few months ago for threatening the judge; and last year, a California man, who was already in prison, was convicted of plotting to have the Federal judge, prosecutors, and FBI agents killed as revenge.

Sadly, earlier this year, we also saw threats against several judges who ruled against President Trump's Muslim ban. After the President himself launched a verbal assault against the judges and against the Federal judiciary more generally, the judges faced a cascade of online threats and they required heightened security measures. Even without such irresponsible and dangerous behavior by the President, Federal judges regularly face threats, and this legislation is an important tool in protecting their safety.

Although disclosure forms should only be redacted in the most extreme and limited circumstances, the Judicial Conference has used its redaction authority sparingly and wisely, and it should continue to have this authority available to it when circumstances warrant its use.

I appreciate Mr. JEFFRIES' leadership in introducing this legislation. I want to recognize Ranking Member CONYERS for the work he has done to champion this issue over the years as well. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Mr. ISSA for moving this bipartisan bill forward.

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished champion of safety of Federal judges.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York for a very thoughtful and, really, a crucial element to justice.

Allow me to acknowledge Mr. JEFFRIES for his leadership, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GOODLATTE for working in a bipartisan manner, and the manager of the bill for his support, and indicate that this has evidence that we wish we did not have to see or could not document.

I know that in my own State just a couple of years ago, the Federal judge in San Antonio was attacked and, in my recollection, lost his life. So we realize that justice requires us to eliminate impediments of fear and danger that may come to the Federal judiciary.

This thoughtful legislation to redact addresses and other personal information from financial disclosure forms of all of the judiciary, magistrates, and appeals courts, district courts, obviously, and the Supreme Court, is crucial for the courts that represent the third branch of government and really represent a need of the kind of stovepipe to allow them to render justice.

So on the financial disclosure forms, they are important for transparency, but I want to acknowledge that, unfortunately, there are individuals who would take out their disgust or contempt for the Federal Government and take that contempt out on the courts.

For that reason and for the reason that it has been reported that there are terrorist cells in every State, that we don't know from where that threat will come, and the fact that we have this very important bill, I want to congratulate the author of the bill. I hope that we will pass this bill as quickly as possible, which protects our Federal judiciary by allowing their personal information and that of their family members to be redacted because justice has to be kept safe and secure.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would close by urging my colleagues to support this well-thought-out, well authored, and in regular hearings by the committee, universally accepted as necessary and reasonable for a 10-year extension.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3229, a bipartisan, commonsense measure intended to protect the safety of federal judges and judicial employees.

The bill accomplishes this critical goal by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information contained in the financial disclosure reports filed by these individuals pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978. Specifically, H.R. 3229 would extend this authority for 10 years, that is, until December 31, 2027.

I am an original cosponsor and strong supporter of this bill for several reasons.

To begin with, absent a further extension of this authority, the Judicial Conference's ability to redact sensitive personal information from the financial disclosure statements filed by judges and judicial employees would cease

and thereby create potentially serious security risks to these individuals.

Judges and judicial employees are often the subject of threats, harassment, and violence. Like probation officers, these individuals routinely interact with disgruntled litigants and convicted criminals who may hold grudges against them.

A resentful litigant seeking to take revenge for a judicial decision can learn of a federal judge's home address, his or her spouse's place of employment, or a child's school, among other types of sensitive information, by requesting a copy of the judge's financial disclosure report.

During 2016, for instance, a federal judge was shot in front of his home, a murder-for-hire plot against a federal judge was uncovered, and threatening letters were sent to other judges.

Fortunately, section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act grants the Judicial Conference the authority to redact certain limited information from financial disclosure reports when the release of such information could endanger a judge, a judicial employee, or a member of their family.

Congress has extended this redaction authority on 5 previous occasions, most recently on January 3, 2012.

Another reason why I support H.R. 3229 is that the Judicial Conference has exercised its redaction authority with demonstrated restraint.

As required by the Ethics in Government Act, the Conference has promulgated regulations requiring a clear nexus between a security risk and the need to redact sensitive information.

In addition, the Act requires the Judicial Conference to report annually to Congress on the number and nature of redactions as well as the reasons for them.

Based on a review of these reports, it is clear that only a small percentage of the financial disclosure reports filed contain an approved redaction of some information in the report.

For example, less than 3 percent of financial reports contained an approved redaction of some information over the past 5 years.

Finally, the need to extend this redaction authority—which will expire in just over 3 months—is a time-sensitive security matter that requires prompt consideration of H.R. 3229.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3229, which will simply extend the Judicial Conference's current redaction authority for an additional 10 years.

In closing, I want to commend Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES for his leadership on this important legislation. We share his commitment to protecting the security of those public servants who serve in the federal judicial branch.

Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3229, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 538;

Adoption of House Resolution 538, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 311.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3823, DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 538) providing for 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, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 187, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—223

Abraham	Budd	DeSantis
Aderholt	Burgess	DesJarlais
Allen	Byrne	Diaz-Balart
Amash	Calvert	Donovan
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Duffy
Arrington	Carter (TX)	Duncan (SC)
Babin	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Bacon	Cheney	Dunn
Banks (IN)	Coffman	Emmer
Barletta	Cole	Estes (KS)
Barr	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Barton	Collins (NY)	Faso
Bergman	Comer	Ferguson
Biggs	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Flores
Black	Costello (PA)	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Cramer	Fox
Blum	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Bost	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Gaetz
Brat	Davidson	Gallagher
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Garrett
Buchanan	Denham	Gianforte
Buck	Dent	Gibbs

Gohmert	Lucas	Rothfus
Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer
Gosar	MacArthur	Royce (CA)
Gowdy	Marchant	Russell
Graves (GA)	Marino	Rutherford
Graves (LA)	Marshall	Sanford
Graves (MO)	Massie	Schweikert
Griffith	Mast	Scott, Austin
Guthrie	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Handel	McCaul	Sessions
Harper	McClintock	Shimkus
Harris	McHenry	Shuster
Hartzer	McKinley	Simpson
Hensarling	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Hice, Jody B.	McSally	Smith (NJ)
Higgins (LA)	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Hill	Meehan	Smucker
Holding	Mitchell	Stefanik
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Stewart
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Stivers
Huizenga	Mullin	Taylor
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Tenney
Hunter	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Hurd	Noem	Thornberry
Issa	Norman	Tipton
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Trott
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Turner
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Upton
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Valadao
Jones	Paulsen	Wagner
Jordan	Pearce	Walberg
Joyce (OH)	Perry	Walden
Katko	Pittenger	Walker
Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi
Kelly (PA)	Poliquin	Weber (TX)
King (IA)	Posey	Webster (FL)
King (NY)	Ratcliffe	Wenstrup
Kinzinger	Reed	Westerman
Knight	Reichert	Williams
Kustoff (TN)	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Rice (SC)	Wittman
LaHood	Roby	Womack
LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Woodall
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Yoder
Lance	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)
Latta	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)
Lewis (MN)	Rokita	Zeldin
LoBiondo	Rooney, Thomas J.	
Loudermilk	Ross	
Love		

NAYS—187

Adams	Delaney	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	DeLauro	Kuster (NH)
Barragan	DelBene	Langevin
Bass	Demings	Larsen (WA)
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Larson (CT)
Bera	Deutch	Lawrence
Beyer	Dingell	Lawson (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Lee
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael F.	Levin
Blunt Rochester	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
Bonamici	Engel	Lieu, Ted
Boyle, Brendan F.	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Espallat	Loebsack
Brown (MD)	Esty (CT)	Lofgren
Brownley (CA)	Evans	Lowenthal
Bustos	Foster	Lowey
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham,
Capuano	Fudge	M.
Carbajal	Gabbard	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cárdenas	Gallego	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Maloney,
Cartwright	Gomez	Carolyn B.
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX)	Gottheimer	Matsui
Chu, Judy	Green, Al	McCollum
Ciциlline	Green, Gene	McEachin
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	McGovern
Clay	Hastings	McNerney
Cleaver	Heck	Meeks
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Cohen	Himes	Moore
Connolly	Hoyer	Moulton
Conyers	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Correa	Jayapal	Napolitano
Costa	Jeffries	Neal
Courtney	Kaptur	Nolan
Crist	Keating	Norcross
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Kennedy	O'Rourke
Cummings	Khanna	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kihuen	Panetta
Davis, Danny	Kilmer	Pascrell
DeFazio	Kind	Payne
DeGette		Pelosi
		Perlmutter

Peters Schiff
 Peterson Schneider
 Pingree Schrader
 Pocan Scott (VA)
 Polis Scott, David
 Price (NC) Serrano
 Quigley Sewell (AL)
 Raskin Shea-Porter
 Rice (NY) Sherrman
 Richmond Sinema
 Rosen Sires
 Roybal-Allard Slaughter
 Ruiz Smith (WA)
 Ruppertsberger Soto
 Ryan (OH) Speier
 Sánchez Suozzi
 Sarbanes Swalwell (CA)
 Schakowsky Takano

Thompson (CA) Griffith
 Thompson (MS) Grothman
 Titus Guthrie
 Tonko Handel
 Torres Harper
 Tsongas Harris
 Vargas Hartzler
 Veasey Hensarling
 Vela Herrera Beutler
 Velázquez Hice, Jody B.
 Visclosky Higgins (LA)
 Wasserman Hill
 Schultz Holding
 Waters, Maxine Hollingsworth
 Watson Coleman Hudson
 Welch Huiuzenga
 Wilson (FL) Wiltgren
 Yarmuth Hunter

Royce (CA) Mast
 Russell McCarthy
 Rutherford McCaul
 Sanford McClintock
 Schweikert McHenry
 Scott, Austin McKinley
 Sensenbrenner McMorris
 Sessions Rodgers
 Shimkus McSally
 Shuster Meadows
 Simpson Meehan
 Smith (MO) Mitchell
 Smith (NE) Moonen
 Smith (NJ) Mooney (WV)
 Smith (TX) Mullin
 Smucker Murphy (FL)
 Stefanik Murphy (PA)
 Stewart Newhouse
 Stivers Noem
 Suozzi Norman
 Taylor Nunes
 Tenney O'Halleran
 Thompson (PA) Olson
 Thornberry Palazzo
 Tipton Palmer
 Trott Paulsen
 Turner Pearce
 Upton Pittenger
 Valadao Poe (TX)
 Wagner Poliquin
 Walberg Posey
 Walden Ratcliffe
 Walker Reed
 Walters, Mimi Reichert
 Weber (TX) Renacci
 Webster (FL) Rice (SC)
 Wenstrup Roby
 Westerman Roe (TN)
 Williams Rogers (AL)
 Wilson (SC) Rogers (KY)
 Wittman Rohrabacher
 Womack Rokita
 Woodall Rooney, Thomas
 Yoder J.
 Yoho Roskam
 Young (AK) Ross
 Young (IA) Rothfus
 Zeldin Rouzer

Quigley Scott (VA)
 Raskin Scott, David
 Rice (NY) Serrano
 Richmond Sewell (AL)
 Rosen Shea-Porter
 Roybal-Allard Sherman
 Ruiz Sinema
 Ruppertsberger Sires
 Rush Slaughter
 Ryan (OH) Smith (WA)
 Sánchez Soto
 Sarbanes Speier
 Schakowsky Swalwell (CA)
 Schiff Takano
 Schneider Thompson (CA)
 Schrader Thompson (MS)

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (UT) Hanabusa
 Bridenstine Johnson, E. B.
 Brooks (IN) Johnson, Sam
 Crawford Lieu, Ted
 Ellison Long
 Granger Loudermilk
 Gutiérrez Messer

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1722

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against: Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 539.

RECOGNIZING THAT FOR 50 YEARS THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH EAST ASIAN NATIONS HAS WORKED TOWARD STABILITY, PROSPERITY, AND PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 311) recognizing that for 50 years the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has worked toward stability, prosperity, and peace in Southeast Asia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]
 YEAS—413

Abraham Barr
 Adams Barragán
 Aderholt Barton
 Aguilera Bass
 Allen Beatty
 Amash Bera
 Amodei Bergman
 Arrington Beyer
 Babin Biggs
 Bacon Bilirakis
 Banks (IN) Bishop (GA)
 Barletta Bishop (MI)

NOT VOTING—23

Bishop (UT) Hanabusa
 Bridenstine Johnson (GA)
 Brooks (IN) Johnson, E. B.
 Buechson Johnson, Sam
 Clark (MA) Long
 Granger Walorski
 Grothman Messer
 Gutiérrez Rooney, Francis
 Ros-Lehtinen

Jenkins (KS) Roskam
 Jenkins (WV) Rush
 Johnson (LA) Scalise
 Johnson (OH) Tiberi
 Joyce (OH) Walorski
 Kelly (MS) Katko
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (MS)
 King (IA) King (IA)
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Kinzinger Knight
 Kustoff (TN) Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador LaHood
 LaMalfa LaMalfa
 Lamborn Lamborn
 Lance Lance
 Latta Latta
 Lewis (MN) Lewis (MN)
 LoBiondo LoBiondo
 Love Love
 Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer
 MacArthur MacArthur
 Marchant Marchant
 Marino Marino
 Marshall Marshall

Stewart Stivers
 Taylor Suozzi
 Tenney Taylor
 Thompson (PA) Tenney
 Thornberry Thompson (PA)
 Tipton Tipton
 Trott Trott
 Turner Turner
 Upton Upton
 Valadao Valadao
 Wagner Wagner
 Walberg Walberg
 Walden Walden
 Walker Walker
 Walters, Mimi Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup Wenstrup
 Westerman Westerman
 Williams Williams
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Wittman Wittman
 Womack Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Yoder Yoder
 Yoho Yoho
 Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Young (IA) Young (IA)
 Zeldin Zeldin

NAYS—190

Adams DelBene
 Aguilar Demings
 Amash DeSaunier
 Barragán Deutch
 Bass Dingell
 Beatty Doggett
 Bera Doyle, Michael
 Beyer F.
 Biggs Engel
 Bishop (GA) Eshoo
 Blumenauer Espallat
 Blunt Rochester Esty (CT)
 Bonamici Evans
 Boyle, Brendan Foster
 F. Frankel (FL)
 Brady (PA) Fudge
 Brown (MD) Gabbard
 Brownley (CA) Gallego
 Bustos Garamendi
 Butterfield Gomez
 Capuano Gonzalez (TX)
 Carballo Gosar
 Cárdenas Gottheimer
 Carson (IN) Green, Al
 Cartwright Green, Gene
 Castor (FL) Grijalva
 Castro (TX) Hastings
 Chu, Judy Heck
 Cicilline Higgins (NY)
 Clark (MA) Himes
 Clarke (NY) Hoyer
 Clay Huffman
 Cleaver Jackson Lee
 Clyburn Jayapal
 Cohen Jeffries
 Connolly Johnson (GA)
 Conyers Jones
 Cooper Jordan
 Correa Kaptur
 Courtney Keating
 Crowley Kelly (IL)
 Cuellar Kennedy
 Cummings Khanna
 Davis (CA) Kihuen
 Davis, Danny Kildee
 DeFazio Kilmer
 DeGette Kind
 Delaney Krishnamoorthi
 DeLauro Kuster (NH)

Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)

□ 1713

Messrs. COSTA and SHERMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

Stated for: Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 538.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 538.

Stated against: Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 538.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 190, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]
 YEAS—223

Abraham Calvert
 Aderholt Carter (GA)
 Allen Carter (TX)
 Amodei Chabot
 Arrington Cheney
 Babin Coffman
 Bacon Cole
 Banks (IN) Collins (GA)
 Barletta Collins (NY)
 Barr Comer
 Barton Comstock
 Bergman Conaway
 Bilirakis Cook
 Bishop (MI) Costa
 Black Costello (PA)
 Blackburn Cramer
 Blum Crist
 Bost Culberson
 Brady (TX) Curbelo (FL)
 Brat Davidson
 Brooks (AL) Davis, Rodney
 Buchanan Denham
 Buck Dent
 Buechson DeSantis
 Budd DesJarlais
 Burgess Diaz-Balart
 Byrne Donovan

Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes (KS)
 Farenthold
 Faso
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)

McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)

Brooks (AL) Freilinghuysen
 Brown (MD) Fudge
 Brownley (CA) Gabbard
 Buchanan Gaetz
 Buck Gallagher
 Bucshon Gallego
 Budd Garamendi
 Burgess Garrett
 Bustos Gianforte
 Butterfield Gibbs
 Byrne Gohmert
 Calvert Gomez
 Capuano Gonzalez (TX)
 Carbajal Goodlatte
 Cárdenas Gosar
 Carson (IN) Gottheimer
 Carter (GA) Gowdy
 Carter (TX) Graves (GA)
 Cartwright Graves (LA)
 Castor (FL) Graves (MO)
 Castro (TX) Green, Al
 Chabot Green, Gene
 Cheney Griffith
 Chu, Judy Grijalva
 Cicilline Grothman
 Clark (MA) Guthrie
 Clarke (NY) Handel
 Clay Harper
 Cleaver Harris
 Clyburn Hartzler
 Coffman Hastings
 Cohen Heck
 Cole Hensarling
 Collins (GA) Herrera Beutler
 Collins (NY) Hice, Jody B.
 Comer Higgins (LA)
 Comstock Higgins (NY)
 Conaway Hill
 Connolly Himes
 Conyers Holding
 Cook Hollingsworth
 Cooper Huffman
 Correa Huizenga
 Costa Hultgren
 Costello (PA) Hunter
 Courtney Hurd
 Cramer Issa
 Crawford Jackson Lee
 Crist Jayapal
 Crowley Jeffries
 Cuellar Jenkins (KS)
 Culberson Jenkins (WV)
 Cummings Johnson (GA)
 Curbelo (FL) Johnson (LA)
 Davidson Johnson (OH)
 Davis (CA) Jones
 Davis, Danny Jordan
 Davis, Rodney Joyce (OH)
 DeFazio Kaptur
 DeGette Katko
 Delaney Kelly (IL)
 DeLauro Kelly (MS)
 DelBene Kelly (PA)
 Demings Kennedy
 Denham Khanna
 Dent Kihuen
 DeSantis Kildee
 DeSaulnier Kilmer
 DesJarlais Kind
 Deutch King (IA)
 Diaz-Balart King (NY)
 Dingell Kinzinger
 Doggett Knight
 Donovan Krishnamoorthi
 Doyle, Michael F. Kuster (NH)
 Duffy Kustoff (TN)
 Duncan (SC) Labrador
 Duncan (TN) LaHood
 Dunn LaMalfa
 Ellison Lamborn
 Emmer Lance
 Engel Langevin
 Eshoo Larsen (WA)
 Espaillat Larson (CT)
 Estes (KS) Latta
 Esty (CT) Lawrence
 Evans Lawson (FL)
 Farenthold Lee
 Faso Levin
 Ferguson Lewis (GA)
 Fitzpatrick Lewis (MN)
 Fleischmann Lieu, Ted
 Flores Lipinski
 Fortenberry LoBiondo
 Foster Loebach
 Foxx Loufren
 Frankel (FL) Loudermilk
 Franks (AZ) Love
 Lowenthal

Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Norman
 Nunes
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Rosen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce (CA)
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger

Rush
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Bishop (UT)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (IN)
 Granger
 Gutiérrez
 Hanabusa
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Keating
 Long
 Marchant
 Messer
 Rooney, Francis
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Scalise
 Tiberi
 Walorski
 Walz

NOT VOTING—20
 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1729
 So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A bill reaffirming the 40 years of relations between the United States and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the shared pursuit of economic growth and regional security in Southeast Asia."
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
 Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 540 (motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 311), I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on this vote.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 540.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
 Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Wednesday, September 27, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall votes 538 and 539, and I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall vote 540.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
 Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on 9/27/17 because I was in Indiana with the President of the United States on an official visit. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 538, "Yea" on rollcall No. 539, and "Yea" on rollcall No. 540.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
 Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on 9/27/17 because I was in

Indiana with the President of the United States on an official visit. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 538, "Yea" on rollcall No. 539, and "Yea" on rollcall No. 540.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 538, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, the amendment printed in House Report 115-333 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3823
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- TITLE I—FEDERAL AVIATION PROGRAMS
- Sec. 101. Extension of airport improvement program.
- Sec. 102. Extension of expiring authorities.
- Sec. 103. Federal Aviation Administration operations.
- Sec. 104. Small community air service.
- Sec. 105. Air navigation facilities and equipment.
- Sec. 106. Research, engineering, and development.
- Sec. 107. Funding for aviation programs.
- TITLE II—AVIATION REVENUE PROVISIONS
- Sec. 201. Expenditure authority from Airport and Airway Trust Fund.
- Sec. 202. Extension of taxes funding Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

TITLE III—EXPIRING HEALTH PROVISIONS

- Sec. 301. Extension of certain public health programs.
- Sec. 302. Extension of Medicare Patient IVIG Access Demonstration Project.

Sec. 303. Funds from the Medicare Improvement Fund.

TITLE IV—DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE MARKET

Sec. 401. Private flood insurance.

TITLE V—TAX RELIEF FOR HURRICANES HARVEY, IRMA, AND MARIA

Sec. 501. Definitions.

Sec. 502. Special disaster-related rules for use of retirement funds.

Sec. 503. Disaster-related employment relief.

Sec. 504. Additional disaster-related tax relief provisions.

Sec. 505. Budgetary effects.

TITLE I—FEDERAL AVIATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “and \$1,670,410,959 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriations Acts, sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2018, and shall remain available until expended.

(3) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—For purposes of calculating funding apportionments and meeting other requirements under sections 47114, 47115, 47116, and 47117 of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(A) first calculate such funding apportionments on an annualized basis as if the total amount available under section 48103 of such title for fiscal year 2018 were \$3,350,000,000; and

(B) then reduce by 50 percent—

(i) all funding apportionments calculated under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) amounts available pursuant to sections 47117(b) and 47117(f)(2) of such title.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “September 30, 2017,” and inserting “March 31, 2018.”

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 47107(r)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

(b) Section 47114(c)(1)(F) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subparagraph heading by striking “FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017”; and

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking “for fiscal year 2017 an amount” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018 an amount”.

(c) Section 47115(j) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

(d) Section 47124(b)(3)(E) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and not more than \$5,160,822 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018,” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

(e) Section 47141(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(f) Section 186(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018,” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

(g) Section 409(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 41731 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(h) Section 140(c)(1) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (126 Stat. 28) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2018”.

(i) Section 411(h) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 42301 prec. note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(j) Section 822(k) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 47141 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(k) Section 2306(b) of the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 641) is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS.

Section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) \$4,999,191,956 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

SEC. 104. SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE.

(a) ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE AUTHORIZATION.—Section 41742(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$175,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017” and inserting “\$175,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and \$74,794,521 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”

(b) AIRPORTS NOT RECEIVING SUFFICIENT SERVICE.—Section 41743(e)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and \$4,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018,” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

SEC. 105. AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 48101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) \$1,423,589,041 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”

SEC. 106. RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) \$88,008,219 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017 and ending on March 31, 2018.”

SEC. 107. FUNDING FOR AVIATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 48114 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking “2017” and inserting “2018”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2) by striking “2017” and inserting “2018”.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.—The budget authority authorized in this title, including the amendments made by this title, shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(2) of section 48114 of title 49, United

States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.

TITLE II—AVIATION REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY FROM AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9502(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “or the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9502(e)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Section 4081(d)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Section 4261(k)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(2) PROPERTY.—Section 4271(d)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(c) FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP PROGRAMS.—

(1) TREATMENT AS NONCOMMERCIAL AVIATION.—Section 4083(b) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM TICKET TAXES.—Section 4261(j) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

TITLE III—EXPIRING HEALTH PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO TEACHING HEALTH CENTERS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—Section 340H(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and \$60,000,000” and inserting “, \$60,000,000”; and

(2) by inserting “, and \$15,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018” before the period at the end.

(b) EXTENSION OF SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM FOR INDIANS.—Section 330C(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-3(c)(2)) is amended—

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

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(D) \$37,500,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018.”

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Part D of the Public Health Service Act is amended by redesignating—

(1) the second subpart XI (42 U.S.C. 256i; relating to a community-based collaborative care network program) as subpart XII; and

(2) the second section 340H (42 U.S.C. 256i) as section 340I.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF MEDICARE PATIENT IVIG ACCESS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 101(b) of the Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 1395l note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting after “for a period of 3 years” the following: “and, subject to the availability of funds under subsection (g)—

“(A) if the date of enactment of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 is on or before September 30, 2017, for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2020; and

“(B) if the date of enactment of such Act is after September 30, 2017, for the period beginning on the date of enactment of such Act and ending on December 31, 2020”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new sentences: “Subject to the preceding sentence, a Medicare beneficiary enrolled in the demonstration project on September 30, 2017, shall be automatically enrolled during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 and ending on December 31, 2020, without submission of another application.”.

SEC. 303. FUNDS FROM THE MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “during and after fiscal year 2021, \$270,000,000” and inserting “during and after fiscal year 2021, \$220,000,000”.

TITLE IV—DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE MARKET

SEC. 401. PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE.

(a) FLOOD INSURANCE MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) AMOUNT AND TERM OF COVERAGE.—Section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) is amended by striking “Sec. 102. (a)” and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 102. (a) AMOUNT AND TERM OF COVERAGE.—After the expiration of sixty days following the date of the enactment of this Act, no Federal officer or agency shall approve any financial assistance for acquisition or construction purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which the sale of flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, unless the building or mobile home and any personal property to which such financial assistance relates is covered by flood insurance: *Provided*, That the amount of flood insurance (1) in the case of Federal flood insurance, is at least equal to the development or project cost of the building, mobile home, or personal property (less estimated land cost), the outstanding principal balance of the loan, or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less; or (2) in the case of private flood insurance, is at least equal to the development or project cost of the building, mobile home, or personal property (less estimated land cost), the outstanding principal balance of the loan, or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less: *Provided further*, That if the financial assistance provided is in the form of a loan or an insurance or guaranty of a loan, the amount of flood insurance required need not exceed the outstanding principal balance of the loan and need not be required beyond the term of the loan. The requirement of maintaining flood insurance shall apply during the life of the property, regardless of transfer of ownership of such property.”.

