



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2017

No. 164

## Senate

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

## House of Representatives

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2017

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 12, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

### OPIOID CRISIS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Dana Milbank had an interesting col-

umn in the morning Post about the feckless congressional response to the opioid crisis. Both the administration and Congress have been good at hyping the crisis, but when it comes time to actually taking action, almost nothing happens.

The failure to protect our citizens is appalling, especially since most of the opioid crisis is a result of failed public policies. We have spent over \$1 trillion on a failed war on drugs that concentrates on prohibition and punishment instead of treatment, which would help people break the cycle of addiction.

The challenges that drove people to abuse opioids in the first place, like chronic pain, depression, and lax policies prescribing vast quantities of ever-more powerful opioids, should never have been allowed to happen in the first place. It was a public policy failure of government, the industry, and, sadly, some unscrupulous practitioners that allowed the addiction