(2) REQUIREMENT FOR MORTGAGE LOANS.—Subsection (b) of section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (7);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(C) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through the end of paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(b) REQUIREMENT FOR MORTGAGE LOANS.—

“(1) REGULATED LENDING INSTITUTIONS.—Each Federal entity for lending regulation (after consultation and coordination with the Financial Institutions Examination Council established under the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1974) shall by regulation direct regulated lending institutions not to make, increase, extend, or renew any loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in an area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, unless the building or mobile home and any personal property securing such loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance: *Provided*, That the amount of flood insurance (A) in the case of Federal flood insurance, is at least equal to the outstanding principal balance of the loan or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less; or (B) in the case of private flood insurance, is at least equal to the outstanding principal balance of the loan or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less.

“(2) FEDERAL AGENCY LENDERS AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE AND GUARANTEE AGENCIES.—

“(A) FEDERAL AGENCY LENDERS.—A Federal agency lender may not make, increase, extend, or renew any loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in an area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, unless the building or mobile home and any personal property securing such loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in accordance with paragraph (1). Each Federal agency lender may issue any regulations necessary to carry out this paragraph. Such regulations shall be consistent with and substantially identical to the regulations issued under paragraph (1).

“(B) OTHER FEDERAL MORTGAGE ENTITIES.—

“(i) COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Each covered Federal mortgage entity shall implement procedures reasonably designed to ensure that, for any loan that—

“(I) is secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located in an area that has been identified, at the time of the origination of the loan or at any time during the term of the loan, by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance is available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and

“(II) is made, insured, held, or guaranteed by such entity, or backs or on which is based any trust certificate or other security for which such entity guarantees the timely payment of principal and interest,

the building or mobile home and any personal property securing the loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in the amount provided in paragraph (1).

“(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘covered Federal mortgage entity’ means—

“(I) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, with respect to mortgages insured under the National Housing Act;

“(II) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to loans made, insured, or guaranteed under title V of the Housing Act of 1949; and

“(III) the Government National Mortgage Association.

“(C) REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT FLOOD INSURANCE.—Each Federal agency lender and each covered Federal mortgage entity shall accept flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under subparagraph (A) or (B), respectively, if the flood insurance coverage meets the requirements for coverage under such subparagraph and the requirements relating to financial strength issued pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(3) GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ENTERPRISES FOR HOUSING.—The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall implement procedures reasonably designed to ensure that, for any loan that is—

“(A) secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located in an area that has been identified, at the time of the origination of the loan or at any time during the term of the loan, by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance is available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and

“(B) purchased or guaranteed by such entity,

the building or mobile home and any personal property securing the loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in the amount provided in paragraph (1). The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall accept flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under paragraph (1) if the flood insurance coverage provided meets the requirements for coverage under that paragraph and the requirements relating to financial strength issued pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(4) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING FINANCIAL STRENGTH.—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, in consultation with the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Government National Mortgage Association, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall develop and implement requirements relating to the financial strength of private insurance companies from which such entities and agencies will accept private flood insurance, provided that such requirements shall not affect or conflict with any State law, regulation, or procedure concerning the regulation of the business of insurance.

“(5) APPLICABILITY.—

“(A) EXISTING COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1) shall apply on the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994.

“(B) NEW COVERAGE.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) shall apply only with respect to any loan made, increased, extended, or renewed after the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any loan made, increased, extended, or renewed by any lender supervised by the Farm Credit Administration only after the expiration of the period under this subparagraph.

“(C) CONTINUED EFFECT OF REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the regulations to carry out paragraph (1), as in effect immediately before the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994, shall continue to apply until the regulations issued to carry out paragraph (1) as amended by section 522(a) of such Act take effect.

“(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as otherwise specified, any reference to flood insurance in this section shall be considered

to include Federal flood insurance and private flood insurance. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede or limit the authority of a Federal entity for lending regulation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, a Federal agency lender, a covered Federal mortgage entity (as such term is defined in paragraph (2)(B)(ii)), the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation to establish requirements relating to the financial strength of private insurance companies from which the entity or agency will accept private flood insurance, provided that such requirements shall not affect or conflict with any State law, regulation, or procedure concerning the regulation of the business of insurance.”; and

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

“(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(A) FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term ‘flood insurance’ means—

“(i) Federal flood insurance; and

“(ii) private flood insurance.

“(B) FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term ‘Federal flood insurance’ means an insurance policy made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

“(C) PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term ‘private flood insurance’ means an insurance policy that—

“(i) is issued by an insurance company that is—

“(I) licensed, admitted, or otherwise approved to engage in the business of insurance in the State in which the insured building is located, by the insurance regulator of that State; or

“(II) eligible as a nonadmitted insurer to provide insurance in the home State of the insured, in accordance with sections 521 through 527 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8201 through 8206);

“(ii) is issued by an insurance company that is not otherwise disapproved as a surplus lines insurer by the insurance regulator of the State in which the property to be insured is located; and

“(iii) provides flood insurance coverage that complies with the laws and regulations of that State.

“(D) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.”.

(b) EFFECT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE ON CONTINUOUS COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) EFFECT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE ON CONTINUOUS COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of applying any statutory, regulatory, or administrative continuous coverage requirement, including under section 1307(g)(1), the Administrator shall consider any period during which a property was continuously covered by private flood insurance (as defined in section 102(b)(8) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)(8))) to be a period of continuous coverage.”.

TITLE V—TAX RELIEF FOR HURRICANES HARVEY, IRMA, AND MARIA

SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

(a) HURRICANE HARVEY DISASTER ZONE AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this title—

(1) HURRICANE HARVEY DISASTER ZONE.—The term “Hurricane Harvey disaster zone” means that portion of the Hurricane Harvey disaster area determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government

under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(2) HURRICANE HARVEY DISASTER AREA.—The term “Hurricane Harvey disaster area” means an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President before September 21, 2017, under section 401 of such Act by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(b) HURRICANE IRMA DISASTER ZONE AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this title—

(1) HURRICANE IRMA DISASTER ZONE.—The term “Hurricane Irma disaster zone” means that portion of the Hurricane Irma disaster area determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under such Act by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(2) HURRICANE IRMA DISASTER AREA.—The term “Hurricane Irma disaster area” means an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President before September 21, 2017, under section 401 of such Act by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(c) HURRICANE MARIA DISASTER ZONE AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this title—

(1) HURRICANE MARIA DISASTER ZONE.—The term “Hurricane Maria disaster zone” means that portion of the Hurricane Maria disaster area determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under such Act by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(2) HURRICANE MARIA DISASTER AREA.—The term “Hurricane Maria disaster area” means an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President before September 21, 2017, under section 401 of such Act by reason of Hurricane Maria.

SEC. 502. SPECIAL DISASTER-RELATED RULES FOR USE OF RETIREMENT FUNDS.

(a) TAX-FAVORED WITHDRAWALS FROM RETIREMENT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 72(t) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply to any qualified hurricane distribution.

(2) AGGREGATE DOLLAR LIMITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the aggregate amount of distributions received by an individual which may be treated as qualified hurricane distributions for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess (if any) of—

(i) \$100,000, over

(ii) the aggregate amounts treated as qualified hurricane distributions received by such individual for all prior taxable years.

(B) TREATMENT OF PLAN DISTRIBUTIONS.—If a distribution to an individual would (without regard to subparagraph (A)) be a qualified hurricane distribution, a plan shall not be treated as violating any requirement of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 merely because the plan treats such distribution as a qualified hurricane distribution, unless the aggregate amount of such distributions from all plans maintained by the employer (and any member of any controlled group which includes the employer) to such individual exceeds \$100,000.

(C) CONTROLLED GROUP.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term “controlled group” means any group treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED MAY BE REPAID.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who receives a qualified hurricane distribution may, at any time during the 3-year period beginning on the day after the date on which such distribution was received, make one or more contributions in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount of such distribution to an eligible retirement plan of which such individual is a beneficiary and to which a rollover contribution of such distribution could be made under section 402(c), 403(a)(4),

403(b)(8), 408(d)(3), or 457(e)(16), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as the case may be.

(B) TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLANS OTHER THAN IRAS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, if a contribution is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to a qualified hurricane distribution from an eligible retirement plan other than an individual retirement plan, then the taxpayer shall, to the extent of the amount of the contribution, be treated as having received the qualified hurricane distribution in an eligible rollover distribution (as defined in section 402(c)(4) of such Code) and as having transferred the amount to the eligible retirement plan in a direct trustee to trustee transfer within 60 days of the distribution.

(C) TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTIONS FROM IRAS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, if a contribution is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to a qualified hurricane distribution from an individual retirement plan (as defined by section 7701(a)(37) of such Code), then, to the extent of the amount of the contribution, the qualified hurricane distribution shall be treated as a distribution described in section 408(d)(3) of such Code and as having been transferred to the eligible retirement plan in a direct trustee to trustee transfer within 60 days of the distribution.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) QUALIFIED HURRICANE DISTRIBUTION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term “qualified hurricane distribution” means—

(i) any distribution from an eligible retirement plan made on or after August 23, 2017, and before January 1, 2019, to an individual whose principal place of abode on August 23, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Harvey,

(ii) any distribution (which is not described in clause (i)) from an eligible retirement plan made on or after September 4, 2017, and before January 1, 2019, to an individual whose principal place of abode on September 4, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Irma disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Irma, and

(iii) any distribution (which is not described in clause (i) or (ii)) from an eligible retirement plan made on or after September 16, 2017, and before January 1, 2019, to an individual whose principal place of abode on September 16, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Maria disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(B) ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLAN.—The term “eligible retirement plan” shall have the meaning given such term by section 402(c)(8)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(5) INCOME INCLUSION SPREAD OVER 3-YEAR PERIOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any qualified hurricane distribution, unless the taxpayer elects not to have this paragraph apply for any taxable year, any amount required to be included in gross income for such taxable year shall be so included ratably over the 3-taxable-year period beginning with such taxable year.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (E) of section 408A(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply.

(6) SPECIAL RULES.—

(A) EXEMPTION OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM TRUSTEE TO TRUSTEE TRANSFER AND WITHHOLDING RULES.—For purposes of sections 401(a)(31), 402(f), and 3405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, qualified hurricane distributions shall not be treated as eligible rollover distributions.

(B) QUALIFIED HURRICANE DISTRIBUTIONS TREATED AS MEETING PLAN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a qualified hurricane distribution shall be treated as meeting the requirements of sections 401(k)(2)(B)(i), 403(b)(7)(A)(ii), 403(b)(11), and 457(d)(1)(A) of such Code.

(b) RECONTRIBUTIONS OF WITHDRAWALS FOR HOME PURCHASES.—

(1) RECONTRIBUTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who received a qualified distribution may, during the period beginning on August 23, 2017, and ending on February 28, 2018, make one or more contributions in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount of such qualified distribution to an eligible retirement plan (as defined in section 402(c)(8)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of which such individual is a beneficiary and to which a rollover contribution of such distribution could be made under section 402(c), 403(a)(4), 403(b)(8), or 408(d)(3), of such Code, as the case may be.

(B) TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS.—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (a)(3) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(2) QUALIFIED DISTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “qualified distribution” means any distribution—

(A) described in section 401(k)(2)(B)(i)(IV), 403(b)(7)(A)(ii) (but only to the extent such distribution relates to financial hardship), 403(b)(11)(B), or 72(t)(2)(F), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,

(B) received after February 28, 2017, and before September 21, 2017, and

(C) which was to be used to purchase or construct a principal residence in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area, the Hurricane Irma disaster area, or the Hurricane Maria disaster area, but which was not so purchased or constructed on account of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, or Hurricane Maria.

(c) LOANS FROM QUALIFIED PLANS.—

(1) INCREASE IN LIMIT ON LOANS NOT TREATED AS DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of any loan from a qualified employer plan (as defined under section 72(p)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to a qualified individual made during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2018—

(A) clause (i) of section 72(p)(2)(A) of such Code shall be applied by substituting “\$100,000” for “\$50,000”, and

(B) clause (ii) of such section shall be applied by substituting “the present value of the nonforfeitable accrued benefit of the employee under the plan” for “one-half of the present value of the nonforfeitable accrued benefit of the employee under the plan”.

(2) DELAY OF REPAYMENT.—In the case of a qualified individual with an outstanding loan on or after the qualified beginning date from a qualified employer plan (as defined in section 72(p)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)—

(A) if the due date pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 72(p)(2) of such Code for any repayment with respect to such loan occurs during the period beginning on the qualified beginning date and ending on December 31, 2018, such due date shall be delayed for 1 year,

(B) any subsequent repayments with respect to any such loan shall be appropriately adjusted to reflect the delay in the due date under paragraph (1) and any interest accruing during such delay, and

(C) in determining the 5-year period and the term of a loan under subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 72(p)(2) of such Code, the period described in subparagraph (A) shall be disregarded.

(3) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “qualified individual” means any qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, any qualified Hurricane Irma individual, and any qualified Hurricane Maria individual.

(B) QUALIFIED HURRICANE HARVEY INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified Hurricane Harvey individual” means an individual whose principal place of abode on August 23, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(C) QUALIFIED HURRICANE IRMA INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified Hurricane Irma individual” means an individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual) whose principal place of abode on September 4, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Irma disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(D) QUALIFIED HURRICANE MARIA INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified Hurricane Maria individual” means an individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual or a qualified Hurricane Irma individual) whose principal place of abode on September 16, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Maria disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(4) QUALIFIED BEGINNING DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the qualified beginning date is—

(A) in the case of any qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, August 23, 2017,

(B) in the case of any qualified Hurricane Irma individual, September 4, 2017, and

(C) in the case of any qualified Hurricane Maria individual, September 16, 2017.

(d) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If this subsection applies to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract, such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in paragraph (2)(B)(i).

(2) AMENDMENTS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(i) pursuant to any provision of this section, or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary or the Secretary of Labor under any provision of this section, and

(ii) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2019, or such later date as the Secretary may prescribe.

In the case of a governmental plan (as defined in section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), clause (ii) shall be applied by substituting the date which is 2 years after the date otherwise applied under clause (ii).

(B) CONDITIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless—

(i) during the period—

(I) beginning on the date that this section or the regulation described in subparagraph (A)(i) takes effect (or in the case of a plan or contract amendment not required by this section or such regulation, the effective date specified by the plan), and

(II) ending on the date described in subparagraph (A)(ii) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted), the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and

(ii) such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

SEC. 503. DISASTER-RELATED EMPLOYMENT RELIEF.

(a) EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE HARVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of an eligible employer, the Hurricane Harvey employee retention credit shall be treated as a credit listed in subsection (b) of such section. For purposes of this subsection, the Hurricane Harvey employee retention credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent of the qualified wages with respect to each eligible employee of such employer for such taxable year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of qualified wages which may be taken into account with respect to any individual shall not exceed \$6,000.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—The term “eligible employer” means any employer—

(i) which conducted an active trade or business on August 23, 2017, in the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone, and

(ii) with respect to whom the trade or business described in clause (i) is inoperable on any day after August 23, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, as a result of damage sustained by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(B) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term “eligible employee” means with respect to an eligible employer an employee whose principal place of employment on August 23, 2017, with such eligible employer was in the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone.

(C) QUALIFIED WAGES.—The term “qualified wages” means wages (as defined in section 51(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but without regard to section 3306(b)(2)(B) of such Code) paid or incurred by an eligible employer with respect to an eligible employee on any day after August 23, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, which occurs during the period—

(i) beginning on the date on which the trade or business described in subparagraph (A) first became inoperable at the principal place of employment of the employee immediately before Hurricane Harvey, and

(ii) ending on the date on which such trade or business has resumed significant operations at such principal place of employment.

Such term shall include wages paid without regard to whether the employee performs no services, performs services at a different place of employment than such principal place of employment, or performs services at such principal place of employment before significant operations have resumed.

(3) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—For purposes of this subsection, rules similar to the rules of sections 51(i)(1) and 52, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall apply.

(4) EMPLOYEE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.—An employee shall not be treated as an eligible employee for purposes of this subsection for any period with respect to any employer if such employer is allowed a credit under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to such employee for such period.

(b) EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE IRMA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of an eligible employer, the Hurricane Irma employee retention credit shall be treated as a credit listed in subsection (b) of such section. For purposes of this subsection, the Hurricane Irma employee retention credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent of the qualified wages with respect to each eligible employee of such employer for such taxable year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of qualified

wages which may be taken into account with respect to any individual shall not exceed \$6,000.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—The term “eligible employer” means any employer—

(i) which conducted an active trade or business on September 4, 2017, in the Hurricane Irma disaster zone, and

(ii) with respect to whom the trade or business described in clause (i) is inoperable on any day after September 4, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, as a result of damage sustained by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(B) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term “eligible employee” means with respect to an eligible employer an employee whose principal place of employment on September 4, 2017, with such eligible employer was in the Hurricane Irma disaster zone.

(C) QUALIFIED WAGES.—The term “qualified wages” means wages (as defined in section 51(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but without regard to section 3306(b)(2)(B) of such Code) paid or incurred by an eligible employer with respect to an eligible employee on any day after September 4, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, which occurs during the period—

(i) beginning on the date on which the trade or business described in subparagraph (A) first became inoperable at the principal place of employment of the employee immediately before Hurricane Irma, and

(ii) ending on the date on which such trade or business has resumed significant operations at such principal place of employment.

Such term shall include wages paid without regard to whether the employee performs no services, performs services at a different place of employment, or performs services at such principal place of employment before significant operations have resumed.

(3) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—For purposes of this subsection, rules similar to the rules of sections 51(i)(1) and 52, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall apply.

(4) EMPLOYEE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.—An employee shall not be treated as an eligible employee for purposes of this subsection for any period with respect to any employer if such employer is allowed a credit under subsection (a), or section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, with respect to such employee for such period.

(C) EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE MARIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of an eligible employer, the Hurricane Maria employee retention credit shall be treated as a credit listed in subsection (b) of such section. For purposes of this subsection, the Hurricane Maria employee retention credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent of the qualified wages with respect to each eligible employee of such employer for such taxable year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of qualified wages which may be taken into account with respect to any individual shall not exceed \$6,000.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—The term “eligible employer” means any employer—

(i) which conducted an active trade or business on September 16, 2017, in the Hurricane Maria disaster zone, and

(ii) with respect to whom the trade or business described in clause (i) is inoperable on any day after September 16, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, as a result of damage sustained by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(B) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term “eligible employee” means with respect to an eligible employer an employee whose principal place of employment on September 16, 2017, with such eligible employer was in the Hurricane Maria disaster zone.

(C) QUALIFIED WAGES.—The term “qualified wages” means wages (as defined in section 51(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but without regard to section 3306(b)(2)(B) of such Code) paid or incurred by an eligible employer with respect to an eligible employee on any day after September 16, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, which occurs during the period—

(i) beginning on the date on which the trade or business described in subparagraph (A) first became inoperable at the principal place of employment of the employee immediately before Hurricane Maria, and

(ii) ending on the date on which such trade or business has resumed significant operations at such principal place of employment.

Such term shall include wages paid without regard to whether the employee performs no services, performs services at a different place of employment, or performs services at such principal place of employment before significant operations have resumed.

(3) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—For purposes of this subsection, rules similar to the rules of sections 51(i)(1) and 52, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall apply.

(4) EMPLOYEE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.—An employee shall not be treated as an eligible employee for purposes of this subsection for any period with respect to any employer if such employer is allowed a credit under subsection (a) or (b), or section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, with respect to such employee for such period.

SEC. 504. ADDITIONAL DISASTER-RELATED TAX RELIEF PROVISIONS.

(a) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF LIMITATIONS ON CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), subsection (b) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply to qualified contributions and such contributions shall not be taken into account for purposes of applying subsections (b) and (d) of such section to other contributions.

(2) TREATMENT OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(A) INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an individual—

(i) LIMITATION.—Any qualified contribution shall be allowed only to the extent that the aggregate of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer’s contribution base (as defined in subparagraph (G) of section 170(b)(1) of such Code) over the amount of all other charitable contributions allowed under section 170(b)(1) of such Code.

(ii) CARRYOVER.—If the aggregate amount of qualified contributions made in the contribution year (within the meaning of section 170(d)(1) of such Code) exceeds the limitation of clause (i), such excess shall be added to the excess described in the portion of subparagraph (A) of such section which precedes clause (i) thereof for purposes of applying such section.

(B) CORPORATIONS.—In the case of a corporation—

(i) LIMITATION.—Any qualified contribution shall be allowed only to the extent that the aggregate of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer’s taxable income (as determined under paragraph (2) of section 170(b) of such Code) over the amount of all other charitable contributions allowed under such paragraph.

(ii) CARRYOVER.—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (A)(i) shall apply for purposes of this subparagraph.

(3) EXCEPTION TO OVERALL LIMITATION ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—So much of any deduction allowed under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as does not exceed the qualified contributions paid during the taxable year shall not be treated as an itemized deduction for purposes of section 68 of such Code.

(4) QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “qualified contribution” means any charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) if—

(i) such contribution—

(I) is paid during the period beginning on August 23, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017, in cash to an organization described in section 170(b)(1)(A) of such Code, and

(II) is made for relief efforts in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area, the Hurricane Irma disaster area, or the Hurricane Maria disaster area,

(ii) the taxpayer obtains from such organization contemporaneous written acknowledgment (within the meaning of section 170(f)(8) of such Code) that such contribution was used (or is to be used) for relief efforts described in clause (i)(II), and

(iii) the taxpayer has elected the application of this subsection with respect to such contribution.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Such term shall not include a contribution by a donor if the contribution is—

(i) to an organization described in section 509(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(ii) for the establishment of a new, or maintenance of an existing, donor advised fund (as defined in section 4966(d)(2) of such Code).

(C) APPLICATION OF ELECTION TO PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS.—In the case of a partnership or S corporation, the election under subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be made separately by each partner or shareholder.

(b) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED DISASTER-RELATED PERSONAL CASUALTY LOSSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an individual has a net disaster loss for any taxable year—

(A) the amount determined under section 165(h)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be equal to the sum of—

(i) such net disaster loss, and

(ii) so much of the excess referred to in the matter preceding clause (i) of section 165(h)(2)(A) of such Code (reduced by the amount in clause (i) of this subparagraph) as exceeds 10 percent of the adjusted gross income of the individual,

(B) section 165(h)(1) of such Code shall be applied by substituting “\$500” for “\$500 (\$100 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009)”.

(C) the standard deduction determined under section 63(c) of such Code shall be increased by the net disaster loss, and

(D) section 56(b)(1)(E) of such Code shall not apply to so much of the standard deduction as is attributable to the increase under subparagraph (C) of this paragraph.

(2) NET DISASTER LOSS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “net disaster loss” means the excess of qualified disaster-related personal casualty losses over personal casualty gains (as defined in section 165(h)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

(3) QUALIFIED DISASTER-RELATED PERSONAL CASUALTY LOSSES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “qualified disaster-related

personal casualty losses” means losses described in section 165(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(A) which arise in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area on or after August 23, 2017, and which are attributable to Hurricane Harvey,

(B) which arise in the Hurricane Irma disaster area on or after September 4, 2017, and which are attributable to Hurricane Irma, or

(C) which arise in the Hurricane Maria disaster area on or after September 16, 2017, and which are attributable to Hurricane Maria.

(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING EARNED INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified individual, if the earned income of the taxpayer for the taxable year which includes the applicable date is less than the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, the credits allowed under sections 24(d) and 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 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.

In the case of a resident of Puerto Rico determining the credit allowed under section 24(d)(1)(B)(ii) of such Code, the preceding sentence shall be applied by substituting “social security taxes (as defined in section 24(d)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)” for “earned income” each place it appears.

(2) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “qualified individual” means any qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, any qualified Hurricane Irma individual, and any qualified Hurricane Maria individual.

(B) QUALIFIED HURRICANE HARVEY INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified Hurricane Harvey individual” means any individual whose principal place of abode on August 23, 2017, was located—

(i) in the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone, or

(ii) in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area (but outside the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone) and such individual was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(C) QUALIFIED HURRICANE IRMA INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified Hurricane Irma individual” means any individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual) whose principal place of abode on September 4, 2017, was located—

(i) in the Hurricane Irma disaster zone, or

(ii) in the Hurricane Irma disaster area (but outside the Hurricane Irma disaster zone) and such individual was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(D) QUALIFIED HURRICANE MARIA INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified Hurricane Maria individual” means any individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual or a qualified Hurricane Irma individual) whose principal place of abode on September 16, 2017, was located—

(i) in the Hurricane Maria disaster zone, or

(ii) in the Hurricane Maria disaster area (but outside the Hurricane Maria disaster zone) and such individual was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(3) APPLICABLE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable date” means—

(A) in the case of a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, August 23, 2017,

(B) in the case of a qualified Hurricane Irma individual, September 4, 2017, and

(C) in the case of a qualified Hurricane Maria individual, September 16, 2017.

(4) EARNED INCOME.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “earned income” has the meaning given such term under section 32(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(5) SPECIAL RULES.—

(A) APPLICATION TO JOINT RETURNS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), in the case of a joint return for a taxable year which includes the applicable date—

(i) such paragraph shall apply if either spouse is a qualified individual, 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 sections 24(d) and 32, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) ERRORS TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL ERROR.—For purposes of section 6213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, an incorrect use on a return of earned income pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be treated as a mathematical or clerical error.

(D) NO EFFECT ON DETERMINATION OF GROSS INCOME, ETC.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied without regard to any substitution under paragraph (1).

(d) APPLICATION OF DISASTER-RELATED TAX RELIEF TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) PAYMENTS TO UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS AND PUERTO RICO.—

(A) UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the United States Virgin Islands amounts equal to the loss in revenues to the United States Virgin Islands by reason of the provisions of this title. Such amounts shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on information provided by the government of the United States Virgin Islands.

(B) PUERTO RICO.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Puerto Rico amounts estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury as being equal to the aggregate benefits that would have been provided to residents of Puerto Rico by reason of the provisions of this title if a mirror code tax system had been in effect in Puerto Rico. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to Puerto Rico unless Puerto Rico has a plan, which has been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, under which Puerto Rico will promptly distribute such payments to its residents.

(2) DEFINITION AND SPECIAL RULES.—

(A) MIRROR CODE TAX SYSTEM.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “mirror code tax system” means, with respect to any possession of the United States, the income tax system of such possession if the income tax liability of the residents of such possession under such system is determined by reference to the income tax laws of the United States as if such possession were the United States.

(B) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, the payments under this subsection shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(C) COORDINATION WITH UNITED STATES INCOME TAXES.—In the case of any person with respect to whom a tax benefit is taken into account with respect to the taxes imposed by any possession of the United States by reason of this title, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied with respect to such person without regard to the provisions of this title which provide such benefit.

SEC. 505. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—This title is designated as an emergency requirement

pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(b) DESIGNATION IN SENATE.—In the Senate, this title is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Irma’s direct hit to the lower and middle Keys was devastating to my district. Many lost everything to the storm’s 130-mile-an-hour winds and significant storm surge. Some lost their lives.

But fortunately, the Keys’ recovery is well underway, and the resiliency and generosity of Conchs and other south Florida residents have been on display before, during, and after the storm.

While facing the prospects of receiving the full force of the storm, Key West police and fire departments decided to remain on the ground, risking their personal safety. They wanted to be there for their neighbors when the storm had passed.

Navy personnel, under the leadership of Captain Bobby Baker, who sacrifice for our country every day, once again answered the call to serve and stayed behind to ensure they would be there to get the runways open and ready to receive aid. Coast Guard Captain Jeff Janszen also stayed to make sure the Port of Key West could open.

Two days after the storm had passed, I visited with both of these leaders. They were working tirelessly to stand up their bases and had not yet checked on the interior of their own homes.

Monroe County Sheriff Rick Ramsay rode out the storm at the Marathon shelter because he felt it was his responsibility to be there to protect his community. Officials from local municipalities from the city of Key West

to Ocean Reef have been working around the clock with their teams to get utilities up and running, roads cleared, and government offices operational.

I am grateful to our first responders and all the public officials and employees who have been working hard to serve the people of the Florida Keys.

I also want to thank my office's Florida Keys director, Nicole Rapanos, who has dedicated long hours to assist our constituents and our neighbors in the Keys so that they can get the resources they need. I am grateful for her dedication to her neighbors and proud to have her on my staff.

Community organizations are also playing an instrumental role in the Keys' recovery. Nonprofit groups like Star of the Sea Outreach, Rotary Club of Key West, and the Florida Keys Outreach Coalition, just to name a few, have been volunteering their time, coordinating donations, and serving direct relief to the community.

Private companies and small businesses have also stepped up to help. Robert Spottswood, whose family owns the Marriott Beachside, opened up the hotel to first responders, Navy personnel, and others who chose to ride out the storm.

Baby's Coffee, which was left with its own damage from the storm, was providing their entire stock to residents of Key West, along with hot meals and coffee.

Ikon Builders and UDT have brought supplies to the food banks and donation distribution centers. The Marathon EOC, which has been operating 24/7 and where approximately one-third of employees had lost their homes, these people continued working to help in recovery and rebuilding, and the list goes on.

On the individual level, people have gone above and beyond to show their true Conch spirit. They have shared their own supplies and taken time to go help neighbors. The outpouring of support from local heroes in the Florida Keys has been so extraordinary, I could be here all day telling the stories of thousands upon thousands of acts of kindness. This powerful sense of community and humanity is one of the many reasons I am proud to represent these local heroes.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the Keys' recovery is well underway. Tourism will be opening up again next week, nearly 3 weeks earlier than anticipated. I have no doubt continued recovery efforts will make the Florida Keys an even greater one-of-its-kind paradise. Americans from across the country and people from all over the world have come to love.

But the truth is, the Keys' tourism-based economy has been stalled, and perhaps the greatest devastation is the financial strain on individuals, families, and small entrepreneurs. Many of those facing hardship are themselves working to assist their fellow survivors, putting their personal interests

aside. This community is doing its part to help their own, Mr. Speaker.

Now it is time for Congress to do our part to help our fellow Americans in my district and in similar communities throughout my home State of Florida, in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

When we debated this bill on Monday, I told my colleagues about how the tax credit for wages would allow small business owners like Owen, a crab and lobster fisherman whose traps were destroyed in the storm, to claim a tax credit for 40 percent of employee wages, up to \$6,000 per employee, helping him get his team back to work as soon as possible.

This legislation would also allow up to 415,000 hurricane survivors in Miami-Dade and nearly 7,500 in Monroe County keep more of their paycheck by referring to earned income from the immediately preceding year for purposes of determining the earned income tax credit.

We are also making it easier for taxpayers to deduct more of the costs from the extensive property damage these storms left behind and allowing anyone struggling with initial recovery efforts to have immediate access to their retirement savings without penalty.

Lastly, this legislation will encourage more American businesses and individuals to continue generously supporting qualified hurricane relief organizations by lifting caps on charitable giving to these groups.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans in Texas, Florida, Louisiana, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico need Congress to act. On Monday, this bill was derailed by political games, posturing, and name calling. I hope that will not be the case today because my constituents and those in other communities like my district don't have time to wait. This tax relief package deserves bipartisan support from my colleagues.

I want to thank Chairman BRADY and the Ways and Means Committee staff for allowing me to shape this legislation for the benefit of south Florida residents, especially those in Monroe County who were hardest hit by Hurricane Irma. I want to thank Chairman SESSIONS and the Rules Committee for making in order my amendment that will provide additional benefits that are critical for our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands. In the aftermath of Hurricane Maria, they are facing a terribly difficult uphill battle to rebuild their communities. I stand in complete solidarity with my friends STACEY PLASKETT of the U.S. Virgin Islands and JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and will work to get them everything they need to rebuild their communities. I hope for their sake we can finally get this done today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first I want to acknowledge those individuals that Mr. CURBELO pointed out and congratulate them for their courage and their kindness as they attempt to get southern Florida back on its feet.

But the key phrase here that my friend from Florida mentioned was the following: Now it is time for us to do our part.

"Our part" calls for a much more vigorous effort, a much more robust investment, and it could, it should, be done now. We don't have to wait to get this done. We don't have to parcel this out in the small amounts that are being suggested.

Now, earlier this week, I rose in opposition to H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act, as well. Today, I am disappointed to say that I am not going to support today's updated version of the legislation either, based on the word "more."

I take no issue with a clean 6-month extension of the FAA expenditure authority, but today's bill includes an extensive list of extraneous provisions.

If we are to include extraneous measures on this must-pass legislation, then the process of compiling the bill should have been done in a bipartisan manner. Instead, our Republican friends assembled their near-term priorities barely, if at all, consulting the Democratic minority, even though many of these issues are indeed bipartisan.

Worse, rather than work together to solve what is rapidly becoming an American humanitarian crisis, they chose to take most of the day off to unveil the tax cut for the wealthiest people in America.

The priorities at this moment are misguided. As I noted earlier this week, while I support the disaster tax relief in this bill, the package is plainly insufficient. I had hoped that we might work together in a manner on these provisions, but that has not occurred.

Traditionally, in this body, we honored and used to respect what is known as the national principle. It was a code of honor that bound us together when one part of the Nation was beset by disaster. Whether it was an earthquake in California, a hurricane in North Carolina, a tornado in Massachusetts, floods in Missouri, or forest fires in Alabama, we did not ask about gender, race, geography. We simply said the national principle prevails and the Federal Government will offer a robust response.

□ 1745

We are failing in that respect to set the precedent today. Instead, unfortunately, this disaster relief package that we will consider does not provide the comprehensive package of incentives and relief that will drive investment and speed up recovery in American communities in Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the devastation across Puerto Rico.

These hurricanes left massive devastation in their wake, and the ongoing situation in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are dire. The situation not only justifies but demands a comprehensive package of incentives and relief to help these communities and their residents get back to their feet.

Republicans will hide behind an amendment they added to the Rules Committee last night. It is really a fig leaf, amounting to \$68 per person in tax relief. We can do much more for our American brothers and sisters in the Caribbean, especially given that the administration continues to drag its feet in terms of sending an emergency supplemental request. That should be done forthwith. We can do better, and we must do better.

They are making vague assurances that we will get around to considering a more extensive package later, but delay and uncertainty will make the situation worse, not better.

Today's package should have included other powerful and proven tax incentives that we have extended in the past disaster recovery efforts consistently. I consider this a missed opportunity.

We need to do more to help our fellow Americans recover from these tragedies. Therefore, I intend to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Mr. CURBELO for his leadership in crafting this disaster relief package for our communities, and Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership on this bill as well.

I rise today not only on behalf of the people in my district in Texas who have been just hammered, but on behalf of everyone in Texas, Puerto Rico, Florida, and the Virgin Islands, who have been devastated by this fall's destructive hurricanes.

These are people who desperately need the support of our bill, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act. Hundreds of thousands of families have lost everything, even loved ones. This bill will help them begin to recover through meaningful, targeted tax relief they need now.

Earlier this week, as communities continued to be decimated by record-high wind gusts, flooding, and storm surges, regrettably, my House Democratic friends opposed this critical bill, putting politics above the very people they represent.

I stand here today to say we all have to do better. We have to show the Nation we can stand together in times of great tragedy to help each other and our neighbors, just as our people did in our district in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support for this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out, as all of us, to those impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. I am committed to providing the resources necessary for Federal response and recovery.

We all voted for the money a week and a half ago. That took 3 days. Other storms in the past took 3 months, so let's set the record straight.

I am pleased to support aid to those affected by Harvey, Irma, Maria, and I will continue to do so. We urgently need to deliver relief and assistance to those currently impacted by Hurricane Maria in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, where the entire island has lost power and many are without water.

I can't support a bill before us today which is not even close to providing the robust relief that Puerto Rico needs. You know it, and we know it. The Congress and this administration need to step up, help Puerto Rico recover.

I plan to reintroduce legislation to extend the earned income tax credit to residents of Puerto Rico, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

The bill before us today completely circumvented the committee process. I am not a process person, but this bill did not have any hearing, despite the fact that myself and my Republican colleague from New York, Mr. REED, have had legislation on comprehensive disaster relief for the last 5 years.

I want to address something my good friend from Texas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, put out yesterday in response to my position and others. He said that Democrats were using hurricane relief as a "bargaining chip" and "playing politics" to enact our own agenda. He also tweeted that we were "sick," which I can only hope was tweeted by an overzealous staffer.

This is where I usually fly off the handle, but I am going to keep cool, I am going to keep calm, and I am going to make sure that I am a real American, not judging people on where they live. I promised myself I would stay calm for the rest of what I have to say.

My only agenda, Mr. Speaker, is to help those who have been hurt by disasters, regardless of where in the United States they live, regardless of what they look like, regardless of how they cook their food. If that is a political agenda, I don't know what world we are living in.

As for "playing politics," as I mentioned, the gentleman from New York and I introduced the National Disaster Tax Relief Act to take politics out of the process, to avoid having to have debates like these.

Congress shouldn't pick and choose who gets disaster relief and who doesn't based on political whims. Tax

relief should not be reserved only for victims of a storm that happened to impact the home district—

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill needlessly pits residents of Texas and Florida against residents of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Louisiana, West Virginia, Utah, and other States. We should treat everyone fairly, and the Reed-Pascrell bill would do that.

Tax relief provisions would kick in automatically for federally declared disaster situations, even in Montana, even in Alaska. We should not play favorites when it comes to helping those in need.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, so let's be clear about who is playing politics here. New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut continue to feel the effects of Hurricane Sandy, just as Carolinians, Utahns, people from West Virginia and Louisiana still feel the effects of the major floods of 2015 and 2016. This is true in many other States.

So while this bill takes a few provisions from our bill, it does not get into the real meat and potatoes as to how we can help everybody. This bill doesn't do enough in the first place, and it doesn't include victims of other disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to demand robust and fair disaster tax relief. And if that is politics, so be it. I plead guilty. I want fairness.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3823.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear what is at stake if Congress fails to pass the FAA extension. Starting on October 1, no aviation taxes will be collected. Approximately \$40 million of revenue will be lost each day; the revenue that would have been used for airport infrastructure funding and the FAA's important safety, operational, and research functions.

No new Airport Improvement Program grants will be issued to airports in the communities across the country.

All FAA accounts funded out of the aviation trust fund—the Facilities and Equipment; AIP; Research, Engineering, and Development accounts—will be impacted.

Thousands of employees will be furloughed and some will be required to show up to work for no pay.

We must also be clear on the impact to hurricane recovery efforts currently underway by the FAA and funded from the Facilities and Equipment account,

including those in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The FAA is currently trying to restore radars, navigational aids, and other equipment damaged during Hurricane Maria. This is happening while stranded passengers in the San Juan airport wait without air-conditioning and electricity for flights off the island.

The FAA technicians are working around the clock to restore services, but because of the extent of the damage and the challenges of the terrain where equipment is located, it is difficult to determine when full restoration will happen.

For instance, as we debate this bill, technicians are making their way to a long-range radar site on a mountain in Puerto Rico. The last two miles to the site through the rainforest are impassable, so the technicians are using chainsaws to clear a path for themselves and their replacement equipment. The radar and navigation equipment are critical for the safe operation of flights.

We will have plenty of time to debate aviation policy in the coming weeks, and I look forward to it. But the FAA extension we are considering this week is not a pawn in a Washington game of political brinksmanship.

It is time for Congress to ensure the FAA's authorities, funding, and disaster recovery efforts continue uninterrupted in order to help those impacted by the hurricanes that are desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who is the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this would be the fourth FAA extension in 2 years. It didn't have to be this way. We had a bill come out of the committee in the last Congress and this Congress that was bipartisan except for one provision; that is the privatization of the Air Traffic Organization.

Now, there is a citizen group out there called Citizens for On Time Flights—actually, Airlines for America funds this—who are saying that we have to fly these old zigzag routes with 1950s' radar, and if only we, the airlines—the same airlines, by the way, that have had their dispatch and reservation systems go down 39 times in the last 2 years. The national air traffic system hasn't gone down in the last 2 years.

But, anyway, they could do better, they say—or Citizens for On Time Flights say. But, unfortunately, it is based on lies.

We have deployed a system where we could fly planes closer together. It is operational, actually, but the airlines haven't purchased the equipment to use it, and they are not going to purchase that equipment until 2020 or after.

So they are saying the FAA is dragging its feet; the FAA is over budget; the FAA is this, the FAA is that. No. Actually, it is the airlines that haven't purchased the equipment to use that system.

Now, the other most egregious part of this privatization proposal is the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman BRADY, has decided to give taxing authority to the private corporation. Now, they are not going to call it taxes. It is fees. Okay.

But right now we finance our Air Traffic Organization with a 7½ percent tax, a progressive tax; the more expensive your ticket, the more you pay. That is how we finance, predominantly, our Air Traffic Organization.

Well, this bill repeals that ticket tax. First thing that happens is the airlines raise their tickets by 7½ percent. They already did that once 5 years ago when there was a temporary lapse. Only two airlines didn't, Spirit and Alaska. Everybody else grabbed the money and ran, \$400 billion.

So Congress repeals the ticket tax. They raise prices 7½ percent, and then they would get three seats on the board. Three seats will go to direct airlines interests to decide what passengers and how people will pay to use the national airspace. So they, in all probability, will come up with a head tax.

So, in addition to paying \$7 billion a year for baggage fees, now we are going to start charging people to use the national airspace with a flat tax. So, hey, that is a big, great win for the people with first class tickets. The people, of course, who have got a \$100 coach seat are now going to be paying more like 20 percent or 25 percent. And the person with a \$2,000 ticket is going to pay, basically, 3-point-something percent.

So this is all really unfortunate because we could have passed already out of this House a bipartisan bill, sent it to the Senate. Instead of trying to jam them with this bill that is loaded down with riders, we would be jamming them with good, long-term policy for the FAA and the traveling public and the aviation industry in America.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have already heard from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is a member of the committee, who is going to oppose the bill because of provisions regarding private flood insurance. He thinks it will cause Federal flood insurance to collapse. And the two Senators from Louisiana who they are attempting to jam with this bill are saying they are going to oppose the bill and block it in the Senate. So we may end up with no continuing authorization for the FAA because they wanted to put these flood insurance provisions and other riders on this bill instead of passing them as separate legislation.

□ 1800

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the distinguished chairman of the House Republican Conference.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017. It also includes a 3-month extension for the Special Diabetes Program for Indians. This is an important program for many of the Tribes that I represent in my district.

It is also a 3-month extension of the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program that is set to expire at the end of this week.

It is estimated that we could have a national doctor shortage of 23,000 by 2025, and when you look at the rural areas like mine in eastern Washington, it is especially stark. We know primary care saves lives, and that is why it is so important to include these provisions in the long-term reauthorization of the THCGME program.

This program specially trains residents in some of the larger shortage areas; and when you compare it to the traditional Medicare program, the Teaching Health Center residents are 3½ times more likely to practice primary care, twice as likely to work in rural areas, and 2½ times more likely to work in the underserved areas.

It is a part of the solution in solving our primary care crisis, but it must be funded. That is why it is so important to continue this funding and this legislation. Without the funding, the program will unravel. The centers could be forced to ramp down. Residents could be terminated, and some centers may be shut down and their programs eliminated altogether.

I encourage my colleagues to recognize the importance of this program and encourage them to continue working with me on a long-term solution that ensures the future success of this vital program.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership. He has been particularly helpful in thinking through how we can work together on the multiple crises that Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico are facing.

Let me thank the manager of the bill for working on these issues as well.

Let me first of all indicate, as I have done earlier today, that I understand that the FAA extension is a clean extension which I will support, recognizing the international airport that is in my district. But again, I will seek the important leadership on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and particularly, the ranking

member, when it comes to dealing with not supporting privatization of air traffic controllers.

I want to speak specifically to the hurricane tax relief. As I do so, let me particularly make mention that I had hoped this bill would have an extension of the CHIP program and the community health centers. Maybe we can work on that, because I know in many of our communities impacted by the hurricanes, those elements are important, community health centers, and, certainly, the Children's Health Insurance Program.

I do want to make a point to say that I wish we could have gone further. I know that there were at least 21 different tax credits or exemptions that we could have had to help those who are impacted by the hurricanes, but these, I want to cite and say that I appreciate them being utilized for my constituents now.

The bill would provide tax credit deductions and other relief to taxpayers in disaster areas affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. Most measures would apply to taxpayers in parts of Florida, Puerto Rico, Texas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

In particular, access to one's retirement funds, the bill would waive the 10 percent penalty on each distribution from retirement accounts for taxpayers in affected areas. Individuals will be eligible to make the withdrawal if their primary residence was in one of the disaster areas as of the date of the storm and they sustained an economic loss.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the bill would increase the size of a loan an individual can take from their employee retirement fund under the retirement plan loans. It would also provide a credit for businesses that were rendered inoperable by the hurricanes but that retained employees, and on the charitable deduction for those who are giving dollars between the 23rd and December 31.

What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to look at some form of a disaster relief tax scheme, if you will, to enhance what we are doing now and to listen, where we can do this in a bipartisan way, working with Mr. NEAL, working with the chairman of the committee, and really making sure we have a long-term response to the journey that my constituents and others will have to take.

I close by saying that now we are up to 185,000 homes that have been severely damaged or damaged. We have got problems with mortgage deductions and a number of other issues, and, therefore, I am hoping we can work together.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017, which provides additional time to debate the future of our Nation's air traffic control system.

Earlier this week, I visited Charlotte Douglas' air traffic control tower and learned firsthand from the controllers about the importance of modernizing our traffic control system. Fortunately, Chairman BILL SHUSTER exercised leadership through spearheading H.R. 2997, the 21st Century AIRR Act, that does just that, by shifting the current bureaucratic and broken air traffic control to a stakeholder-managed, not-for-profit corporation. With NextGen projected to ultimately cost \$120 billion, it is imperative that we fix our air traffic control in this Congress.

Importantly, the 21st Century AIRR Act also strengthens air service in rural communities through ensuring that general aviation will have full access to U.S. airspace. It advances the remote air traffic control tower program, which means that rural communities are fully integrated into our Nation's air traffic control system.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on this critical issue facing the Fifth District of South Carolina.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), and I must tell you that anybody who has witnessed her heartfelt advocacy on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico in the last 24 hours would be moved. I also would say that nobody in this Chamber knows more about what has happened in Puerto Rico right now than the gentlewoman from New York, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I really appreciate those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill. As we all know, many people are hurting in the areas affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. Sadly, the response by the administration has been bumbling, inexcusably weak, and inadequate.

While some of the proposals in the bill are needed, these measures are necessary, but far from sufficient to help Puerto Rico recover. If anything, these half steps are an insult to the American citizens living in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Puerto Rico is hurting. They do not need legislative lip service passed just so that the majority can claim they are helping. Instead of taking real and meaningful steps to provide much-needed relief for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, this bill ignores the challenges they face.

Providing personal casualty assistance and penalty-free withdrawals from retirement accounts is commendable, but not for Puerto Rico. Just under half the island is living in poverty, and the average median income is under \$20,000. In fact, 67 percent of

workers have no money left to save for retirement after paying bills, and only one in five workers is contributing to retirement savings.

So I ask you, what savings will they pull from, and how and when will this happen? American citizens in Puerto Rico cannot even get cash out of an ATM without waiting hours in line. Providing funds based on the assessed value of those provisions for Puerto Rico is insufficient. It is a fig leaf offered by Republicans so that they can check it off their list.

In order to truly help the many victims affected by the hurricanes, Congress needs to start by providing the economic support required to recover.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this bill is unworkable for Puerto Rico as it stands now. I applaud the effort and speed with which this was drafted, but it must be strengthened to truly address the needs of Americans in these disaster areas.

Even today, I got a call from the most important medical institution, and they are running out of antibiotics. The veterans hospital that treats 200,000 soldiers who have participated in every war, they do not have access to healthcare. This is how we honor their service? No, Mr. Speaker.

Vote down this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, you just heard the eloquent testimony from Ms. VELÁZQUEZ about what the people of Puerto Rico are facing right now.

I wish that the majority would have approached this process differently. The reauthorization of the FAA could have been a simple, straightforward exercise. It could have and should have been a bipartisan effort. They saddled the FAA with unrelated partisan priorities, incorporated with little input from Democrats, and presented a weak tax package to address the recent major national disasters.

As I said when a version of this bill came up earlier this week, I wish the disaster tax relief section were better designed and more extensive. This updated bill still doesn't provide adequate relief to the affected families and communities who desperately need it. You just heard from Ms. VELÁZQUEZ on that basis.

While waiving penalties on the withdrawal of retirement savings and expanding EITC and child tax credit provisions are helpful, the majority inexplicably left out some of the most economically powerful tax incentives on the shelf, including those that would be helpful to rebuild devastated infrastructure.

Given this damage and the needs of hard-hit areas, especially the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, I cannot understand why we are not including proven

assistance contained in previous disaster tax packages as we did to our family and friends in places like Texas and Louisiana.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I truly deplore the way some colleagues have decided to politicize such a sensitive, urgent, and important issue.

There are people in my community who are suffering, who lost their homes, yet they are still working hard to help their neighbors rebuild. For them to find out that this institution would oppose a measure to help them because some colleagues think it is just not good enough—now, you heard them. They recognize there is a lot of good in this package, but it is not enough.

I am the Representative of the district that was hit the hardest by Hurricane Irma. Chairman BRADY was here. He has been working hard back home to help his community recover while managing his responsibilities here as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He is calling for passage of this legislation that he sponsored.

Also putting their names on this legislation, JENNIFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, the Resident Commissioner elected by Puerto Ricans on the island to this Chamber, she has added her name to this legislation.

Also, STACEY PLASKETT, a member of the minority who represents the Virgin Islands, she has added her name to the amendment we filed to make this legislation even stronger.

So the Members representing the districts that were hit the hardest, where people are suffering—and the gentlewoman from New York is absolutely correct; the suffering in Puerto Rico cannot be compared to anything else that we are seeing here on the mainland—their representatives want to see this legislation pass, but some of our colleagues say it is just not good enough. So because this is not good enough for them, people should get nothing.

We wonder. We wonder why so many Americans don't trust this institution, why so many Americans are frustrated with the politics in this country: because if it isn't perfect, if it isn't exactly what I want, then I am against it.

□ 1815

Now, fortunately, not all of the Members of the minority agree with this. When we first had this vote on Monday, 26 Democrats voted in favor of the legislation. And I thank them—not just for me, but on behalf of all of my constituents, the people of the Florida Keys, south Florida, and, of course, the people of Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands. I thank my Democratic colleagues and all of my Republican colleagues that sup-

ported this package. I invite more Members from both parties to support this package today because this is not the time to play political games.

Now, I understand some people here are frustrated about what may have happened in the past. I wasn't here, and I belong to a new generation of Members of this institution. Quite frankly, I think none of us on either side is interested in relitigating the old fights and the old debates. We want to see the solutions for today and tomorrow.

The people of Florida—Monroe County, the Florida Keys, and Miami-Dade—the people of Texas, Louisiana, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, they need us now. They need this solution now.

Can we do more later?

Absolutely. Everyone knows that this Chamber and the other will soon consider additional funding for FEMA—much-needed funding. I will support a robust package for FEMA because the agency is strained and it is working hard to help people all over this country and out in the Atlantic.

But to say that this is not good enough, so instead we will do nothing is just unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider because I think it is important that we send a message of national unity to help those who are hurting. If we can do more in the future, we will and we should.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just thank all of my colleagues that understand how urgent this situation is, how much pain and suffering are being experienced in these communities, and I ask them respectfully to please support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for the Committee on Ways and Means has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the terrible tragedy and suffering from Harvey, Irma, and Maria. We have seen the shattered homes, and we have seen the shattered lives. I have been to Houston and my native Texas to visit with a number of the victims.

There are many tragedies, Mr. Speaker, out of these hurricanes and flooding, but one of the tragedies—one of the tragedies—is that in Harris County, where Houston is, 80 percent of the homes that were flooded didn't have flood insurance.

Now, why didn't they have flood insurance, Mr. Speaker?

I believe one of the reasons is because we have a government monopoly called the National Flood Insurance Program. Many people don't even know of its existence. Many people think they were safe because they were 3 feet outside of the government designated 100-year floodplain. Many thought that somehow this was simply rolled into their homeowners' insurance policy, but it wasn't.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to make sure that people have more affordable options for flood insurance.

Wouldn't it be wonderful that for every time you saw a life insurance commercial or an auto insurance commercial, you saw something about flood insurance to help educate the American people about the need for this basic insurance policy?

We could see the savings occur as people rolled this into their homeowners' policy.

In the very small portion of the market, Mr. Speaker, where there is competition, people are saving not just hundreds of dollars, but thousands of dollars.

We have heard from the Megoulas family in Pennsylvania: "NFIP insurance would have cost me \$2,700 a year, but I was able to find private coverage for only \$718. . . ."

We heard from the Cyr family, also of Pennsylvania: "I have benefited from switching to private market flood insurance from FEMA. I save about \$1,000 per year."

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a piece of legislation known as the Flood Insurance Market Parity and Modernization Act, also known as Ross-Castor. I want to thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROSS) for his leadership on this issue. It is very simple. It simply clarifies congressional intent that people ought to have more options.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, as people begin to rebuild after these hurricanes, they need better options for flood insurance, particularly with the NFIP \$30 billion in debt, facing another bailout, and facing an uncertain future. Now we need to take care of that.

That is why I have proposed, along with Chairman DUFFY, a 5-year, long-term reauthorization. We are currently operating under a temporary 90-day authorization. But as we do, let's work on something that we can all agree on. The last time this bill came up in the House, Mr. Speaker, 419-0. It has recently come out of the Financial Services Committee 58-0.

I am not sure you can get that kind of vote tally for a Mother's Day resolution. It is bipartisan. It is the very definition of bipartisan.

So let's take one important step today to help the victims of Harvey, Irma, and Maria as they begin to rebuild their homes, to have more flood insurance options, more affordable insurance options. As we work through what we might disagree on in the NFIP authorization, let's pass today what we can agree on and help the victims today.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill, which began as a must-pass reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration but has

now become a Christmas tree for unre-lated Republican priorities.

Puerto Rico is on the brink of a humanitar-ian crisis following Hurricane Maria that is being exacerbated by Trump's and Congress' failure to ade-quately respond. Tens of thousands in Texas and Florida are just beginning to pick up the pieces following Hurricanes Harvey and Irma. Yet, other than the small initial down payment of disaster aid we passed—which I might add Chairman HENSARLING voted against—Congress has yet to pass a single policy reform that will actually improve the lives of any of those who found them-selves in harm's way.

This is the first time in this Congress that we are debating a flood insurance policy change on the House floor. How-ever, this is not a policy change that would address the resilience of the Flood Insurance Program, help fami-lies to recover, or improve our coun-try's response to natural disasters. No. The Republican response to the cata-strophic storms of these last 2 months is to muscle through the expansion of private flood insurance, which has long been sought by the insurance industry.

Now, let me be clear. I don't oppose this policy. I voted for it last Congress and I voted for it when we marked it up in committee this year. But moving this bill at this time, while ignoring all the other policy responses needed but the Flood Insurance Program and the ongoing natural disasters in our coun-try, is simply irresponsible.

The NFIP will expire on December 8 of this year, and we still lack a credible plan to ensure that it is reauthorized for the long term. Therefore, I will op-pose any and all efforts to break apart the debate on substantive reforms to the NFIP from the reauthorization de-bate we should so desperately be hav-ing.

The bill before us today does abso-lutely nothing to address the stability of the NFIP, which is in jeopardy fol-lowing a devastating series of cata-strophic hurricanes across several States and U.S. territories. We know that we will need to increase the NFIP's borrowing authority so that policyholders from Harvey, Irma, and Maria can be made whole, but the chairman has no plan to deal with the debt, frequently telling those of us who have urged him to consider debt for-giveness to just forget about that idea.

I have long called for Congress to for-give NFIP's debt, particularly because of the unsustainable burden placed on policyholders paying hundreds of mil-lions of dollars a year just on the inter-est for the government to pay itself back. Flood insurance is already unaffordable.

So why are we continuing to make it worse by saddling policyholders with interest on a debt that will never be repaid?

We need thoughtful, comprehensive solutions to a long-term reauthoriza-tion that addresses the debt, afford-ability, mapping, and mitigation. That is not what we have before us today.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), who is the author of the bipartisan Flood Insurance Mar-ket Parity and Modernization Act, which passed this body in the last Con-gress 419-0. He is the vice chairman of the Housing and Insurance Sub-committee and the real leader for af-fordable private flood insurance.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this desperately needed legislation.

Included in this bill are two provi-sions that are particularly important to my constituents in central Florida. One is tax relief for families and small businesses recovering from the destruc-tion of Hurricanes Harvey, Maria, and Irma. The other is language taken from my legislation, the Private Flood In-surance Market Development Act, which will allow private sector insurers to compete with the National Flood In-surance Program.

The catastrophic impact of the three major hurricanes is heartbreaking and tragic. However, it has been inspiring to witness the outpouring of charity and goodwill from our communities in response.

Now it is time for this Congress to rise to the occasion. The tax relief for disaster victims in this legislation is a great first step.

This bill will help individuals in the disaster areas keep their jobs, support retirement savers paying for recovery, encourage charitable contributions to help victims, and put more money in the pockets of families trying to get their lives back on track after having lost everything.

To deny our constituents this relief because it is not enough is simply ir-re-sponsible. To be sure, I agree that more aid will likely be needed.

But is that really a good excuse to do nothing?

I certainly don't think so.

Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't just about providing immediate relief. Thank-fully, it also provides some measure of long-term relief to communities vul-nerable to floods—the most costly of all natural disasters.

Thanks to the inclusion of my legis-lation, H.R. 1422, this bill will provide consumers with more options and lower costs in the flood insurance mar-ketplace as well as help to reduce the unacceptable number of homes not in-sured for flood losses.

Last Congress, this House passed nearly identical legislation by a vote of 419-0. That is why I was so disheart-ened to hear some characterize this re-form as a long-time Republican pri-ority. This isn't a Republican priority, and it is not a Democratic priority. This is a national priority.

The NFIP is more than \$25 billion in debt and runs an annual deficit of \$1.4

billion. Folks, this is an insurance company on the brink of being unable to pay out claims to policyholders without another taxpayer bailout.

The NFIP desperately needs to off-load some of its risk, and we can help by allowing the private sector to do what it does best: compete for cus-tomers by offering better service, lower prices, and more comprehensive cov-erage.

I understand some of my colleagues think competition will destabilize the NFIP. First, we need to be clear that the NFIP in its current state is belea-guered, it is not stable, and it is not sustainable. Reforms must be made.

Second, I would urge my colleagues to recognize that by forcing nearly all of the flood risk in this Nation into a single, government-run insurance pro-gram, we contribute to the NFIP's bloated and unstable risk portfolio.

□ 1830

So the NFIP needs some help, and consumers need competition. More cov-erage options will help make flood in-surance an attractive investment for everyone, thereby reducing the number of uninsured homes.

With the NFIP alone, our constitu-ents are severely limited. For example, an NFIP policy only covers up to \$250,000 of damages.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ROSS. In addition, NFIP policies do not cover homeowners displaced by living expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has an untold number of supporters. I include in the RECORD a letter from 15 major insurance, housing, banking, and trade associations in support of the private flood insurance provisions in H.R. 3823.

SEPTEMBER 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned trades and organizations strongly support the "Development of a Pri-vate Flood Insurance Market" title of H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017. This package includes bipartisan, clarifying language, in-troduced by Representative Dennis A. Ross (FL-15) and Representative Kathy Castor (FL-14), to increase acceptance of private flood insurance products. This will increase flood insurance options for consumers, there-by providing more competition and coverage options to families and businesses.

The Ross-Castor language passed the House last year by a vote of 419-0, and it was ordered reported out of the House Financial Services Committee in June by a vote of 58-0. The bipartisan fix clarifies what is already in federal law (following the passage of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 and reinforced in the Homeowners Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014) in-tended by Congress to allow lenders to ac-cept private flood insurance in lieu of federal

coverage to satisfy the mandatory purchase requirement.

The undersigned trades and organizations strongly support inclusion of the bipartisan Ross-Castor language in the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 that allows consumers the choice of government or private flood insurance coverage. We ask for you to vote in favor of this important legislative package when it is considered by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI)

Reinsurance Association of America (RAA)
National Multifamily Housing Council (NMHC)

National Apartment Association (NAA)

American Bankers Association (ABA)

Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers (CIAB)

American Insurance Association (AIA)

National Association of REALTORS® (NAR)

National Association of Professional Insurance Agents (PIA)

Financial Services Roundtable (FSR)

Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America (Big "I")

Mortgage Bankers Association (MBA)

National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC)

Independent Community Bankers of America (ICBA)

National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions (NAFCU).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me start off by letting the America people know fully why we Democrats on this side of the aisle are opposed to this bill.

Nobody has worked as hard as Democrats on this bill, Mr. Speaker, but the reason we object to it is that the flood insurance part of this bill was a result of cherry-picking items that they wanted. The American people deserve better than that. Then they attach it to an FAA bill with a 6-month extension. That is no way to treat the issues that we have today.

All you have got to do is click on the television and look at what is happening to American citizens in Puerto Rico, Florida, Texas. And you are going to put something where they cherry-picked this together to solve this particular problem?

There is no sense of urgency here, Mr. Speaker.

Another reason is that, unlike all of our other disaster tax credit relief packages, every time we have had an expansion added to the bill, we expanded these tax credits for low-income people, expanded the tax credits for the new markets area for people to immediately come in and invest. Not in this bill. There is no expansion in this bill.

My friends over there talk about bipartisanship. My middle name is bipartisanship. There is nobody on that committee who works harder for bipartisanship than DAVID SCOTT.

But the one piece of bipartisanship—our amendment that I worked fever-

ishly on with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), in which we were able to address the issue of the penalties of expense on those poor people who chose to have their monthly installments there and not be punished for it.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. We worked together on that and cut that cost in half. That one bipartisan piece of endeavor in our Financial Services Committee is not even included in this bill. That is why we are opposed to it.

Let's treat the American people the way they deserve. There is no better time. You are talking about expanding the help. Our people, American citizens in Puerto Rico, Florida, and Texas, deserve for us to have a complete flood insurance program, not piecemeal.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 3823.

First, I would like to mention I have deep concerns over Republicans' failure to extend vital healthcare programs that expire this Saturday, including important bipartisan programs like CHIP, Community Health Centers, and the National Health Service Corps. If we fail to act, access to affordable and quality care for children and vulnerable populations nationwide will be jeopardized.

However, I want to focus on another issue that is extremely important to my constituents: flood insurance.

This bill would undermine efforts to comprehensively reform the National Flood Insurance Program by allowing the development of a private flood insurance market while not confronting challenges to NFIP, like increasing affordability, investing in mitigation, and ensuring transparency and accountability. It would not even reauthorize the flood insurance program, which is due to expire on December 8; or raise its borrowing authority, which is due to run out in the coming weeks and could impact claims from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

When Superstorm Sandy devastated New Jersey 5 years ago, some of the hardest hit communities were in my district, and the NFIP did not help them the way it should have. Too many of my constituents are still dealing with high premiums, inaccurate flood maps, or still waiting for their Sandy claims appeals to be decided.

That is why I helped introduce the bipartisan SAFE NFIP Reauthorization Act, which would reauthorize the program, cap premium rate increases, authorize funding for more flood mapping, reform the appeals process, and

cap the compensation of flood insurance companies. These are changes that we must pursue. The legislation we consider does none of this.

Mr. Speaker, we should be working together to comprehensively improve the NFIP. Doing anything less is an abdication of our responsibility. I encourage all of my colleagues to oppose this legislation and work towards meaningful flood insurance reform.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), a true expert on flood insurance issues.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk during this discussion about the flood insurance program, about making sure we are providing for the hurricane victims. There is talk about the FAA.

Let me be clear: we support the FAA. We support making sure that we provide all the resources necessary for the hurricane victims, from Hurricanes Irma, Harvey, and Maria. Where things are getting distorted is that this bill includes extraneous provisions that will actually undermine these very objectives.

I want to explain.

Under the legislation that has been attached—the flood insurance legislation—it does allow private insurers to come in, which all of us support, but not in a vacuum. What is going to happen when you do this in a vacuum is that you are going to cause premiums to be diverted from the program.

This is the program where these people have been paying premiums for years, and the program is not going to have the resources to pay their claims, which means it is going to have to borrow more money, which is going to make the premiums go up even greater.

You are going to see the private insurers come in and cherry-pick low- and moderate-risk policies, which is only going to leave the high-risk policies in the program trying to pay a debt and not having a diverse portfolio of low-, moderate-, and high-risk policies.

This is a flawed approach. It needs to be addressed on December 9, when this current program expires. We should be addressing this holistically.

I want to say it again. Those of you who have hurricane victims are undermining their very recovery by supporting this legislation.

One of the other major flaws is this, Mr. Speaker. This shows flooding in Louisiana last year, flooding in Texas this year.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.

DUFFY), chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee and a leader on flood insurance in the House today.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment and thank Ms. CASTOR and Mr. ROSS for their hard work on this legislation.

There are some here in this body who have said: if we let free markets into the National Flood Insurance Program that is run by the Federal Government, you are going to undermine the premiums that come into the national flood insurance pool.

It is \$25 billion in debt and is structured in a way where premiums can't rise. This doesn't undermine the program.

What we are doing is saying: Listen, if you are in the National Flood Insurance Program right now, the way it is structured, there is only one place you can buy insurance. But this is a provision that will open up the market and let private companies come in and offer families better policies at better prices. If they don't, you can stay in the NFIP. You don't have to go private. You can stay government. But you give people a choice.

It is like saying: Listen, you have to keep the United States Postal Service as your one carrier. You can't have FedEx or UPS. You don't get those choices.

People want a choice. In Houston, instead of having only 20 percent of the people who had coverage, you might have had 40, 50, or 60 percent of the people who would have had coverage. More people would have had protection.

I have got to tell you, I am disappointed in the partisanship.

I am going to quote a person I rarely quote, but a person I truly like. She once said in the process of this bill: "This is an example of real compromise."

Then, on the substance of the bill, this fine woman from California said: "We can have the opportunity for our constituents to have some choice. I think that is real compromise, that is substantive compromise, that is meaningful compromise, and that is the kind of compromise that reasonable people can engage in."

Mr. Speaker, that was the gentlewoman from California, who is now in opposition to this bill.

When this came up by itself—the same bill—last Congress, everyone voted for it. When it came up in committee, everyone voted for it. Democrats and Republicans voted for this bill because they knew that it was going to offer more choice and better prices to American families. That is why it was bipartisan.

I think this is a moment where our Congress can stand together on behalf of the American people who don't have flood insurance, who don't have a reasonably priced policy. Let's stand with them today and pass the Ross-Castor bill. By the way, ROSS and CASTOR are both from Florida. Two Florida Members, Republican and Democrat, came together.

Let's get it done, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 538, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3823 is postponed.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our fellow Americans who know what it means to give the ultimate sacrifice to the Nation: our Gold Star families.

This past weekend, we observed National Gold Star Mothers and Families Day, a solemn reminder of our sacred obligation to hold dear in our heart and to never forget those in uniform we have lost. Psalm 34 says: "The Lord is close to the brokenhearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit."

I believe this was on President Lincoln's mind when he wrote to Mrs. Bixby, a mother who lost five of her sons in the Civil War. President Lincoln wrote: "I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only with the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

Like many in this Chamber, I have presented and saluted too many flag-draped coffins of our fallen warriors. As we remember them, let us also recommit ourselves to the task of caring for the families they leave behind who forever carry the pain of their loss. As they gave to the Nation, the Nation must give to them.

Today, I urge my colleagues to join me in renewing our obligations to our Gold Star families, a commitment for life.

□ 1845

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

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

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, September is National Preparedness Month, and I rise today to offer prayers, condolences, and encouragement for those impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Also, I rise to thank the thousands of first responders, neighbors, and volunteers who have come out in droves to respond to these disasters. I stand with those residents now recovering from storm and flood devastation.

This Nation stands behind you ready to make you stronger and more resilient in the face of disaster. As a resi-

dent of a city that faced many disasters, I can attest to the fact that Americans across this Nation are resilient and only grow in strength in the face of a challenge.

In the wake of these disasters and as we remember the 16th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks and prepare to mark the fifth anniversary of Superstorm Sandy next month, we are reminded of the critical importance of preparing for the disasters that our communities may face. We cannot always control whether a disaster will strike our communities, but we can take every opportunity to prepare ourselves, our loved ones, and our communities.

We are a resilient nation in the face of disasters. As a resident of Staten Island and chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I urge all Americans to take time this month to make a plan, sign up for alerts and warnings in your area, check your insurance coverage, and make sure that you have an evacuation plan. We cannot plan on disasters ahead of time, but we can certainly prepare ourselves for when they come.

POLLS HAVE BUILT-IN BIAS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, both the Washington Examiner and Washington Times recently have reported on a practice that is resulting in overly low approval ratings for President Trump. Pollsters are not necessarily rigging their questions to get a desired result; instead, they are creating a biased result by how they select people to poll.

Frequently, the pollsters contact more Democrats than Republicans. Unsurprisingly, the results tilt anti-Trump. The Examiner pointed out that this "robs Trump of about 8 points in his approval ratings, from 46 percent to 38 percent."

The Times noted that in polls including Presidential approval questions, the Economist relied on a sample that used 58 percent more Democrats than Republicans, which "gave Democrats a 14-point edge, while Reuters and Gallup gave Democrats an 11-point and 7-point edge in their samples."

Mr. Speaker, as the 2016 election taught us, we shouldn't rely on biased polls if we want accuracy.

SEPTEMBER IS SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, a

time for our Nation to raise awareness about the recurring tragedy of suicide.

This epidemic is too common for the men and women who wore our country's uniform and put their lives on the line to defend our freedom. An estimated 20 veterans lose their lives to suicide each and every day.

A new VA report shows the risk for suicide is 22 percent higher among veterans than civilians, and 250 percent higher amongst female veterans than female civilians. This is unacceptable.

Twenty veterans a day lost to suicide should be a call to action for our country and for this Congress. We must take action, and we must do it now.

Typically, the time in this Chamber is split. Republicans have 1 hour and Democrats have 1 hour, but we believe this issue is too important to be overshadowed by partisan politics. That is why, tonight, Congressman TIM MURPHY and I have brought together Members from both sides of the aisle to show our commitment to solving this problem together and finding real solutions for our veterans.

This is the fifth year that we have assembled this team to raise awareness and send a clear message that the epidemic of veteran suicide must end. We have so much work left to do. So tonight we demonstrate our ongoing support for individuals, organizations, and agencies devoted to preventing the epidemic of veteran suicide. We challenge the VA, the Department of Defense, and our fellow lawmakers to do more. We are failing in our obligation to do right by those who have sacrificed so much for our freedom.

Finally, we stand here tonight, unified, for the military families who have experienced this tragedy, and we say to you: Your family's loss is not forgotten. We work for the memory of your loved ones, and we will not rest until every veteran has access to the care he or she needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who understands the importance of addressing this epidemic, a colleague and friend of mine.

Thank you for being here this evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and giving me an opportunity to speak on such a critically important topic.

You know, I served for 26½ years, Mr. Speaker, in the United States Air Force. I pinned Purple Hearts on the chests of some of my troops that had gone into harm's way. I know the stress and strain on military families and on military members. I represent a district that arguably is one of the largest, if not the largest, veteran-populated districts in the State of Ohio, with nearly 50,000. And yet today, in 2017, we see 20 veterans per day, 1 every 72 minutes, committing suicide.

What does that say about us as a nation when we send our young people off in uniform to stand in harm's way, to protect our freedoms, to protect our

liberties, to protect our values and way of life, and then when they come home we can't get them the help that they need when they are down?

One of the saddest days since I began serving the people of eastern and southeastern Ohio was the day I got a call from a young wife of a military member. She said she had been dealing with the VA for quite some time to get her husband an appointment with a mental health counselor, all to no avail. He couldn't get in, couldn't get in, couldn't get in.

I stopped by the VA center one day. I asked to speak to the director, gave the young man's name, and I said: I would like to see the status of his appointment.

They looked him up in the system, and they said: Well, you will be happy to know, Congressman, that he has got an appointment next Wednesday.

I said: Well, I am actually here to tell you that you can cancel that appointment because he committed suicide last week.

He had been waiting for weeks and weeks and weeks to get in to see a mental health counselor, struggling with PTSD and the emotional and mental battle scars that came back with him from combat overseas. You know, it is one thing that we send our young people away to fight for us on foreign soil. Imagine for a second what their families go through when they are gone day in and day out, not knowing if they are going to get that call or that knock at the door to tell them that their loved one has been injured or, worse, killed in action. And then we bring their loved one home, and they are helpless in terms of getting them the care and the treatment that they need.

I agree with my colleague: we need to do more. The agencies, the VA, the Department of Defense, mental health counselors all over the country, Congress, families, communities, we need to do more to help our veterans get back on their feet after they have participated in that inhumane, disastrous, catastrophic event known as war.

Mr. Speaker, it almost leaves you speechless to think about the millions of families that are impacted by this, 20 per day—20 per day. One per day is unacceptable, but yet we are seeing 20 per day.

I urge my colleagues and I urge our agencies in the Federal Government—the VA, the DOD—let's get behind an effort, and let's turn this trend in the opposite direction.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time to speak.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude to Congressman JOHNSON. Not only is he an amazing Representative for the people of Ohio, he is also a veteran who served our country ably and proudly, and his story of a veteran in his district lost to suicide should be a call to all of us around the country to take care of the veterans in each of our districts.

We have made some progress since last year. I have often shared the story of a young veteran in my district, Sergeant Daniel Somers. Sergeant Somers was an Army veteran of two tours in Iraq. He served on Task Force Lightning, an intelligence unit. He ran over 400 combat missions as a machine gunner in the turret of a Humvee. Part of his role required him to interrogate dozens of terror suspects, and his work was deemed classified.

Like many veterans, Daniel was haunted by the war when he returned. He suffered from flashbacks, nightmares, depression, and additional symptoms of post-traumatic stress, made worse by a traumatic brain injury.

Daniel needed help. He and his family asked for help, but, unfortunately, the VA enrolled Sergeant Somers in group therapy sessions, which Sergeant Somers could not attend for fear of disclosing classified information. Despite requests for individualized counseling or some other reasonable accommodation to allow Sergeant Somers to receive appropriate care for his PTSD, the VA delayed providing Sergeant Somers with appropriate support and care.

Like many, Sergeant Somers' isolation got worse when he transitioned to civilian life. He tried to provide for his family, but he was unable to work due to his disability.

Sergeant Somers struggled with the VA bureaucracy. His disability appeal had been pending in the system for over 2 years without resolution. Sergeant Somers didn't get the help he needed in time.

On June 10 of 2013, Sergeant Somers wrote a letter to his family. In the letter he said: "I am not getting better, I am not going to get better, and I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on."

□ 1900

He went on to say:

"Thus, I am left with basically nothing. Too trapped in a war to be at peace, too damaged to be at war. Abandoned by those who would take the easy route, and a liability to those who stick it out—and, thus, deserve better. So you see, not only am I better off dead, but the world is better without me in it.

"This is what brought me to my actual final mission."

We lost Sergeant Somers that day.

No one who returns home from serving our country should ever feel like he or she has nowhere to turn. I am committed to working on both sides of the aisle to ensure that no veteran ever feels trapped like Sergeant Somers did, and that all of our veterans have access to appropriate mental healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) a freshman representative and a great addition to our Congress.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention

Month, and I rise to bring awareness to the pressing issue of veteran suicide.

When our servicemembers go overseas, they bravely and selflessly risk their own lives for the greater good. But when they return home, our veterans face new adversities. Many are confronted by intense emotional distress, including depression and post-traumatic stress. Others struggle to readjust to civilian life or to reintegrate into their families and their social networks.

Unfortunately, too many veterans succumb to their mental anguish. America loses 20 Americans every day to suicide. It is time we step up and be there for them and provide them the support they deserve.

I encourage anyone who knows a veteran—whether a family member, a co-worker, or a friend—to reach out. A simple gesture of kindness can make all the difference in the life of a veteran going through a difficult time.

I will do my part in Congress, fighting for more and better resources to support our veterans. Veterans fought for us. Now it is time we fight for them.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Somers' story is familiar to too many military families. Sergeant Somers' parents, Howard and Jean, were devastated by the loss of their son, but they bravely shared Sergeant Somers' story and created a mission of their own. Their mission is to ensure that Sergeant Somers' story brings to light America's deadliest war—the 20 veterans that we lose every day to suicide.

Howard and Jean are working with Congress and the VA to share their experience with the VA healthcare system and to find ways to improve care for veterans and their families. We worked closely with Howard and Jean to develop the Sergeant Daniel Somers Classified Veterans Access to Care Act, and ensure veterans of classified experiences can access appropriate VA mental healthcare services.

After more than 3 years of work, I am proud to say that the Sergeant Daniel Somers Classified Veterans Access to Care Act is now law. But this is just one small step forward, and our work with Howard and Jean doesn't stop here. We have so much work left to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), who has served veterans bravely in Congress and home in his district for many years.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. SINEMA for that very nice introduction.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Nation who are listening or watching us on C-SPAN, I want to impress that we have exactly, right now, 40,000 soldiers—veterans—who are committing suicide each year.

This is a national crisis, but it is more than that. It is a national tragedy, but it is more than that. It is an American national shame.

These soldiers go where they are commanded to go. They go into a hail of bullets. They go and they fight and they die. They leave an arm, they leave a leg, they leave so much of themselves on the battlefield, and so many leave their minds there because of the devastation. And when we bring them back home, the level of treatment that many of them are getting, and even not getting, is, again, a national tragedy and a national shame.

It is my home that the plea that America will hear this day from these Members of Congress will awaken us to what I believe is, and should be, the number one issue facing this Nation: take care of our veterans.

Twenty a day, 40,000 every year, is terrible.

Now, myself, what am I doing?

Each year, I put on a jobs fair. But I don't put on that jobs fair by myself. Partnering with me is the VA, where we have, in Atlanta, Georgia, at that convention and trades center, a jobs fair each year with the VA, and we are averaging about 450 jobs each year.

But we don't stop there. We have a health fair because it is the PTSD—post-traumatic stress syndrome—that is this archenemy that we are not examining. The reason for that is that there is a severe shortage of psychiatrists in the VA and there is a severe shortage of primary care physicians in the VA.

So right here in this legislature, my good Republican friend, LARRY BUCSHON from Indiana, and I—and he is a doctor—have worked together. We put together legislation 2 years ago, in 2015, for the special appropriations for veterans that we would pay the tuition, pay the loan forgiveness, for those physicians who are psychiatrists and who will go and work in the VA.

But we didn't stop there. Knowing how the vagarious income levels are structured and the pay scales are structured according to where you live in the United States—and we have VA hospitals, VA centers all over this country, and the salary levels vary—we made sure that an added incentive would be to those graduating psychiatrists who will go and help our veterans and go help us fulfill this shortage, that we would make sure that their incoming salary would be at least 2 percent higher than that average.

My only heartbreak in all of this is that we were only able to get 12. And I can tell you how much that broke my heart by this Congress. But it is a start.

This bill will be replenished. And if you in the public can help us, if we want to do something right now about cutting down on the number of suicides that our veterans are having, help us get more psychiatrists into the VA system, help me and LARRY BUCSHON and many Democrats and Republicans who voted for the initial piece of legislation—we only got 12 the first time, but we should get 300, 400, 500. We should be willing to make that appropriation.

We can talk, we can sympathize, we can do all of that, but we need to get better treatment, psychiatric treatment, for our veterans. That will not happen, ladies and gentlemen, if we don't get more psychiatrists into the VA system.

So give LARRY BUCSHON from Indiana, my Republican friend, a call. My office, give me a call. But better than that, call your Congressman and say: Let's get this bill expanded so we can get more psychiatrists.

The Congress will move if the American people say move.

Now, finally, I must say this. There is no one that embodies the final words of Jesus Christ before he was crucified. Those final words that he spoke to his disciples 24 hours before he was crucified were: "Love one another as I have loved you."

And there is no greater love than that one who will lay down his life for his friend. That, ladies and gentlemen, is our veteran.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCOTT for being here and for his passion for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) to talk about this important issue we have been working on together.

Mr. MURPHY has been serving in Congress since 2002. He is our only practicing psychologist serving in Congress, and he is the co-chair of the Mental Health Caucus. In addition, Congressman MURPHY is a commander in the Navy Reserve and provides services to veterans at the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center specializing in treating those individuals who are suffering from traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder. It is a privilege to serve with him in Congress and work on this important issue.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for her dedication to helping veterans.

It will be often cited that 20 veterans a day take their own lives. It is important that we take a deeper dive into why that is because, as a society, we want to know.

There will be upwards of 40-some thousand suicides this year in our Nation. Even one is too many. And I know that organizations that deal with suicide prevention want to see that drop considerably. But there is some understanding that is important for us to know what we can do and what stands in the way.

I want to note that those who serve in the military are about 1 percent of the population. Those who have served in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam are dying off fast from natural causes. But a great many of those veterans who do take an act of suicide are above age 50. Many of them have never served in combat.

Characteristic groups, such as the Army National Guard and reservists are among those who do have some

higher rates. It has been interpreted that perhaps one of the reasons for that is that they do not stay with their cohorts after combat. They go back home, come back on weekends, but don't have that same day-to-day support.

We also know the military, very much so after Vietnam, when you were done with your time, when you got your points, you were gone.

□ 1915

You could be in the middle of a battle, and you would be picked up by helicopter and taken home with encrusted blood still on your uniform from your friends, but you were sent back to the States—no chance to recover, no chance to develop from that, no chance to even get a checkup from the neck up, and, as a matter of fact, that was not even done. So for those who did serve in Vietnam and Korea and World War II, you just went back to life.

We have learned it is important to do more for people, and we do try and understand what is it, the characteristics among those who have taken their own lives, or tried to, that causes that to happen.

First of all, it is worth noting that about 70 percent of those who have taken their own lives who were veterans have not been involved with the VA hospital system. That is extremely important to know. They are not involved.

Now, that could be a number of reasons. It could be veterans who were not eligible for involvement at the VA. Many reservists and guards are not unless they served Active-Duty time, and even that is a limited timeframe. They also may have not been early identified when they came out of the military that would make them eligible for services. And, quite frankly, in many cases, it just is not near their home.

A study that was done with people at Fort Carson, Colorado, of 70-some folks who had attempted suicide, found that the number one reason that they gave, out of a list of 33 possibilities, was they wanted to end emotional distress. They simply wanted the pain to stop, and they ran out of ways to make it stop.

I reflect on the life of my father, who is now gone for other reasons, but one day when I was at home from college—and he himself was a World War II veteran—I heard his soft voice calling from the bathroom, and to see him there with a lot of blood on him, because he had just attempted to cut his arms and kill himself. Luckily, he did not. We got him care. But I believe for him, he certainly would have been in this category. He just wanted the pain to stop.

I don't think it was PTSD or his old signs of war. I think it was, perhaps, other distress as he dealt with his own alcoholism, or did not deal with it very well at that time, and the financial distresses of raising a family, and we just didn't have money, but it was enough to affect me—lifetime—in terms of try-

ing to understand and dedicate my life to helping those in psychological need.

I should mention, on September 11, I got my honorable discharge, so I am no longer in the Navy. I miss it every day, because I loved that time working with servicemembers who had traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress and a wide range of other problems, but here are a few things that I learned from them that are very important.

One is, if you want care in mental health, you just can't get it, not only because there may not be a VA near you, but even if there was, many persons who are dealing with panic and anxiety and depression don't want to leave the house; many with post-traumatic stress disorders do not want to go onto a bus or into traffic or into congested areas, because that can bring back some terrible memories for them. The very thing they need is to get treatment, but the very problems they have prevent them from getting treatment.

Now, we have passed legislation here that deals with choice to allow veterans to get that care closer to home. But can they get it? Well, tragically—not just sadly but tragically—in the area of mental health services, half the counties in America have no psychiatrist, they have no psychologist, they have no clinical social worker, they have no psychiatric nurse practitioner, and they have no licensed drug treatment counselor. In other words, it is not available.

If you just look at those, for example, with a substance abuse disorder, of the 22 million, about 75 to 80 percent of them also have a mental health problem and they are at higher risk for suicide. And certainly if we have a veteran who has substance abuse and depression, they are at higher risk.

But look at this group. For every 1,000 people with a substance abuse disorder—for every 1,000 people—900 do not seek treatment. Out of the 100 who do seek treatment, 37 have got nothing available to them. Of the 63 who have something available, only six get evidence-based care.

So it is no wonder when we talk to veterans, and they say, "I tried getting help, but this person didn't understand. I couldn't get help. It was a problem that was ongoing," at some point they reach that point where they want to just end their emotional distress.

I remember visiting the house of a veteran. The mother had called me and said: "Can you help him? He won't go to the VA. He won't get help."

I made a house call. The VA doesn't do that, but I made a house call. And without revealing too much, I will just say that it was pretty clear he had a lot of medication around his house. His apartment was pretty unkempt, food lying around, bottles, dozens and dozens of bottles of medication unopened, each one from the VA, because probably each time he went to the VA, they said: "How are you doing?"

"I am not doing well."

"Here. We will just increase your dosage," or, "We will give you a different medication," but the system was not set up to say, "How are you doing? What else can we do to care for you?" It simply was not set up to go to his home and help him out when he missed his appointments, when he was no longer employed, when he had isolated himself from society, when, like so many people, covered the windows of their bedroom with camouflage or some other dark thing so the light doesn't get in, don't watch TV, just stay away from the world, this shrinking world that constricts you like a snake around the throat until they see no more reason to live.

I remember going to the VA hospital and mentioning, "You know, I know the Marines are famous for not leaving anyone in the field. What do you do about some of these other folks with mental health problems?"

They said, "We don't go out to their homes."

I said, "Why not?"

"We just don't do that."

"Why not?"

"We just don't."

I agonize over that as being a Navy healthcare provider to know this doesn't sound like the Marines. The Marines don't leave someone out there.

Are we so constricted and tied up by rules that we can't even go and reach out to them? But that is part of the problem, that we need easier access to local care, we need care that reaches out to veterans, and not just say, "Hey, listen, if you really want to get help, why don't you suck it up, pull up your bootstraps and go out and get help," because some of them are not able to do that yet.

Many of them feel, as a veteran, "I have faced tougher battles. I can't let people know I am weak or I am struggling."

Many of them have addiction disorders, and they don't want people to know that they are weak and they are struggling.

To those veterans, I say this is not a sign of failure. It is like if you are in the battle and bullets are coming at you and grenades are coming at you and incoming fire is coming at you, the last thing you want to do is deny it is happening. You have to acknowledge it is happening. What do you do? You get on the radio and you call for help. That is what we have to make sure veterans understand, that that is what this is about, depression and panic and anxiety as well.

We need more providers. I have had legislation on a mental health bill to get more providers. We recently voted on some things in amendment to the Labor-H bill here to get a little bit more, but we need thousands of more providers, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, licensed drug treatment counselors. We don't have that.

If Congress really wants to help, we have to do more of that, but part of the

problem is this, too: they oftentimes, in the field, have such massive student loans. And relative to other areas of medicine and healthcare, they get paid so little, they may choose not to go into these areas of mental health care. So for those who are the most vulnerable, we make it the most difficult for them to get care.

Add to that the idea of, who among those who are mental health providers actually have training and understanding of military healthcare, understanding military medicine, understanding military life?

I was commissioned 8 years ago, and I know that when I went on to officer school, and I went to training, you have got to learn a lot. The Marines say, "I learned to shoot a gun, and I can polish my shoes better than anybody," but there is more to it than that. It is understanding the words, the acronyms, the lifestyle, what a person goes through.

We could certainly do much better, if not just saying let's hire people at the VA, but have a program for civilian mental health professionals, one, to recruit more; two, to pay for more reimbursed student loans to get them in the workforce; but also, quite frankly, to give them more regular orientation of what it is like to be a member of the military. Let them observe boot camp. Let them understand this.

I will give you an example. Once a soldier who I was treating, he said he had given up getting care for a while. He said the third time he had to explain to his therapist what an MRAP was, he said, "Give it up." The MRAP is a military vehicle, commonly known vehicle.

Now, every branch of the military has their own acronyms, and I don't pretend to know them all, but if a person doesn't even know the basics, you lose that sort of connection with the patient, and they give up.

The other issue here is that we need to be able to have a system that monitors the medication closely. It is very common that if someone is on medication, they are a polypharmacy event; that is, they are taking so many medications, and then they will take other medications that counteract the effects of those medications, and then they will take other medications to deal with the side effects of those medications.

It was not uncommon for us at Walter Reed to have a patient on 8 or 10 or 15 or more meds that they were on. We found that we reduced them down to one or two.

But with medication comes weight gains, comes increase for diabetes, comes other problems, comes stresses in the family, comes situations where they are estranged from their spouse, difficulties with children, episodes with anger. These aren't bad people, but they see their life deteriorating, they see questions with regard to what is happening through their employer, they wonder about their future, they

may have taken poor medication, but sometimes they just give up.

There is a quote by author Steve Goodyear, who had quite an inspirational quote. I hope, Mr. Speaker, if there are veterans listening tonight, they take this to heed.

Mr. Goodyear said: My scars remind me that I did indeed survive my deepest wounds. That in itself is an accomplishment. And they bring to mind something else too: they remind me that the damage life has inflicted on me has, in many places, left me stronger and more resilient. What hurt me in the past has actually made me better equipped to face the present.

That is a message I want veterans to hear, that having moments of depression or anxiety or worry are as normal as feeling tired or hungry, but we know when you get in a downward spiral, it gets worse.

I don't want veterans to give up. I don't want veterans or members of the military feeling that they have so much emotional distress, this is the only way to end it.

I understand the feeling, but I also know that, as members of the community and members who are veterans, we wrap our arms of hope around those veterans to say there is help out there, and we as Congress Members have an obligation to make sure we are providing those services.

It pains me when I think that sometimes we can come up with funding for all sorts of programs, but for this 1 percent who say, "I am willing to take a bullet for you, I am willing to die to defend my country, its Constitution, and its flag," we as Congress ought to be able to say we are willing to put some money in to help you get more services.

Also some advice for those veterans who may be listening: It is extremely important to follow a few guidelines in your own life, too, besides not giving up, but physical fitness that you were forced to do in the military and boot camp, and all those pushups and sit-ups and running and pullups we did, they had a reason; because when you stay physically fit, it affects your brain functioning and it improves it, and it is one of the things that is used to fight off depression and other problems.

Two, you have to have an attitude that is focused on positive things. You can make it. Many times, part of that attitude, an essential part, is a strong faith in God, a strong belief there, which gives you that attitude to say, "I can do it." Navy SEALs talk about the way you eat an elephant is one bite at a time; the way you temper steel is with fire; that pain is weakness leaving the body; that courage is something that is built through experience and focus. It is not something that just comes, but you build that attitude. So you have fitness, you have attitude.

Another part is sleep. Many studies I have seen—I think it was Dr. Germain at the University of Pittsburgh who did studies that said perhaps sleep is a

greater factor with post-traumatic stress, anxiety, and depression than anything else, and a big part of this is just getting enough sleep.

Members of Congress, we deal with this a lot in terms of our own hectic lifestyle, and we know many constituents, because of their workload, their anxiety in the family, they don't get enough.

It is essential. It doesn't necessarily mean you are crazy, you have problems, but that is an important part.

Further, training, knowing what you can do, whether it is in the workplace or the military, we know it is essential.

Making sure one eats right. It sounds obvious. I don't want to make this in any way sound small, but making sure one is actually eating a healthy diet is an important part of fighting off suicide, fighting off depression.

Then making sure that people are paying attention to relax, to rehabilitate themselves, to do their own personal checkup from the neck up to make sure they are dealing with these things.

None of those things I just mentioned require help from a doctor. All of those things are essential to healing and getting better.

When one reaches the point where you say, "You know what, I need a little help here; I need to call in support on the radio; I need a quick response team; I need to pop some smoke; get some help in here," that is okay. I want veterans to know not only is that okay, that is what we are supposed to do.

□ 1930

You call in help. We don't need dead heroes on the battlefield. We certainly don't need them in the streets or the homes. We need people who are saying: Understand, that even though it may be tough to get help, there is help out there. There is help out there. People want to facilitate and help you get better.

I don't want anybody to feel that this is the way to end emotional distress. It is a permanent solution to a temporary problem, and even if that problem seems to have been going on for years, I know people can and do get better. I have seen it time and time again. The soldier or veterans that thought: I can't go on; I have to give up. They can turn that life around and become a contributor.

One has a few choices. One can be a victim and say: You know what? I am under this giant boulder. I will never get better. The weight is too great. I am too weak. I cannot move on. There's no hope.

Or you can move on to another stage and say: I am going to be a survivor.

On the first part, you say: I am helpless because of what is happening. When you are a survivor, you say: You know what? I am going to move on despite what is happening. I will pray more. I will engage more. I will do

more. But every day I will wake up and commit more to get through that day to do something that is important and meaningful. I don't need to set up a goal of 10 years from now, but let me get through that day. Let me find some things I can do and focus. It is extremely important.

But beyond that, beyond being a victim or a survivor, is a third stage, and that is being a thriver, someone who says: I am going to make sense out of what I have done, and it is going to make me a stronger person.

What I said here in the quote from Steve Goodier where he says, "What hurt me in the past has actually made me better equipped to face the present," if I am in a tough situation, if I am in a situation where I, myself, look at it and I have despair and I lack hope for my own future and I turn towards someone, give me someone who has been there before. Give me a veteran. Give me a soldier who understands boot camp and what is it like to be yelled at and lack sleep. Give me a veteran who has been on the battlefield. Give me someone who has been out to sea and understands what it is like to be months without seeing your family. Give me someone who has been there and says: I made it; so can you.

I want veterans to have that sort of hope. We have our obligations in Congress: get more providers, make sure the VA is responsible. But since most people aren't near a VA, we can do a lot to help them.

I hope that this Veterans Suicide Recognition Month is something that sometime in the future we can put behind us and make it a thing of the past. We can do that if veterans themselves make those decisions to get help, and if we as the Congress make some decisions to get them that help, and society itself says: Stop having pity on them. Give them help out of affection and love and respect.

And, by the way, that respect also includes a lot of people who play professional sports, who have no idea what it is like to have someone shoot at you and try to kill you. Stand up. Have a backbone instead of a wishbone. A lot of veterans don't really want to hear that life is tough for you when you make more money in 15 minutes than they will make in a lifetime. Show some respect for those folks.

And then as we as a society recognize what they have given to the last full measure, we will be able to provide the kind of things they need and save some lives.

Too many times I have gone to a ceremony. You fold a flag 13 times and hand it to a grieving widow or widower. How much worse it is when they take their own life, because the stigma among the family is there was nothing else you could do, and all of us feel helpless when that happens. Let us make sure we are not part of that problem and, instead, we are part of the solution to celebrate and help our veterans so these things don't continue to happen.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman MURPHY, and thank you for partnering with me on this important effort this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from New York, THOMAS SUOZZI, who serves on the Armed Services Committee and has been a great addition to our caucus this year.

Thank you for joining us.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Congresswoman SINEMA and Congressman MURPHY and all of my Democratic and Republican colleagues for trying to bring attention to this very important issue.

I also want to thank Secretary Shulkin, who has announced his Get to Zero initiative to try and address this problem of 20 veterans every day committing suicide in our country.

Just today, as on many days, I saw a veteran who had lost both of his legs. It is common here in Washington, D.C., but it is common throughout every city and every town throughout our country that we see more and more veterans who have injuries. After 16 years at war, there are more and more veterans in our country who have been disabled.

With 20 veterans committing suicide every day, we know, however, that there are many injuries that we cannot see, injuries that veterans carry around by themselves at home, alone, in the dark of night, with nothing but their pain.

As Congressman MURPHY pointed out, 70 percent of the veterans of the 20 per day that commit suicide in our Nation—70 percent, 14 of the 20—do not have access to veterans benefits at the current time and do not utilize those services.

In fact, in our Nation today, there are 21 million veterans, approximately, and of those 21 million veterans, only 7 million have access to veterans benefits.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill, H.R. 2736, to suggest that what we need to do in our Nation is provide mental health benefits to every single veteran in our country, regardless of whether they were Active Duty, whether they were in the National Guard or in the Reserves, whether they were honorably discharged or less than honorably discharged. It is estimated that, since 2009, there have been 22,000 veterans with mental illnesses that have received other than honorable discharges. Arguably, most of those discharges were because of the same mental illness that they now carry around with them today.

Think of a veteran who is in crisis, a veteran who is contemplating suicide, a veteran who, as Congressman MURPHY described, is at the end of their rope and feels that there is no help and the only way to escape their pain is to commit suicide. Think of that veteran who reaches out for help at the VA.

Could you imagine going through the bureaucracy to figure out whether or not you were even eligible for services

if you weren't currently enrolled? You are seeking help, you are in the middle of a crisis, and you have got to fill out a form. You have got to determine whether or not you meet the criteria.

I am an attorney and a certified public accountant and a Member of the United States Congress. I read the requirements, and I couldn't figure them out. We need to make it much easier for anyone who has ever worn a uniform in any capacity whatsoever: in battles that we won, in battles that we lost, whether they were in combat or whether they worked on a truck, whether they were Active Duty, whether they were Reserve, whether they were in the National Guard. Every veteran should have access to mental health services during a crisis. We have to make it much simpler.

We heard a story tonight from Congressman JOHNSON, who talked about a veteran who was trying to get an appointment to get mental health services in the midst of a crisis, and the time was put off and put off and put off, and he finally got the appointment. And the Congressman was informed when he called the VA: Oh, we have good news; the appointment has been scheduled. The Congressman advised the VA that the veteran had already committed suicide.

So we have got a couple obligations, I believe. Number one is for those veterans who are currently utilizing VA services. We have to, as has been suggested by some of my colleagues, make sure we have the resources in place so that those veterans receive the services that they need on a timely basis, especially when they are in crisis, to make it as easy as possible for them to navigate the bureaucracy and get the help that they need.

Additionally, we need to make sure that those veterans who are not currently enrolled for veterans services and veterans benefits are made eligible for mental health services, certainly in crisis conditions, so that when someone reaches out to them, they are embraced with the loving arms of their country, as manifest in the VA, and they are brought in and cared for and helped to navigate through that crisis in their life.

There will be talk about how much it is going to cost. There will be a challenge as to whether or not we can afford to take care of these men and women who have served our country and are now facing this crisis in their life.

But I would guarantee you that any American in this country would say that we have to expend any cost for every veteran because there is no higher obligation in this Nation than taking care of the men and women who have worn our uniform, no greater obligation in this country. We can never forget the vet.

I want to thank Congresswoman SINEMA for inviting me here tonight to talk about my bipartisan bill, H.R. 2736, and for helping to bring attention

to this very serious crisis in our country.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman SUOZZI, for your commitment to taking care of veterans in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from California, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY.

Congressman JULIA BROWNLEY has served on the Veterans Committee for 5 years now and is the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee for Veterans. She has been doing a yeoman's amount of work to help ensure that our veterans get the care they need when they return home.

Congresswoman, thank you for joining us again.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding to me and for organizing this Special Order hour and bringing attention to this very, very important topic.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today, both Republicans and Democrats, because addressing this epidemic of veteran suicide is the highest priority for Members of both parties.

Congressman SUOZZI talked about the fact that Dr. Shulkin, the VA Secretary, has made this his top clinical priority; and by shining a clear light on this topic, I hope we can finally reduce the stigma around mental health issues and be clear about the significant work that still needs to be done to address this devastating epidemic.

We need to do more because 20 veterans commit suicide each day, veterans like Sara Leatherman and Linda Raney and Katie Lynn Cesena. As Congressman Murphy already pointed out, it is also estimated that only 6 of those 20 veterans were receiving VA services.

The VA provides some of the most comprehensive mental healthcare and resources in the Nation, and we need to encourage more veterans to seek care that is available, and we must be ready for them.

We do need more providers, and I support Congressman MURPHY and Congressman SCOTT and others who are advocating for more providers within the VA.

But, unfortunately, whether it is a lack of providers, long wait times, or not enough resources devoted to outreach, we face a serious issue with getting veterans set up with the care that they need. The VA took an important step forward earlier this year by expanding access to its mental healthcare for veterans with other than honorable discharges. That was the right thing to do and the right step, but much more must be done.

One important component of reducing veteran suicide is to better understand which programs have been most successful. The Clay Hunt Act and my bill, the Female Veteran Suicide Prevention Act, required an independent analysis of the VA's suicide prevention and mental health programs to find out what works.

It is critical to break this data up based on gender because, tragically, recent VA data indicates that women veterans are 2½ times more likely to take their own lives than civilian women. Actually, that is a better statistic than last year, because last year it was 6 times more than civilian women. But the reason why that has been reduced, tragically, is because the number of suicides amongst civilian women has increased.

As the population of female veterans continues to grow, the VA needs to recognize their unique experiences and provide the quality healthcare that will address this suicide epidemic. It is clear that women on the battlefield experience the same kind of trauma that men experience on the battlefield, and that may be a very similar experience, but we know that women's experience in the military serving our country can be very, very different, and we need to understand how best to treat both women and men.

□ 1945

In closing, please let me remind veterans and those who love them that the VA operates a confidential call line that is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Please call. If veterans are listening tonight, please call and have the courage to, if you need that support, make that call your first step. And any veteran and any family member can call.

That phone number is 1-800-273-8255, and then you press number 1. You can also send a text message at 838255. Please, please, if you are in need, please reach out and make this call.

Please know that we are here for you. We are fighting for you. Give us a chance to help you.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BROWNLEY for her dedication not just to this event every year, but to taking care of veterans at home and here in Washington.

I thank all of the colleagues from both parties who joined us this evening. Our thoughts are with all the families who have lost a loved one to suicide. But our efforts to end veterans' suicide do not end today or even this month. We are committed to continuing this fight to ensure that our veterans always know that they have a place to turn.

We can do more. We need a VA that provides real and meaningful help to veterans in need; a VA that puts veterans first and works aggressively with community providers to improve the quality and accessibility of care. We need a VA that is transparent and open to restore the trust and credibility it has lost. The VA can and must do better. No one deserves our gratitude and respect more than those who put their lives on the line for our freedom. And when the VA fails, our heroes suffer.

We, who enjoy freedom every day, thanks to the sacrifices of our military servicemen and -women, must all step up to end the epidemic of veteran suicide.

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

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (during the Special Order of Ms. SINEMA). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mrs. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3819. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

REQUISITES FOR IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to make one point. That one point is that a President need not be convicted of a criminal offense to be impeached; in fact, need not be charged with a criminal offense; need not be charged with a statutory offense; need not be charged with a codified offense to be impeached.

But before I make this point, Mr. Speaker, I have to acknowledge that I am always in awe of this well, and I don't take for granted this great opportunity that has been accorded me to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I believe that those of us who have been so blessed should acknowledge our blessings. This is a blessing.

Mr. Speaker, there are many people who don't have this opportunity, so I am going to take one liberty before going into my message. I just want people to know what I see as I stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

As I look forward, Mr. Speaker, I would have those who have not had the opportunity to stand here to know that there is above the doors at the second level a depiction of Moses the Lawgiver.

I would have people know, Mr. Speaker, that behind me, of course, is the flag of the United States of America.

And I would have persons know, Mr. Speaker, that we have these two podiums, and that, typically, Democrats

will occupy this side and Republicans the other. We can go to either side. There is no requirement that I stand where I am standing. I can stand at many other places in this room.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want people to know that this is a special place, and I am honored to have the opportunity to stand here tonight and to speak to the issue of a President not having the necessity of committing a crime to be impeached. There is no requirement that a crime be committed. There is no requirement that a statutory offense be violated.

Let's take, for a moment, a look through the vista of time. Let us go back to the Constitutional Convention, and let us hear now the words of George Mason. George Mason reminded his colleagues that no one should be above justice. His words were: "Shall any man be above justice?"

These words were put before his colleagues because, at the time, they were considering what they could do to deal with the possibility of a runaway Presidency. What could they do? How could they stop it? What would be the methodology by which a President could be extricated from his position?

And they had good reason to give consideration to this, Mr. Speaker. They had good reason because the President was probably the most powerful person in the country. The President would be the most powerful person in the country. The President is the Commander in Chief of the military. The President has the awesome power to pardon anyone, saving himself.

So the question becomes: How do you remove a President from office?

This is what they had to grapple with. And, of course, they considered a judicial process. They considered persons who might be a part of a jury. They considered these things.

The Federalist Papers, if you would care to read, will give you a rendition of what their thoughts were. Start with Federalist Paper No. 65.

But they considered these things, and they concluded that the process should not be judicial. They concluded that if a President is to be removed from office, it should be by persons who are in the political arena. They concluded that this should be something that would be, in fact, political, not judicial. They concluded that a President need not commit a crime to be removed from office.

I am emphasizing this, my dear friends, because there is a lot of confusion about this question. And if you would care to read something that could summarize what I am saying, you might look at an article that was written by a person with the Cato Institute, Gene Healy, August 7, 2017, styled "The Overcriminalization of Impeachment." I would commend it to you. Please read it if you want to read a good summary of what impeachment is all about.

So they had to grapple with this question, and they concluded that it

would be a political one, not a judicial question. And in so doing, in concluding that it would be a political one, they incorporated into the Constitution Article II, section 4—Article II, section 4 of the Constitution—that addresses the question of impeachment.

And in so doing, at some point after the codification and ratification of the Constitution, there was a person to be impeached. The first person was a Federal judge, Judge John Pickering. Judge Pickering was not accused of committing a crime. There was not an allegation that he committed a crime.

If you read the Articles of Impeachment, you will find that Judge Pickering, once he was convicted, was convicted, generally speaking, for having loose morals and intemperate habits, not a crime. But the questions did deal with morality.

Shall any man be above justice?

Not above the law. The law codified. Justice carries with it a certain amount of morality.

Shall any man—and today I would say "any person"—be above justice? Shall any person be above justice?

The Framers of the Constitution concluded that Article II, section 4 would address it, and they, themselves—a good many of them—were there when the first person was impeached in 1804, Judge John Pickering.

So for those of you who are believers in the original intent, the best way to ascertain the original intent of the Framers would be to look at what the Framers did when they had the opportunity.

What did Madison do?

Madison, the father of the Constitution, it is said, and other Framers who were actually there when Article II, section 4 was put in place, found that Judge Pickering, who committed no crime or no allegation of a crime being committed, with reference to his impeachment, should be impeached because of moral reasons and an intemperate habit or habits.

Mr. Speaker, I mention these things because it is important for us to understand that we have made a mistake. We have made a mistake in that we have outsourced—this is from Gene Healy, by the way—the responsibility of investigating the acts of a President to the executive branch itself.

Think for just a moment, dear friends. The Justice Department is an arm of the executive branch. We in Congress have outsourced the investigation to the executive branch by and through the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, that can give the appearance of impropriety. We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. It could look to some like that outsourcing has created a circumstance by which the chief executive, the President, could influence the Attorney General. That is the way it could look.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the intent is that we have in the Constitution, Article II, section 4. That is

not the intent. The intent was for the Judiciary Committee in the Congress of the United States of America to investigate. That is where the power to investigate lies, because it is for impeachment.

By outsourcing it to the executive branch, such that the Justice Department might perform dysfunction, we give the appearance that impeachment requires the commission of a crime, because that is what the Justice Department is looking for, criminality, not morality. The Justice Department wants to know what crime was committed, under what circumstances.

And too many people believe that if the Justice Department does not find that a crime was committed, then there is no impeachable offense. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker.

Regardless as to what a Justice Department concludes, regardless as to whether a good lawyer would bring charges by way of something from what the Justice Department concludes, the Congress of the United States of America still has the power, the prowess, the potency, if you will, to impeach, notwithstanding any finding of a Justice Department, notwithstanding any conclusions of the Justice Department, because it is not the responsibility of the Justice Department to investigate and then pass it on to the Congress with some recommendation. That is not their responsibility. That is the Judiciary Committee and the Congress of the United States of America.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have given this false impression that somehow there must be an offense committed. But, Mr. Speaker, I assure you that it is not the case, and the evidence is there for those who care to read the article that I have called to your attention. It is a short read.

Or if you care to read the Federalist Papers, Federalist Paper No. 65, you can read some of the conclusions that Madison and others have presented.

□ 2000

This is something that is important to this country. So I am standing here in the well of the House tonight to make one point, a place that I am in great awe of, a place that I consider sacred. I am standing here in the well of the House tonight to make the point that a President need not commit a crime, a statutory offense, to be impeached. Impeachment belongs in one place, and one place only, and that is right here where I stand now, in the House of Representatives.

If the House of Representatives, upon receiving articles of impeachment, should vote to impeach, that means that a President would be indicted. It does not mean that the President—the 218 votes, assuming all persons in the House are present. It doesn't mean that the President is going to be removed from office.

Impeachment does not mean removal from office. Impeachment means that

the President must now face a trial in the Senate, to be presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. That is what impeachment does. It moves it along.

And, by the way, there is no requirement that you assure anyone that you can get the votes necessary to impeach to bring an impeachment before the House. A privileged resolution to impeach does not necessitate your being able to prove before you present it that you are going to prevail with it. That is not the case.

If you can think of it in terms of the real world, while this is real—we say that term loosely, I assure you. If you think in terms of the world beyond these walls where a person might be indicted, in this country, every day, people are indicted who are not convicted. So impeachment is not tantamount to conviction. Impeachment merely means that there is reason now for the Senate to take up this cause.

The Senate, upon taking up the cause, can find the President not guilty or guilty. If the President is found guilty, the President is removed from office. There is no other punishment. The President is removed from office. After the President is removed from office, if the Justice Department or some other agency, some other arm of the government concludes that the President has committed a criminal offense, then a President would be prosecuted.

Now, there is some debate amongst some constitutional scholars as to whether or not a President can be prosecuted while the President still holds office. I think most of them would agree that it would happen after the President leaves office, but that is a debate that I don't care to enter.

My point is the President would be removed from office. Now, that is important to consider because removal from office is not punishment. Criminal acts have punishment upon conviction. The President is not punished. The President is removed from office. That is not considered punishment. The President does not face punishment upon being convicted of impeachment. The President is removed from office.

Now, that, in and of itself, is not something that I believe we should take lightly. I think it is serious, but it is not tantamount to punishment.

For those of you who may just be joining us for this statement that I am making tonight, I have taken this position tonight in the well of the Congress of the United States of America for one reason: to make the point that a President need not be charged with a criminal offense to face impeachment in the Congress of the United States of America. The Constitution doesn't require it. The Framers did not make that an issue when they impeached the first person, Judge Pickering, and it is not an issue to the extent that most of the people who have been impeached have not been charged with a criminal of-

fense—not, N-O-T, charged with a criminal offense.

I close with this. The Framers, very much concerned about a runaway President, runaway Presidency, very much concerned about the awesome amount of power that they were according one person: the power to be commander of all of the Armed Forces; the power to send persons into battle; the power to send people, literally, in harm's way such that many might not return; the power to impeach, nearly with impunity—not with absolute impunity, but nearly with impunity. There are some opportunities for the President to provide a person not with impeachment, but with exoneration for a crime, and that President could be impeached for the way that exoneration took place, depending on the relationship that the person had with the President.

But the point is impeachment is there because it is an awesome power that we have given the President; and because we have given the President this awesome power, it is important that we have a check on the President that does not require the commission of a crime.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the generosity of this Special Order. I thank the leadership as much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 870. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to implement Medicare payment policies designed to improve management of chronic disease, streamline care coordination, and improve quality outcomes without adding to the deficit; to the Committee on Ways and Means; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1028. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 810. An act to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 26, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3110. To amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the

independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

The proceedings held before the House convened for legislative business are as follows:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2017 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Martin Frost, vice president of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, at 8 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of history, we thank You for this day when former Members return to Congress to continue in a less official manner their service to our Nation and to this noble institution.

May their presence here bring a moment of pause where current Members consider the profiles they now form for future generations of Americans.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Bless all former Members who have died since last year's meeting, 33 in all. May their families and their constituents be comforted during a time of mourning and forever know our gratitude for the sacrifices made in service to the House.

Finally, bless those here gathered that they might bring joy and hope to the present age and supportive companionship to one another. Together, we call upon Your Holy Name now and forever.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Martin Frost 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.

Mr. FROST. The Chair now recognizes the president of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, the Honorable Cliff Stearns from Florida, to address the Members.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker and Father, thank you for those very welcome comments. I think all of us, when we come on the House floor, we feel keenly the fact of this beloved country and how much we respect our positions as former Members of Congress.

Thank you, Martin. It is always a distinct privilege to be back in this revered Chamber and to see so many of my good friends and former colleagues here. On behalf of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, I appreciate the Speaker's invitation to return to this wonderful place and to present to the Congress

Former Members of Congress' 47th annual report.

I will be joined by some of our colleagues in reporting on the activities, finances, and projects of our organization since our last report a little over a year ago. But first I would like to ask the Clerk to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following former Members answered "present":

Mr. Alexander of Arkansas
 Mr. Baird of Washington
 Ms. Christensen of the Virgin Islands
 Mr. Coyne of Pennsylvania
 Mr. DiGuardi of New York
 Mr. Edwards of Texas
 Mr. Frost of Texas
 Mr. Gerlach of Pennsylvania
 Mr. Glickman of Kansas
 Mr. Hertel of Michigan
 Mr. Hochbrueckner of New York
 Mr. Horsford of Nevada
 Mr. Konnyu of California
 Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina
 Mr. Lungren of California
 Mr. Maffei of New York
 Ms. Morella of Maryland
 Mr. Rahall of West Virginia
 Mr. Roth of Wisconsin
 Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut
 Mr. Sarpalius of Texas
 Mr. Skaggs of Colorado
 Mr. Slattery of Kansas
 Mr. Stearns of Florida
 Mr. Tanner of Tennessee
 Mr. Turner of Texas
 Mr. Walsh of New York
 Mr. Weller of Illinois
 Mr. Zeliff of New Hampshire

Mr. FROST. The Chair announces that 29 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Frost, thank you very much, and I would also indicate the former members of the European Union are all accounted for and present here, and we welcome all of them here especially.

I want to thank all of you for joining us today. As I prepare for today's report, I want to give you a little quote from Aristotle that goes back 2,500 years. He was asked: What would be the best form of life one could live? He replied that "the best form of life, the Eudaimonia outcome, given all that, would be the life of the good lawgiver."

He didn't mention the richest person, nor the most spiritual man, but the legislator. For all of us, service in this remarkable building was the pinnacle of our professional lives, and I am very proud that through the Former Members of Congress we can continue, in a very small measure, the public service that brought us here to Congress in the first place.

My colleagues, our Association was chartered by Congress, and one requirement of that congressional charter is for us to report once a year to Congress about our activities.

Incidentally, in 2016, there were approximately 1.8 million not-for-profit organizations in the United States. Of that number, right around 100 are congressionally chartered, and those in-

clude such outstanding organizations as the USO and the Boy and Girl Scouts of America. Former Members of Congress, therefore, is in very exclusive and prestigious company, and we take the mandate that comes with being congressionally chartered very seriously.

Our Association was founded in 1970 and chartered by Congress in 1983. It is a bipartisan, nonprofit, voluntary alliance of former United States Senators and Members of Congress standing for America's constitutional system, which vests authority in the people through their elected offices.

We work together to strengthen Congress in the conduct of its constitutional responsibility through promoting a collaborative approach to policymaking. We seek to deepen the understanding of our democratic system, domestically and internationally, and to encourage the citizenry through civic education about Congress and the importance of public service.

We are successful because Democrats and Republicans work together in a partnership for all of our programs and our many projects, including participation with current Members of Congress.

We are so proud to have been chartered by Congress, and we are equally proud that absolutely no taxpayer dollar is earmarked or expended to make all of our programs possible. Everything we do, and you will hear about many of our activities in a short while, is financed via grants and sponsors, our membership dues, and our annual fundraising gala. Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, and our most recent annual audit by an outside accountant confirmed that we are running the Former Members of Congress in a very fiscally sound, responsible, and transparent manner.

We are successful because former Senators and Representatives come together, across party lines, for the good of our organization. They all believe in our mission, and they continue to have the public servant's spirit at heart.

Former Members of Congress, in 2016, donated over 6,500 hours of energy, wisdom, mentoring, and expertise. All of these activities were donated pro bono. No former Member received any kind of honorarium to go on a Congress to Campus visit or participate in any Former Members of Congress' programs. Your only remuneration is the knowledge that you are giving back, that serving in Congress was a unique privilege, and that it comes with a mandate to teach the next generation.

Before I report on specific activities, as your Association's president, I want to thank all the Members who have contributed their time and expertise to make our organization such a success. So on behalf of the Former Members of Congress, thank you wholeheartedly for your participation.

Many of you have joined us for several years on this occasion. There will be numerous programs and projects which, by now, you have become quite

familiar with. This is a sign of the Former Members of Congress' stability and purpose. We are extremely proud of our 50-year history of creating lasting and impactful programs that teach about Congress and representative government, and our ability to take long-standing projects and expand them and improve upon them.

In addition to hearing about programs we have conducted for many years, you will hear from us about a new vision we have for this organization. For over a year now, our Association has engaged in a very detailed, in-depth strategic planning process which has set us off for a very exciting path.

This process was led by a strategic planning professional who has worked in this field for decades, has written extensively on management and organizational success, and has served clients, including many Fortune 100 companies. His name is Mark Sobol, and he made the service of his company, Longwave Partners, available to us pro bono, because he so strongly believes in our former Members organization, that it can play an integral and impactful role in reconnecting citizens with their government, and also showcasing that public servants, no matter what the party label is, are eager to work together for the good of this country.

Our work with Mark and Longwave included our board of directors, countless former Members of Congress, our excellent staff, and numerous other stakeholders. It resulted in a vision for Former Members of Congress that outlines the next 3 to 5 years and has, as its core, four strategic principles: We will provide forums for dialogue that will strengthen bipartisan relationships here on Capitol Hill; we will become recognized nationwide as an unparalleled resource for the United States Congress; we will be a champion for public service and an advocate on behalf of Congress; and we will create internal mechanisms for maximum impact.

Sincerely, I want to thank Mark for his invaluable leadership on this transitional, transformative undertaking, and I also want to thank my colleagues for being so engaged in this exciting progress.

I include the Former Members of Congress' strategic plan for the RECORD.

THE UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(Cliff Stearns, President; Martin Frost, Vice President; Tim Petri, Secretary; Karen Thurman, Treasurer; Barbara Kennelly, Past President)

INTRODUCTION

We are engaged in a strategic planning process to deepen the impact and shape of the future of the US Association of Former Members of Congress—FMC. We continue to believe that the current political climate and dysfunction is preventing Congress from functioning at its highest possible level. This condition has compelled FMC, a Congressionally chartered 501(c)(3) non-profit, to re-evaluate its mission and identify those opportunities that will deepen the positive contribution we are making toward a more civil

and productive political discourse in our nation.

With the input of a bipartisan group of more than twenty former Members over the summer, as well as staff and “friends of FMC”, we convened meetings in the fall of 2016 and early January 2017 to create a mission and strategic themes for FMC that would serve us and our country well into the future. Since that time, we have assembled staff to build the comprehensive strategic plan we will deploy this year and beyond.

Ahead, are the results-to-date of our collective efforts.

MISSION STATEMENT

FMC is a bipartisan, nonprofit, voluntary alliance of former United States Senators and Representatives, standing for America’s Constitutional system, which vests authority in the people through their elected representatives.

FMC: Working to strengthen the Congress in the conduct of its Constitutional responsibility through promoting a collaborative approach to policy making.

FMC: Seeking to deepen the understanding of our democratic system, domestically and internationally, and to encourage the citizenry through civic education about Congress and public service.

THE 9 STRATEGIC THEMES DEVELOPED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SENIOR STAFF AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

- 1) Embrace the whole “Congressional Family”
- 2) Collaborative Partnerships
- 3) Community Outreach and Programming
- 4) Showcase Good Governance
- 5) Build our Brand
- 6) Elevate and Enhance Media Presence
- 7) Working Together for Congressional Success
- 8) Celebrate Bipartisanship
- 9) Build Bipartisan Relationships

THE 4 CORE STRATEGIES DEVELOPED BY STAFF TO TRANSLATE FMC’S MISSION INTO ACTION

- 1) Provide forums for dialogue that build and strengthen relationships in support of a healthy representative democracy.
- 2) Elevate and streamline our brand so that our accumulated wisdom and convening power is recognized as a reputable and unparalleled resource on the U.S. Congress.
- 3) Be a champion for public service that is based on respect and collaboration.
- 4) Develop FMC for maximum impact and efficiency.

CORE STRATEGY 1: PROVIDE FORUMS FOR DIALOGUE THAT BUILD AND STRENGTHEN RELATIONSHIPS IN SUPPORT OF A HEALTHY REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

Purpose: Strengthen and expand existing programs that build across-the-aisle relationships for current Members of Congress as well as Congressional staff; showcase good governance that is based upon bipartisanship and civility; reconnect citizens with their representative democracy by bringing Congress back into the community.

Specific Actions:

A. Programming. Redefine programming portfolios to fall into easily recognizable categories, for example group all exchange programs, group all Capitol Hill programs, group all non-DC programs rather than current labels.

- 1) Build partnerships with like-minded organizations that offer programs which align with FMC’s mission.
- 2) Identify vital themes and streamline programming into consistent and recognizable groups and develop cohesive schedule of events
- 3) Streamline staff responsibilities and portfolios to group programs in a more coherent way.

4) Expand Congress to Campus model to other constituencies by marketing events better, incorporating social media and modern technology such as an updated website, and using modern technology to keep constituencies involved.

5) Make more concerted effort to have Statesmanship Awards Dinner celebrate true bipartisanship and build coherent year-round programming around event theme.

6) Increase public service element of annual and regional meetings by incorporating FMC programming and telling FMC’s story to our own membership in a more compelling and cohesive way, which will also aid in recruiting FMCs to be more active.

7) Expand programming impact and ability to keep constituents involved following a program by building a cohesive schedule of events so that participants from one event can continue their interaction with former Members via a follow up event, for example a Congress to Campus visit is followed up by a webinar.

8) Find ways to incorporate technology into every aspect of FMC events, from marketing to registration, from tweets during event to creating platforms for follow up.

B. Regional Outreach. Develop a comprehensive plan for regional outreach to reach new constituencies.

1) Increase regional outreach based on FMC’s themes, for example bipartisanship or civics, and involve local media.

2) Incorporate as many FMC constituencies as possible into a regional program, for example by combining a Congress to Campus visit with a Congressional staff delegation, all involving local former Members.

C. Social Fabric. Broaden and enhance social activities to create relationships

1) Identify and create new forums by building collaborations and partnerships.

2) Enhance FMC presence by creating unique and inclusive events on Capitol Hill and at non-Congressional venues.

3) Bring together the different members of the “Congressional Family”: former Members, current Members, Congressional staff, FMC partners, etc.

CORE STRATEGY 2: ELEVATE AND STREAMLINE OUR BRAND SO THAT OUR ACCUMULATED WISDOM AND CONVENING POWER IS RECOGNIZED AS A REPUTABLE AND UNPARALLELED RESOURCE ON THE U.S. CONGRESS

Purpose: Vastly expand our reach and our impact; be an advocate on behalf of the Congress and on behalf of the value of public service; unify our leadership, membership and staff behind FMC’s core message.

Specific Actions:

A. Brand Identity. Unify and elevate FMC brand and marketing materials, both internal and external.

1) Decide whether “FMC” accurately describes the work of FMC.

2) Create consistent, unified visual brand for all FMC artwork, logos, letterhead, etc.

3) Create unified message and train everyone, including board and staff, to communicate the same points about FMC.

4) Develop cohesive schedule of events with same themes across programming.

B. Website. Have a more modern, dynamic and interactive site that better tells our story and is a more effective tool for staff.

1) Redesign current site.

2) Drive social media traffic to website and vice versa.

3) Make better use of partners and like-minded entities to expand outreach via social media and advertise FMC capabilities and programming.

C. Media. Build relationships with the media.

1) When appropriate, invite media to FMC events.

2) Train and deploy FMC board and senior staff to be issue experts and a resource for national, regional, and local media, while also telling FMC’s compelling story.

CORE STRATEGY 3: BE A CHAMPION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE THAT IS BASED ON RESPECT AND COLLABORATION

Purpose: Celebrate bipartisanship that is the unifying driving force behind FMC’s success; provide opportunities for an expanded number of former Senators and Representatives to continue their service to country via FMC programs; demonstrate the power of civility.

Specific Actions:

A. Involvement. Create a call-to-action on a national and regional basis to expand the present number of actively involved former Members, and create a pool of engaged Members in all regions of the country.

1) Focus on civic education to create a call-to-action that is regional and happens at the state level; raise Members’ engagement in FMC by giving them a real issue with real action items and real deliverables that can be applied across the country.

2) Organize regional meetings to gather former Members who are no longer in DC, engage them in FMC as an organization, educate them on FMC projects, issue call-to-action on civic education, and use these relationships to build a more actively involved membership in all regions of the country.

3) Give broader group of engaged stakeholders an opportunity to benefit the organization by expanding notion of “Congressional Family” to also include current Members, current senior staff, former senior staff, etc. via partnerships and collaborative efforts across the country.

B. Recruitment. Expand the number of former Members of Congress, both in the Washington, DC area and in all other parts of the country, who actively participate in the call-to-action through FMC programming and are willing to donate their time, expertise, leadership and funding to FMC.

1) Increase the degree of former Senator participation and active engagement.

2) Make recruitment a core element of all regional meetings as well as the DC-based annual meeting, utilizing these gatherings to focus much more on FMC’s programming and the need for membership support.

3) Showcase success by highlighting the impact specific former Members have made by participating actively in FMC programming.

4) Create regional hubs across the country where fully engaged FMC members can take a leadership role to recruit former colleagues in the area.

CORE STRATEGY 4: DEVELOP FMC FOR MAXIMUM IMPACT AND EFFICIENCY

Purpose: Streamline all of FMC’s resources—staff, funding, leadership—for greater impact; modernize programs and processes to capitalize on new technology, thus expanding our impact, but expending fewer of FMC’s limited resources.

Specific Actions:

A. Short-term resources. Refine our notion of where we spend our time and money in the short-term:

1) Develop a strategy specific to Congress to Campus visits that envisions an increased number of visits, a Steering Committee composed of FMC board members, and additional funding via a corporate or foundation sponsor.

2) Decline participating in projects by outside organizations if project does not meet the following test: Does the project further FMC’s mission? If no, decline. If yes, will we be compensated for FMC staff time and any other costs?

a. If yes, proceed only if staff time is available.

b. If no, is the project's purpose or potential for future FMC impact worth expending our own resources? If no, decline.

3) Communicate to outside groups that there is limited opportunity for short notice and ad hoc programming (it will emerge clearly after a 12 to 18-month calendar of events is created which time windows lend themselves for additional programming, and which do not).

4) Streamline program implementation procedures and create templates to eliminate redundancies across the organization.

B. Long-term resources. Refine our notion of where we spend our time and money in the long-term:

1) Examine benefit of hosting charitable golf tournament.

2) Examine benefit of hosting Life After Congress Seminar.

3) Eliminate current model of Congress Bundestag Seminar.

C. Organize. Create more effective and cohesive procedures:

1) Group programming into themes.

2) Streamline staff portfolios.

3) Elevate impact of board of directors.

4) Expand notion of "Congressional Family" and outside stakeholders.

5) Develop long-range calendar to implement cohesive message and common themes.

D. Review and Evaluate. Install an annual review process to evaluate implementation of this plan and whether the plan's objectives continue to be core strategies for FMC.

PLAN COMMENTARY

With current staffing and budget levels, we can:

A. Develop an across-the-organization unified visual brand to incorporate logo/look/marketing materials.

B. Via SKDKnickerbocker contract:

1) Develop consistent branding message.

2) Train board members and staff to communicate consistent message and deploy trained spokespersons to interact with local and national media outlets.

3) Develop social media strategy.

With additional funding, we can:

A. Redesign website.

B. Hire senior staff member as Director of Development to free other staff up for program creation and implementation instead of fundraising.

C. Develop recruitment strategy to incorporate regional outreach, DC-based former Member outreach, and marketing materials.

D. Develop new programs that are mission-specific, incorporate multiple themes we aim to address during a given year, can serve as a recruitment tool to bring additional former Members into the fold, and take advantage of the resources like-minded organizations offer via partnerships and collaboration; new projects could include:

1) Case studies of legislation that showcase across-the-aisle collaboration and resulted in high positive impact for the nation.

2) A national theme—civic education—that can be implemented regionally, thus creating a call-to-action and a common project for former Members and other stakeholders across the nation.

3) Programming focused on advocating on behalf of Congress and current Members, for example highlighting the need for Congressional Reform or shining a spotlight on the tremendous fundraising demands put on current Members.

4) Social events and travel for current Members and senior Congressional staff to build bipartisan relationships.

E. Hire junior staff member to assist with additional programming as well as support senior staff that service the needs of partners and collaborative projects.

F. Organize regional activities to recruit FMCs and to broaden the organization's national footprint/impact.

G. Offer additional programming in DC to build across-the-aisle relationships for current Members and senior Congressional staff.

H. Purchase hardware and software to make much better use of technology, for example to offer webinars, webcasts and podcasts; this could be an option for academic institutions (colleges, community colleges, high schools) to participate in a condensed Congress to Campus experience without the cost of travel or an administrative fee.

CROSSCUTTING THEMES FOR STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Communicate cohesive message.

A. Develop across-the-organization look.

B. Train staff and board to communicate unified message.

Create a stronger media presence by redesigning website and social media strategy.

A. Take advantage of technology to tell more compelling and interactive story.

B. Use technology to engage membership and program participants before, during and after an FMC event.

C. Make use of the SKDKnickerbocker opportunity.

Develop cohesion across the organization.

A. Sync programs into cohesive themes.

B. Sync long-range calendar of events.

C. Redefine staff portfolios.

D. Redefine deliverables and expectations of board of directors.

Build partnerships and opportunities for collaboration.

A. Expand successful programs to new venues.

B. Expand internal definition of "Congressional Family" and FMC stakeholders.

C. Build FMC footprint that goes beyond DC.

D. Serve partners by offering FMC as a resource, and take advantage of partners to utilize their projects to further FMC's mission.

Elevate FMC from a DC organization to a national organization.

A. Recruit former Members from all parts of the country to support the organization's mission and diverse range of programs.

B. Bring broad range of FMC programming together for a regional project.

C. Empower regional stakeholders—former Members, local media, local Congressional staff, etc.—to take advantage of FMC as a resource.

Mr. STEARNS. Already, this work has had a tremendously positive impact on us. I am extremely pleased to announce that, since our last meeting, as a direct result of our strategic plan, we have secured three new grants: the Democracy Fund; the Hewlett-Packard Foundation's Madison Initiative; and just last week, the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission. These outstanding sponsors join our long-term partners with whom we have worked for many years, including the Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, and The German Marshall Fund of the United States.

In addition to this fundraising success, or more accurately because of it, we have added four additional staff members to the Former Members of Congress team, many of whom you will meet throughout the day.

We have also launched a new program aimed at connecting, on a bipartisan basis, current district directors from throughout the country with each other to work together on specific

issues and benefit from hearing each other's best practices.

As you know quite well, district directors are at the very forefront of our representative democracy and tend to be the first interaction between a constituent and his or her Member. The district director functions as a mediator, bridging the gap between the national policy and the district's interest. But the very nature of being in the district means that the congressional professionals do not have the same opportunity their colleagues in D.C. have: to get to know their counterparts in other offices, to work collaboratively on issues of common concern, and to build a network of contacts among their peers.

Thanks to expanding on existing grants and winning new foundation support, we have conducted a number of district director specific staff delegation trips and now have brought together, under one umbrella, dozens of district directors from all parts of the country and, of course, on both sides of the political aisle. District director study tours provide an exciting opportunity to build bipartisan relationships, share best practices, and, with the international travel, build transatlantic relationships.

In March, a bipartisan group of 10 district directors from around the country traveled to Stuttgart, Germany, to study security issues, dual vocational education and apprenticeships, trade, and foreign investments.

In April, a bipartisan group of six district directors traveled to Houston to learn about the energy industry and workforce development.

In June, a bipartisan group of six district directors went to Boston and focused on the tech industry and education.

This October, another bipartisan group of six district directors will be going to Iceland to focus on alternative energy, the environment, and natural resources.

After all these trips, we can confirm that district directors greatly appreciated and found immense value in the opportunity to not only learn about the organized topic but to share the experience with other district directors, particularly from the other side of the aisle.

One statement heard again and again, "I have that same issue, what did you do about it?" These district directors through FMC have a chance to really bond, regardless of what party, where in the country they are from or what the demographics of their constituency is.

For 2018, we already have confirmed another district director trip to Germany and to Japan. We also plan for other activities to engage district directors, including possibly two more domestic trips and invitations to all Former Members of Congress regional meetings.

Regional meetings are another outgrowth of our strategic plan. One clear refrain of the strategic planning sessions that we had that resonated loud

and clear was that we need to get outside of Washington more. If we are going to be supportive of Congress, we need to make sure we are not a voice just heard in D.C.

Former Members live outside of Washington. Current Members are spending much more time in their districts. It is, therefore, critical that we participate more outside of D.C. and with the congressional staff that is outside.

Since our last report to Congress, we already have hosted three regional meetings, with a fourth one planned for later this year. These meetings are a day long and not only provide an opportunity for former Members to come together, but we also provide them an opportunity to share their knowledge and expertise with the younger generation by building into our program outreach to a college campus, or a high school, for example.

We were in Los Angeles late last year and included a meeting with UCLA students. In April, we went to Chicago, where a group of former Members held a panel for Northwestern students. In July, we visited Boston, where a group of former Members and a visiting delegation of district directors met with interns in the Massachusetts State House.

We have a regional meeting in Orlando on the schedule for November 7th and have arranged for a mini Congress to Campus visit to the University of Central Florida. In addition to bringing together former Members from the region, we extend invitations to State Representatives, district directors, local academics, and others in the congressional family.

We plan to crisscross the country with regional meetings so that we can both engage our membership and meet their needs, as well as expand our mission to deepen the understanding of our democratic process and to engage the citizenry through civic education about Congress and public service.

Our last new development should be highlighted: we are issuing to our Members a call to action on the crucially important aspect of civic education. We have formed a partnership with the Lou Frey Institute at the University of Central Florida. As you are surely aware, civic education has been one of the most important issues our dear friend Lou Frey has worked on since leaving Congress, and his institute has become a leading voice on this topic in my home State of Florida. Included in this partnership is the Civic Mission of Schools, which works hand in hand with the civic education initiative of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

We envision an extremely active role for former Members to play at the State level to be an advocate for civic education. Florida, of course, is a great example on how civics can be restored if there is a bipartisan consensus and commitment to make it happen.

In addition to this partnership, I am proud to share with you that we are in the process of taking our highly successful model of the international Con-

gressional Study Groups and translating it for the first time to a domestic issue: the Congressional Study Group on Civics.

Our vision is to bring together, under our umbrella, the bipartisan congressional family—Republicans and Democrats; former Members and current Members; chiefs of staff currently working on the Hill and some who left the Hill and are now in communities all over the country; and our newest constituency, district directors for current Members—all of us working together under the umbrella of the Congressional Study Group on Civics to promote civic education and make a better understanding of our representative democracy and a much greater knowledge base when it comes to Congress and the work of Members of Congress. This new undertaking is in the very beginning stages, and I look forward to reporting to you next year on our progress.

One goal of this civic outreach is to remove the stigma that now is attached to the word "politician." John Buchan had a quote. He was an English scholar; he wrote 42 books; he had numerous publications; he was elected to parliament in England at the beginning of the 20th century; and he was appointed Governor General of the Assembly in Canada by the King.

This is what he said: "Public life is regarded as the crown of a career, and to young men and women, it is the worthiest of ambitions. Politics is still the greatest and most honorable adventure."

If our civic education outreach can reintroduce this appreciation of public service in this next generation, then we will have succeeded.

Civic education and this commitment to reaching out to students across the country are just two of the reasons we will honor our colleague David Skaggs later today. I hope you all will join us during our luncheon in David's honor as we recognize his exemplary service to this country with our 2017 Distinguished Service Award.

As many of you know, David was an officer in the Marine Corps in Vietnam before seeking public office. He served in the Colorado State Legislature and, of course, here in the House of Representatives for six terms. He now serves with Martin Frost and Vin Weber on the board of the National Endowment for Democracy. He and his lovely wife, Laura, will be with us during lunch today.

Before I yield to David to report on our Congress to Campus and Civics projects, I hope all of you will join me in a round of applause for our 2017 Distinguished Service honoree, David Skaggs.

Mr. SKAGGS. Cliff, thank you very, very much for your very kind words. I am honored to receive this award. It is especially important because it comes from my peers, and I am humbled, given that prior recipients of this award included such giants as Amo

Houghton and Lee Hamilton. My great thanks to you, the Executive Committee, and the board of directors.

I am here to talk a little bit about the Congress to Campus program that Cliff has already alluded to. It is our most impactful and important domestic program, and I am glad to report on it and also to add some thoughts about the state of civic education across America.

What a year Congress to Campus has had during 2016 and 2017. Under this program, bipartisan pairs of former Members visit college campuses for several days to speak to students from all disciplines in a variety of settings, large and small.

We have three goals: to promote public service in the next generation of Americans, to teach about Congress and the work of a Member of Congress in ways that political science doesn't often capture, and to engage students in a discussion about the issues of the day.

The format demonstrates that a Republican and a Democrat can have different points of view and opinions but still have a respectful debate looking for common ground and a path forward.

Last fall, during the election season, the Former Members of Congress sent teams to 16 campuses. We had an additional 14 visits during the spring term. It was the busiest academic year in the 35-year history of the program.

Former Members visited all over the U.S., from the University of Maine to Alcorn State in Mississippi and from the Naval Academy to Arizona State. There were also four international Congress to Campus visits.

Students come away with a better understanding of how Congress works and what the life of a Member of Congress is like. Sixty percent of the students report that their opinion of Congress improves after hearing from a bipartisan pair of former Members.

After hearing from such a visit, one student observed that Republicans and Democrats aren't completely at odds and that they can work together. That is certainly very different than the way the media portrays things. Another student came away with a sense of how important it was to be involved in public service.

In 2016, over 50 Members gave their time to speak to almost 7,000 students, not just at colleges in the Congress to Campus program, but also students in high school and middle school. I want to thank my colleagues on behalf of the Association for their participation in these many visits.

Special thanks to the Former Members of Congress staff, particularly Sharon Witiw, who is here in the Chamber, for nurturing this important program, for getting on us to participate and expanding it in partnership with our friends at the Stennis Center. We have come a long way since the years when a busy Congress to Campus year consisted of two or three visits per semester.

For these college audiences, we don't talk about how a bill becomes law but, rather, examine issues deeply and look into the politics of today's Congress. The program is civic education in practice.

I also need to report that more and more, during these visits, we encounter a lack of civic literacy, a lack of basic understanding of our Constitution and the structure and practice of American representative democracy. It seems to be getting more pronounced every year.

Our Association shares with many others across the country a growing concern about the current state of civic knowledge and skill. Just last week, the Annenberg Center at the University of Pennsylvania found in its survey that only a quarter of Americans can name all three branches of government and more than a third can't name any of the rights protected by the First Amendment.

Lack of this sort of basic civic knowledge and skills probably has a relationship to the current level of distrust in government and officeholders. This has led the Association to look for possible solutions.

Building on the civic ed admission of our Congress to Campus program, the Association now intends to play a larger role in addressing civic illiteracy by reaching younger audiences in middle and secondary schools.

A bipartisan group of our Association came together for strategic planning around this mission. Working with the Lou Frey Institute at the University of Central Florida, the campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools, and Tufts University and facilitated by Pete Weichlein's wife—is she here today, Pete? No. Okay.—we developed a plan for how former Members could be more actively involved.

This work has generated some exciting developments. Cliff has already shared the idea of a Congressional Study Group on Civics, which we intend to have bring together current Members, district directors, and chiefs of staff, bring them into our undertaking to advance civic learning and practice.

Last week, the Association participated in a groundbreaking national symposium on civics organized by our two partners, the campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools and the Lou Frey Institute, where funders and many civic organizations exchanged ideas and renewed their commitments to improving our common efforts to educate for democracy.

Pete and I were there and had the privilege, on behalf of our Association, to commit us to making civic education the centerpiece of the Former Members of Congress' domestic programs, and Pete will be on each and all of us to make good on that promise.

We have a steering committee of former Members committed to the effort. My friends and colleagues, George Nethercutt, Jim Gerlach, Bill

Sarpalius, Tom Coleman, Karen Thurman, Steve Horsford, and Mickey Edwards join me on that committee. We will convene soon to discuss what former and current Members can do together to make a difference and to issue a call to arms to our membership. Consider yourselves forewarned. I am looking at you, Dan Glickman.

By exemplifying bipartisanship and taking advantage of the networks we still have, former Members can make a tremendous contribution to addressing the core need of American democracy: preparing our young people for active citizenship. I look forward to reporting to you again next year on our progress.

More importantly, we need to engage all of you in this effort. Our people's lack of understanding of our own system of government has become pervasive, and it threatens the Republic. It explains much of what ails us politically.

Cliff, thank you very much for your leadership of the Association and for the opportunity to give this report.

Mr. FROST. Cliff, if we could suspend.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I have never spoken on this mike before, so I am going to give it a try. This is literally the first time I have spoken from this one.

Hey, Donna, how are you doing? Good to see you guys.

Greetings. Good to have you. Not much happening around here, pretty easy going, you know, slow moving, nothing controversial whatsoever. It is an interesting time, I can tell you that, one of these deals.

I came here in 1998 with many of you. I see so many familiar faces.

Good to see you, Dan.

And I would say what has changed this place in the 19 years I have been here is the internet. The internet has changed society. It has also changed the way Congress works—some good, some bad, and some in between. You are basically out there seeing that.

All I would ask you to do is, in your walks of life, in your spheres of influence, just help explain to the country how this place really, actually works. Because you hear sort of the cartoon version of it when you turn on TV. It is actually a place where people care, where people work hard, where people think, where people study, where people interact, and where they get along more often than not and we actually get things done.

At a time where faith in civil society and in our government is not very high, we could use a few more ambassadors helping express to the country that the foundation here is solid, it is strong, it is enduring, and it is going to persist.

When these microphones are turned off or when the TVs are turned off, we all actually get along pretty well. About 80 percent of the things that we

pass here, just like when you were here, are bipartisan. Now, clearly, we are going to have partisanship; clearly, we are going to have different viewpoints and passion. But at the end of the day, the system is strong; the system is going to work; the institutions are here; and the separation of powers is as valid and as potent as it ever was before.

I would just say: Welcome. It is great to see all these familiar faces. You look a whole lot happier than you probably did when you were here. Whenever I see Members of Congress after they have left, they look like they have aged like 5 or 10 years, and I think that goes for a lot of you.

I would say this: Help us be ambassadors for this institution, for this branch of government, to revive sort of civil respect for what we do here. I think we could all use a little bit of that, and it is just really nice to see you.

God bless you.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule. I know that you do have a few things to look after these days, and thank you for being here and recognizing the significance of this organization.

Mr. Stearns.

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and we are just delighted that you took the time to come speak with us.

David, thank you very much for that excellent report. I very much look forward to your remarks during lunch today.

My colleagues, as all of you know, our most active programming involves current Members of Congress from both parties and from both Chambers and, of course, our Congressional Study Groups. We conduct programs focusing on Europe and Asia. We bring current Members of Congress together with their peers and legislatures overseas, and we work with our Department of State to talk about representative democracy with audiences overseas, also.

Via the Former Members Association, I have met with numerous groups of legislators from other democracies who come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government, our form of democracy, and what is going on politically in the United States and on Capitol Hill.

These conversations and meetings are always a two-way street, and I learn as much, if not more, from our visitors as they do from me. Our Association has a longstanding partnership with a great NGO called Legacy International, bringing young professionals from the Middle East and North Africa to the United States.

Our most recent group completed their 6-week D.C. stay earlier in the year and was composed of young professionals from Tunisia and Morocco. Most of these visitors worked in the NGO sector in their countries, and they

came to the United States to learn about the interaction between government and the nongovernmental sector. It is truly a very enriching cross-cultural dialogue, and I am very pleased that FMC offers this opportunity to our Members and to their visitors.

As I stated earlier, the main international activity of our Association is housed with the Congressional Study Groups on Japan, Germany, and Europe. These are our programs that involve current Members of Congress as well as current senior congressional staff.

I now invite my good friend and predecessor, Connie Morella of Maryland, to report on this aspect of our international work.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Cliff, for the introduction and all of your comments, and particularly for your leadership of Former Members of Congress during this year. You have done a superlative job.

Well, as you know, Former Members of Congress works with all Members of the congressional family. Our network also includes current Members of Congress and their senior staff to promote a collaborative, bipartisan, and effective approach to policymaking both at home and abroad.

Our flagship programs for our colleagues who are still in office are the Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, and Europe. The Congressional Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges that strive to create better understanding and cooperation between the United States and our most important strategic and economic partners abroad.

Each study group has a membership roster of between 75 and 125 Members of Congress, and it is led by a bipartisan, bicameral pair of co-chairs who are currently in Congress. Our model celebrates active discussions among all participants, avoiding lengthy speeches or formal presentations, in order to create an atmosphere that promotes personal connections. We believe that the network of peers created via our programs have acted to renew and expand areas of mutual cooperation, especially in times of transition.

The Congressional Study Groups are not the only programs dedicated to this mission, but they are unique in their year-round outreach to Capitol Hill. Unlike other formats, we provide long-lasting staff support and maintain a well-respected reputation as independent and non-advocacy. As a result, our network attracts a large, diverse group of legislators and policymakers who are committed to international dialogue. What is most important for us is that they join the discussion.

A few highlights from the 114th Congress: We hosted 62 roundtables in Washington, D.C., which are the foundation of our programming. Maintaining a year-round outreach ensures that we are developing meaningful relationships instead of having occasional encounters.

108 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate and 204 senior congress-

sional staffers participated in at least one of those roundtables; most participated in multiple programs.

We also organized 12 study tours abroad for Members of Congress and senior congressional staff because we know that immersive travel experiences have immense value.

Each trip is an opportunity for mutual learning and sharing, as well as forming bonds, with meeting partners and within the bipartisan delegation itself, and we know that is important.

Already, our programming calendar in the 115th Congress has been busy. In the first 6 months of 2017, we have organized three study tours for Members of Congress and three study tours for senior congressional staff.

Our roundtables on Capitol Hill also recently welcomed several senior officials, including the German Federal Minister of Economic Affairs and Energy, the chairman and CEO of Luft-hansa, and a high-level delegation from the Japanese Diet.

I would like to acknowledge the service of all of our co-chairs for their hard work and dedication to these critical programs. Our co-chairs are true leaders, who not only serve in their role as official Study Group leaders, but are also called on by various embassies and outside organizations to speak on panels, attend roundtables, and meet with countries who have visiting delegations.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is led by Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, Representative CHARLIE DENT, and Representative TED DEUTCH. We thank the Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, for his service as a Senate co-chair until February 2017.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan is led by Senator MAZIE HIRONO, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Representative DIANA DEGETTE, and Representative BILLY LONG.

The Congressional Study Group on Europe is led by Senator JOHN BOOZMAN, Senator CHRIS MURPHY, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, and Representative PETER WELCH. We very much appreciate all their efforts in leadership.

I also want to mention that our work is not limited to the three main Study Groups on Germany, Japan, and Europe. For example, over the past 6 months, we have put a lot of energy into bringing Korea-focused programming to Capitol Hill. I don't have to tell you how important our relationship with South Korea is, and the many security and trade issues that shape this part of the world.

We, therefore, in addition to our ongoing focus on China, have commenced programming on Korea. We are very fortunate to have former Member Jay Kim chair this effort in Korea itself, and his leadership already has resulted in a number of incredibly informative Capitol Hill programs involving former and current Members.

The work of the Congressional Study Groups is complemented by our Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially fo-

cused on European nations, the Diplomatic Advisory Council is now comprised of approximately 30 ambassadors from four continents who advise and participate in our programming. Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogues is a very valuable addition to the Congressional Study Groups and provides a valuable outreach beyond our three Study Groups.

At the beginning of the 114th Congress, we also formed the Congressional Staff Advisory Council. As former Members of Congress, we know the value of good staff. I always say my rock and my staff, they support me. The Staff Advisory Council formally recognizes the mutually beneficial relationships we have in offices across Capitol Hill. We are as grateful for the staff who participate in and support our group programming as we are for the Members of Congress.

Finally, I would like to add a thanks to those individuals, organizations, and corporations whose patronage makes our work possible. In particular, I would like to recognize Ambassador Jim Zumwalt and Ms. Junko Chano of Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, Dr. Karen Donfried and Reta Jo Lewis of The German Marshall Fund of the United States, and Ms. Paige Cottingham-Streater of the Japanese-U.S. Friendship Committee for their tremendous support as institutional funders of the Congressional Study Groups in 2017.

Companies that belong to the 2017 Business Advisory Councils are: Allianz, All Nippon Airways, Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ, BASF, B. Braun Medical, Central Japan Railway Company, Cheniere Energy, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL, Evonik Corporation, Fresenius Medical Care North America, Fresenius SE, Hitachi, Honda, Lockheed Martin, Lufthansa German Airlines, Marubeni America Corporation, Mitsubishi Corporation (Americas), Mitsubishi Heavy Industries America, Mitsui, Nissan, Panasonic, RatnerPrestia, the Representative of German Industry and Trade, Sojitz, Toyota Motor North America, UPS, and Volkswagen of America.

Because of their financial support, our activities not only help to build vital bilateral relationships between legislatures, but also build bipartisan relationships within our own Congress. Mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are crucial, as you know, to solving pressing problems, whether at home or abroad.

As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided by the Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues who are still in office, and are proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach.

So I want to thank you, Cliff. I want to thank all of the Members who are here. Continuing these very important programs is important, and we thank you for that.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Connie.

Mr. Stearns.

Mr. STEARNES. Thank you, Connie, very much for that report, and thank

you also for the continued leadership that you have provided for the former Members of Congress. Your counsel is always appreciated and is invaluable.

I now will lead to another former president of our Association, Dennis Hertel of Michigan. Dennis, along with former Member Ken Kramer, has been the driving force behind a program that is incredibly near and dear to our hearts: our efforts to help severely wounded veterans returning from the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan.

We do so via our annual charity golf tournament called The Members—to avoid any confusion with The Masters—and we really have had a tremendous impact.

Dennis.

Mr. HERTEL. Thank you, Cliff.

Let me associate myself with Connie Morella's remarks. Your leadership of FMC has been exemplary, and your report today is a tribute to our great energy and commitment. On behalf of our Association, thank you very much, Connie.

I want to thank Speaker RYAN for what he said today about coming to visit us, but also talking about our being ambassadors to the Nation. I think we are, not only the Nation, but worldwide, about the Congress and how proud we are of the Congress and the democracy that we have here, and even with our great differences in today's world, how we carry on and represent the people and commend the Congress for doing so.

I am tremendously pleased to share with our colleagues an update on our charitable golf tournament. As Cliff mentioned, I, along with Ken Kramer, co-chair the event, which is now in its 11th year.

Back in 2006, we had low attendance. It was just a competitive match that we had between Republicans and Democrats out at Andrews Air Force Base and very private. We were dwindling in our attendance, and we thought maybe we could change this and make it into something effective for the community.

We were able to transform it into something that was fun but also, more importantly, inspirational, where the focus was not just on your golfing ability. I am the example. I am not a golfer. I have co-chaired this for 10 years with Ken now, but I am the worst duffer you could have out there, yet the Democrats still won even with me on their team this year.

It has become successful. As of today, the tournament has raised almost \$1.3 million to help veterans and their families deal with injuries sustained during the Afghanistan and Iraq wars.

The two beneficiaries of the money raised, Warfighters Sports, a division of Disabled Sports USA who helps with 120 different sports for their members across this Nation who have been injured in defending our country, and Tee it Up for the Troops, are two outstanding organizations that use adaptive sports as a way for severely wound-

ed veterans to reengage with their families and communities and get a bit of their prewar activity back into their lives. These guys go skiing, they go mountain climbing, horseback riding. You name it, they do it. We are so proud of the men and women and what they have accomplished.

We are proud that for the last 3 years, we have shared this honor of co-chairing the tournament with Congressman JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee, who I am sorry to see is retiring now—he has just been an excellent chairman and a great friend to all of us all these years—and Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas, who has just been an outstanding leader and is going to continue with us, I hope. He is just so enthusiastic in getting Members out there.

They are the ones who recruit the current Members of Congress, and they bug them and hassle them every week to get them out to our tournament. We have had more people, more Members at our tournament than other golf tournaments. There are so many different tournaments here in Washington that have Members play, but we have had the greatest turnout over the years.

It is unlike any other golf tournament. There is still a little friendly competition. As I said, the Democrats won this year. I can't say that enough, because we lost for the past 7 years prior. And, you know, Republicans belong to more country clubs than Democrats, anyway. I think they have more experience.

More importantly, we have had over 30 wounded veterans play this last year, and every year in our tournament, so many wounded veterans, and it is just inspirational.

I played with a veteran from Michigan, a young man who had been in Afghanistan 2 weeks on the Army police force there, and lost his leg in a bomb explosion. And he was out there playing golf. Just an outstanding golfer, outstanding American, and to share that day with him has just been an honor for all of us.

So we are already working now on the tournament for next year. It will be April of next year. We hope we get more former Members out. As I have said, we have done really well with current Members of Congress, but what we need is to get more former Members out. It doesn't matter our age or our ability. Even if you can just come out for the day and spend it with the veterans, you know, watching the match and having lunch and dinner and breakfast with the Members and, more importantly, the veterans, that is really worthwhile. If you bring your family out there too for a while, that is fine too. It is always at the Army and Navy Club, so it is convenient.

We finish early. We start early. We start at 8 and we finish about 4 in the afternoon, so we leave before the rush hour traffic so the Members can get back here for a vote. So we would love

to have you come out even for a few hours if you have the time.

Ken Kramer, Pete Weichlein and I back in 2006 wondered whether we could change our existing tournament to something more meaningful, and decided to transform the golf event from a highly competitive Members only tournament to a fun and inspirational fundraiser, where the focus was not on your golfing ability, but rather on coming together, on a bipartisan basis, former and current Members alike, for a great cause. I think I can speak for Ken and Pete when I say that we have succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. As of today the tournament has raised almost \$1.3 million to help veterans and their families deal with injuries sustained during the Afghanistan and Iraq wars. The two beneficiaries of the money raised, Warfighters Sports, a division of Disabled Sports USA, and Tee it Up for the Troops are two outstanding organizations that use adaptive sports as a way for severely wounded warriors to re-engage with their families and communities and get a bit of their prewar activity back into their lives.

Both Ken Kramer and I have had the honor to be cochair of this tournament for the past 10 years, and we are proud that the last three years we have shared this honor with Congressman Jimmy Duncan of Tennessee and Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas. JIMMY and GENE are instrumental in recruiting current Members to the tournament. This tournament is unlike any other golf tournament. Although there still is a little friendly competition with the Speakers Cup, which the Democrats won this year after several years of losing to the Republicans, the day is all about the vets. Over 30 wounded veterans played in the tournament. It is quite amazing to see a wounded warrior, for example, someone who has lost a leg, drive the ball like a pro, out-shooting everyone in the foursome, or be inspired with stories of the courage you hear while playing a round of golf with a warrior suffering from traumatic brain injury. The tournament we hosted earlier this year was our most successful yet, with the greatest number of players and the largest dollar amount raised, and we already are working on the next tournament in April 2018.

Before I yield the floor back to Cliff, let me thank him and Martin Frost for their incredible leadership on our annual gala event, the Statesmanship Awards Dinner. Cliff is FMC's president and Martin is the event's chairman. They work tirelessly on making the dinner a signature event here in D.C., and, more importantly, a huge successful evening for all of us.

As you all know, we do not receive any funding from Congress, as Cliff pointed out again this morning. Not a single taxpayer dollar is earmarked for any of our programs, which, in my opinion, is exactly the way it should be. We are independent, we raise our own money, and our former Members donate their time pro bono for all the different programs that we have. As Cliff went over, we had former Members donate to us an astounding 6,500 hours of pro bono public service, even without the need to cover an honorarium. Running all of our outstanding programs does cost a lot of money and staff time. Therefore, in addition to

foundation grants, the Statesmanship Awards Dinner is an incredibly important piece of FMC's budgetary puzzle.

Over the years, I have heard so many of our former Members talk about how much they appreciate our staff and how wonderful our staff is and how they accomplish what would take tenfold another staff to do. We think it is the best staff in Washington. That is saying a lot, considering all the other competitive nonprofits that are successful here in Washington.

So the way that we can show our appreciation for the staff and what they have accomplished and what they are doing for us and what they are doing for our country is this dinner. That is the one thing that we can all demonstrate our support at, because it pays their salaries. So if you appreciate what they do and you think they deserve a bonus, the best way to help them and to improve our Association is to help us sell tickets for this dinner.

Under Martin Frost's chairmanship this last year, our 20th annual dinner, we had the most successful event ever. It was getting to be kind of the same old thing, and Pete Weichlein, our executive director who spearheaded this effort, said let's change it up, let's move it to the Mellon Auditorium, which has been a tremendous, majestic setting, and let's have some outside awardees that we honor too. Let's not just have a boring program where we have people get up and receive an award and give a thank-you speech and then take pictures. Let's have a panel discussion instead so we can involve the audience and take some questions and we all stay awake and people don't sneak out early, because it is interesting to hear that panel discussion.

That is what Pete Weichlein has created now, and I think it is those two decisions that we now have the signature event here in Washington. We have something that we are proud of where we see more and more people come, more and more active Members come, people from the administration, past Members come. The Speaker has been supportive, the majority leader, minority leaders have been supportive in so many ways. I just think it is a way that we get to talk about what we do to a broader audience, and for them actually to say thank you to us by coming to that dinner.

We now have a dinner that has become a signature event here in D.C., a classy and substantive evening of which all of us can be very proud. The only thing missing is to make it a black-tie evening, and maybe that is something we can consider for the future. It is that sophisticated an event.

So Martin and Cliff have already put things in place to make the 2018 dinner even more outstanding. They should be commended for their efforts. I, along with the other former Members serving on the event's steering committee, are committed to helping them. I hope all the former Members here today will take a closer look at the dinner and decide to become more involved.

We are recognizing via this dinner the tremendous power of bipartisanship, something that Speaker RYAN talked about that is so important to all of us, and it really is exemplified in that dinner every year by the awards that we give, by the discussion we have, and by the people that attend.

So this year we are going to be honoring as honorees Senators LAMAR ALEXANDER and PATTY MURRAY, along with House Members DIANA DEGETTE and, my good friend, FRED UPTON from Michigan. We will host a conversation of our honorees on stage again so that those in attendance can hear about their success reaching across the political aisle and working together for the good of the country. They are able to tell stories about exactly how they accomplish things and what they did and the kind of personal relationships that they have and why that makes a difference, the kind of thing that we know about, that we want to reach the larger world so that they understand that things are done by individuals working together, and not by speeches and by fundraising alone, but by Members of Congress being effective and caring about moving the ball forward.

The 21st Annual Statesmanship Awards Dinner is one of the most impressive in town. You will not regret becoming involved. You will see more of your former colleagues from both the House and the Senate, as well as ambassadors. Connie Morella has brought more ambassadors to that dinner and more administration officials and former officials than ever before.

I am thinking of Speaker RYAN. A lot of us served with his former boss, Jack Kemp. Jack Kemp was in the Reagan administration and was such a leader. It just flows down from people who have served before carrying that torch forward, and I think Speaker RYAN is a great example of that. So the dinner exemplifies that, and it has become an increasingly impressive event, showcasing our Association.

I hope all of you will join Martin and all the hard work he is doing. He will push us. He is really good at pushing us. He did that when he did it for the Democrats. He is a fundraiser. Now he does it, very importantly, for our Association. We would like that muscle to be used in a bipartisan way now.

Cliff's leadership is outstanding across the board and tireless. So thank you very much. We are looking forward to a great dinner in 2018.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Dennis.

We are now going to recognize Cliff again. As part of this meeting, we have to conduct some formal business, which is to reconstitute our board, to continue our officers. Cliff has some remarks about staff also, but this is the actual business part of the meeting that we are required to conduct.

Cliff.

Mr. STEARNS. Martin, thank you for that overview.

And, Dennis, thank you very much for that very impressive report. We ap-

preciate your leadership. You and Ken have given so much over the years for this golf tournament. I can only echo your remarks about the Statesmanship Awards Dinner, which will be held next year on March 21.

All the programs we have described, of course, require both leadership and staff to implement. Our Association is blessed to have top people in both categories. I simply want to take this opportunity to thank our board of directors—over 30 former Members of Congress divided equally between the parties—for their active advice and counsel, and I really sincerely appreciate it.

I also want to thank the many partners and supporters we have to make our programs possible. We are truly lucky to have assembled a group of corporations and foundations that believe in our work and make our success possible, and we very much value our partnership with them.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not thank the other members of our Association's executive committee: our vice president, Martin Frost; our secretary, Tom Petri; our treasurer, Karen Thurman; and our past president, Barbara Kennelly.

You have all made this Association a much stronger organization and much better than it was before, and I thank you, of course, for your time and energy.

To administer all these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals. It is just amazing to me how much we get done with just a relatively small staff, and it is a testament to their dedication and their capabilities how successful we have been because of this.

Andy Shoeng and Rachel Haas left the Former Members of Congress after many years of tremendous service, and we wish them both all the best as they pursue their new opportunities. Andy is earning his master's degree at the University of North Carolina, and Rachel found a great new position with a firm much closer to home, though I am very glad to see that she is with us this morning.

As I mentioned earlier, we have added four new staff members, and I hope that throughout the day you will have an opportunity to meet them. They are: Alia Diamond, who is working on our communications; Kathy Hunter, helping us with development and membership; Patrick Egenhofer, focused on the Congressional Study Group on Germany and some of our domestic programs; and Paul Kincaid, who is our brand-new director of Congressional Outreach, and his first day is today. We welcome all of you.

The rest of our team that you have had a chance to work with over the years are, and let me simply mention their names.

Alexis Terai, who is part of our international team and runs our Congressional Study Group on Japan. She is fluent in Japanese, was educated in the United States and abroad, and has been

the key component to making our Study Group on Japan the largest and most active international exchange we offer to current Members of Congress.

Lorraine Harbison is our International Programs Manager with main focus on the European Program. In addition, she makes the Diplomatic Advisory Council such a great success and has grown it from just a handful of embassies to now over four dozen actively participating Ambassadors.

Sharon Witiw is our director of community outreach and oversees the smooth separation of projects such as the Congress to Campus program. She is also in charge of creating the vision we have for our Congressional Study Group on Civics, and you will be hearing from her as programming for their projects commences next year.

Sabine Schleidt is our managing director who spends most of her time on the current Member international programs, but also a lot of hours on implementing the strategic vision and fundraising goals of our Association. With our new hire of Paul Kincaid as director of congressional outreach, Sabine's role will be much more focused on development, strategy, and engaging our membership. She joined our organization over 6 years ago, and, thanks to her creativity and her simply can-do attitude, we have grown tremendously under her leadership.

And lastly, Pete Weichlein is our chief executive officer, who has been with the Association for over 18 years, first as a program director, then as international program director, and, since 2003, as our CEO. When you think about that, when he became the CEO, the Former Members of Congress was in a dire financial situation, and, over the years, he has taken this organization with his leadership to new heights, and I think all of us really appreciate his efforts.

So all of you, if you would, please give an outstanding group of professionals a big round of applause.

Hoorah, hoorah, hoorah.

I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome to Washington a large delegation of former members of the European Parliament. As you know, we have two incredibly meaningful and active global partnerships, with our colleagues in Ottawa and our colleagues in Brussels. We often coordinate programs, particularly democracy-strengthening projects, and we exchange best practices. We are so thrilled to have them with us today on the House floor. They are led by their president of the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament, the Honorable Enrique Baron Crespo. Thank you so much for coming, and we appreciate your attendance.

Every year at our annual meeting, we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. I, therefore, now will read to you the names of our candidates for board members and officers. They are running unopposed; and I, therefore, will ask for a simple "yea"

or "nay" as I present to you the list of candidates as our slate.

For the Association's board of directors, the candidates are:

Jim Coyne of Pennsylvania
Byron Dorgan of North Dakota
Steve Horsford of Nevada
Ken Kramer of Colorado
Jim Matheson of Utah
Jim Moran of Virginia
Karen Thurman of Florida
Ed Whitfield of Kentucky

All in favor of electing these eight former Members to our board of directors, please say "yea." Any opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. As president, I serve a 2-year term, which will end in 2018. However, the other three elected members of the executive board are up for re-election to a 1-year term. The candidates for our executive committee are:

Martin Frost of Texas for vice president

Tom Petri of Wisconsin for secretary
Karen Thurman of Florida for treasurer

All in favor of electing these three former Members to our executive committee say "yea." Any opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership. The executive committee is completed by Barbara Kennelly, who is an unelected officer in her capacity as immediate past president. Thank you.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Stearns, if you would suspend for just a moment, we are honored to have with us the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. President Stearns and Vice President Frost, and Tom, who is going to tell you what to do, welcome back; although, I see a lot of you, from time to time, as you walk the halls and remind us of the good old days.

We have had quite a session so far, as I think you have noticed. You heard me talk before, and I am sure you have made this recognition already, we lost one of the great Americans with whom many of us have served, Bob Michel. Bob Michel passed away. Bob Dole is still with us, still with a great sense of humor, and, frankly, I miss those two Republicans dearly, and I miss a lot of you as well.

We can remember when we were much more collegial than we now find ourselves. We saw an election in Alabama which does not bode well for future collegiality in the United States Senate, I think. We will see what happens in that election. Obviously, that was the primary. We will see what happens in the general.

I think all of us have a responsibility to talk about the Congress that we have served in over the years. This is my 36th year in the Congress. I don't know that any of you served that long, and some people are asking why I am serving that long.

Nick Rahall, how many years did you serve?

Mr. RAHALL. Thirty-eight.

Mr. HOYER. Thirty-eight. So I have to run one more time at least. Right, Nick?

But in any event, I like to be with each of you every year that you come back here. As I say, I see some of you. And the Historical Society obviously does a wonderful job. I think that when I see you and we say "hello" to one another, it is in a different context in which we meet as people who have participated in a very important and historic way, have worked together, have respected the institution, have respected the process of the institution, and have differed, obviously, but, nevertheless, were able to come to a place where we agreed to disagree and to at least act on that on which we could agree.

I think that was very important for our country. As I have said before, and as you know, I continue to be very concerned about what we project to the country. The Congress now has single-digit approval. They don't believe the board of directors of the United States of America is working, and I think that is of great concern to all of us as citizens, as Americans, that we can't be successful as a nation if we have so little respect from the people who we represent, or confidence that we are doing the work that they want done.

I try to convey to them, and I want to tell you, as you know, the majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY from California, and I get along well. We don't always agree, obviously. ROY BLUNT, who is one of my best friends, as I think some of you know, is now a Senator from Missouri but was the minority whip, and was the acting minority leader and minority whip for a period of time. He likes to say, "Connie, Steny and I always agree when there are at least 420 other people voting the same way," which is to say unanimous consent essentially we agree.

Roy and I didn't agree, but when we agreed, we made things happen in a bipartisan way. KEVIN MCCARTHY and I do the same—not as often because we are more polarized than when most of you served in this Congress. When you served in this Congress, you remember, there were real confrontations. Some of us served in the Gingrich years, and they were pretty tough years, but even in those times when you served, there was an ability, I think, to work more closely together than now exists.

John Boehner is not in the Congress because he wanted to work together, and we did on some very significant things. And John finally said: Look, if I can't get 218 on my side, I am not sure I want to be Speaker. He wasn't pushed out. People who say John Boehner was pushed out are wrong. John Boehner decided to leave. He wasn't pushed out. He would have had the majority of support on his side of the aisle all the time. There was no doubt about that.

But I think John just got frustrated about his inability to galvanize a majority. I think MITCH MCCONNELL probably empathizes a lot with John Boehner right now. Probably all of you think so as well.

But I like to come here, and I thank you for staying engaged, staying involved—raising the institution, as opposed to the partisanship, but the institution and what its role is in our democracy.

People talk about: Every 2 years, you really ought to change that. I am not sure that we ought to change it. The Founding Fathers were undoubtedly right, in my opinion. Does it cause us problems? Yes, it does. I tell my colleagues on my side: You cannot solve America's problems in 24-month cycles. What I mean by that, of course, is if all we have is thinking that goes from election to election, we won't be able to solve America's problems because they are not just subject to a 24-month solution. We have got to think longer term.

I am very worried about the debt, as I am sure some of you are, but we continue to do either spending or cutting taxes, and both sides that do that talk about how we need to balance the budget. We are not there.

I thank you for staying engaged. I thank you for continuing to communicate with the public, with my constituents and your constituents, your former constituents, and your broader constituents as your fellow American citizens, to try to encourage them. When people say: When are you guys going to get together? My response to them is: As soon as you do. And they look at me quizzically. I say: As soon as you elect, on both sides of the aisle—Nick, have I talked too long? Is that my signal? What Nick is saying is: You junior Members need to get off the floor.

Mr. FROST. I would advise Mr. HOYER that there is no 5-minute rule here; however, we do have to vacate the floor in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. I am about to end.

My point to you is we need to work together to make sure that our citizens do not believe that if you make an agreement with the other side you have sold out. I don't care which side you are on. Democracy is about compromise. Democracy is about working together. Democracy is about the creation of consensus. If we can't do that, we won't succeed as a country. Forget about Republicans and Democrats, we won't succeed as a country. I know you continue to do that, and, very frankly, looking at so many of you with whom I have had the honor and pleasure of serving, I know that when you were here, you worked at doing that. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. STEARNS. I just want to thank Mr. HOYER, the Democratic whip, for his kindness in coming by to give his remarks, and we appreciate his leadership and serving.

My colleagues, it is now my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former Members and current Members who have passed away since our last report.

As all of you know, at the conclusion of our annual meeting later today, we will hold a memorial service in Statutory Hall starting at 6 p.m., where we will be joined by many of the families, as well as current Members of Congress, to pay tribute to the public servants we have lost.

In addition, it is altogether proper to recognize these Representatives and Senators this morning here in the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to now rise as I read the names. At the end of the list, we will pay our respects to their memory with a moment of silence. We honor these men and women for their service to our country. There are 32 names. They are:

William Armstrong of Colorado
 Bill Barrett of Nebraska
 Anthony Beilenson of California
 Helen Bentley of Maryland
 John Brademas of Indiana
 William Carney of New York
 Eligio "Kika" de la Garza of Texas
 Pete Domenici of New Mexico
 Jay Dickey of Arkansas
 Vernon J. Ehlers of Michigan
 Eni F.H. Faleomavaega of American Samoa
 Robert Garcia of New York
 Benjamin A. Gilman of New York
 John Glenn of Ohio
 Ken Hechler of West Virginia
 Lawrence J. Hogan, Sr., of Maryland
 Clyde Holloway of Louisiana
 Bill Hudnut of Indiana
 Raymond P. Kogovsek of Colorado
 Melvin Laird of Wisconsin
 Steven LaTourette of Ohio
 Mike Lowry of Washington
 Dawson Mathis of Georgia
 Robert Michel of Illinois
 Abner Mikva of Illinois
 Robert Morgan of North Carolina
 Ralph Regula of Ohio
 Clint Roberts of South Dakota
 Mark Takai of Hawaii
 Burt Talcott of California
 Ray Thornton of Arkansas
 George Voinovich of Ohio

We will now have a moment of silence.

Thank you.

My colleagues, this concludes the 47th Report to Congress by the Association of Former Members of Congress.

Let me leave you with one final thought as we exit this historic Chamber. David Hume, as you know, was a great political philosopher, and this is what he said: "Of all men that distinguish themselves by memorable achievements, the first place of honor seems due to legislators and founders of states who transmit a system of laws and institutions to secure the peace, happiness, and liberty of future generations."

We thank the Congress, the Speaker, and the minority leader for giving us

the opportunity to return to this revered and beloved Chamber and to report on our Association's activities. We look forward to another active and productive year, and I want to thank all of you for your attendance. Please join us for coffee and danishes in Room H-122 as we leave the Capitol.

God bless America.

Mr. FROST. The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of the House and Senate for their presence here today.

Before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those former Members who did not respond to the roll when it was called to give their names to the Reading Clerk for inclusion in the roll.

I have noticed some of your presence and have handed a revised list to the Reading Clerk, but I may have missed a few of you. So, if you did not answer the roll, please stop by before you leave.

Thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 28, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2666. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0503; Product Identifier 2017-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-19009; AD 2017-17-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2667. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adding the Polar Ship Certificate to the List of SOLAS Certificates and Certificates Issued by Recognized Classification Societies [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0880] (RIN: 1625-AC35) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2668. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0472; Product Identifier 2016-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-19002; AD 2017-17-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2669. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0337; Product Identifier 2017-NM-006-AD; Amendment 39-19006; AD 2017-17-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2670. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0479; Product Identifier 2016-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-19004; AD 2017-17-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2671. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0502; Product Identifier 2016-NM-120-AD; Amendment 39-19016; AD 2017-18-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2672. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0475; Product Identifier 2016-NM-142-AD; Amendment 39-19017; AD 2017-18-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2673. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0559; Product Identifier 2017-NM-013-AD; Amendment 39-19014; AD 2017-18-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2674. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0247; Product Identifier 2016-NM-180-AD; Amendment 39-19015; AD 2017-18-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2675. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0164; Product Identifier 2017-NE-06-AD; Amendment 39-19008; AD 2017-17-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2676. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket

et No.: FAA-2016-7270; Product Identifier 2015-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-19025; AD 2017-18-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2677. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0512; Product Identifier 2017-NM-031-AD; Amendment 39-19005; AD 2017-17-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2678. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9521; Product Identifier 2016-NM-061-AD; Amendment 39-19018; AD 2017-18-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2679. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0481; Product Identifier 2016-NM-196-AD; Amendment 39-19003; AD 2017-17-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2680. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9517; Product Identifier 2016-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-18984; AD 2017-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2681. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0128; Product Identifier 2016-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-18999; AD 2017-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2682. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0474; Product Identifier 2016-NM-096-AD; Amendment 39-19007; AD 2017-17-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2683. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR — GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0516;

Product Identifier 2016-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-19000; AD 2017-17-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2684. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0496; Product Identifier 2016-NM-103-AD; Amendment 39-19001; AD 2017-17-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2685. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0638; Product Identifier 2017-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-19019; AD 2017-18-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2686. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7264; Product Identifier 2015-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-18998; AD 2017-17-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2687. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9518; Product Identifier 2015-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-18989; AD 2017-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2688. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0652; Product Identifier 2017-NE-18-AD; Amendment 39-18997; AD 2017-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2689. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0627] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2690. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Assets for Independence Program Report to Congress: Status at the Conclusion of the Sixteenth Year, Fiscal Year 2015", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 604 note; Public Law 105-285, Sec. 414(d); (112 Stat. 2771); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2691. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma

Disaster Relief (Notice 2017-49) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2692. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Guidelines for Good Faith Determinations of Qualifying Public Charity Status (Rev. Proc. 2017-53) [IRB 2017-40] received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2693. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe Harbor for Inadvertent Normalization Violations (Rev. Proc. 2017-47) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3281. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-334). 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:

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3845. A bill to establish a grant program to incentivize States to reduce prison populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3846. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require payment to counties of a portion of certain revenues received by the United States under Federal oil and gas leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 3847. A bill to revise the Yurok reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3848. A bill to reform our government, reduce the grip of special interest, and return our democracy to the American people by increasing transparency and oversight of our elections and government, reforming public financing for Presidential and Congressional elections, and requiring States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 3849. A bill to extend certain provisions of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act until September 30, 2030, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 3850. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to establish labels that may be used as a voluntary means of indicating to consumers the extent to which products are of United States origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3851. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to provide for rewards for the arrest or conviction of certain foreign nationals who have committed genocide or war crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 3852. A bill to permit the waiver of Jones Act requirements for humanitarian relief efforts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3853. A bill to provide for nuclear weapons abolition and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative Measure Number 37 of 1992, while ensuring environmental restoration and clean-energy conversion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 3854. A bill to provide that the Executive Order entitled "Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input" shall have the force and effect of law; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3855. A bill to require a report on significant security risks of the national electric grid and the potential effect of such security risks on the readiness of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3856. A bill to reinstate reporting requirements related to United States-Hong Kong relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. BARR, Mr. MESSER, Mr. TROTT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 3857. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish standards of conduct for brokers and dealers that are in the best interest of their retail customers;

to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. LEE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GALLEGÓ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HECK, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BASS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3858. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the TIGER Discretionary Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. LEE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GALLEGÓ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 3859. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. JONES):

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from unauthorized hostilities in the Republic of Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 541. A resolution recognizing the achievements of Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions on the 10th anniversary of their establishment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H. Res. 542. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of October 1 through 7, 2017, as "Latex Allergy Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. Res. 543. A resolution congratulating Northeastern Illinois University on the sesquicentennial of the University; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

126. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 254, urging the President and Congress to expand access to afterschool summer meal programs and streamline the application process for summer meals; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

127. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 234, urging Congress not eliminate the property tax deduction allowable under United States federal tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 3849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 3850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. FOX:

H.R. 3851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 grants Congress the power to "To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;"

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 3854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 3855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 16 of the U.S. Constitution ("To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" and "To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress").

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 36: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 66: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 299: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 377: Mr. NORMAN and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 392: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 502: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 535: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 644: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 664: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 721: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 747: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 785: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 790: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 795: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 807: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 866: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 927: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 959: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 997: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. BERA, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. FASO.

H.R. 1035: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1057: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1098: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1148: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1150: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1164: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COMER, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1200: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1225: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1253: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1270: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1276: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MENG, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1279: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1317: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1380: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1384: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1419: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1459: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1464: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1494: Mr. HUDSON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1602: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1606: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1674: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1699: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1810: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1825: Mr. PETERS and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1865: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. SHUSTER.

- H.R. 1889: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1953: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. LOBONDO.
H.R. 1957: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2069: Mr. PETERS and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2095: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2121: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2201: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2219: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2232: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2264: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2319: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2401: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2405: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2418: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2436: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2499: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2501: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2625: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2640: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 2641: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2658: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2670: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2679: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2685: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2687: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2690: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2740: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 2788: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2790: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2840: Mr. CRIST, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 2856: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2862: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 2871: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2897: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2898: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2909: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2948: Mr. HIMES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3042: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3053: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 3079: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 3107: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3117: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3176: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3227: Mr. NADLER and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3272: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3273: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3274: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3275: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3281: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3320: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3329: Mr. PERRY, Mr. COLE, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3342: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3349: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3378: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3380: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3383: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3395: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3525: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3545: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3552: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 3570: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3576: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3632: Mr. AMODEI and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 3641: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3692: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3696: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3699: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3721: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3733: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3758: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3759: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3761: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3775: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3782: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3792: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3810: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3812: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3826: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3831: Mr. PETERSON.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.J. Res. 48: Ms. TSONGAS.
H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 128: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. YODER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 142: Mr. SIRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. FLORES.
H. Res. 161: Ms. ROSEN and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 220: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 257: Mr. CORREA.
H. Res. 271: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H. Res. 274: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 279: Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 359: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 490: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 518: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 529: Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 534: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. ABRAHAM.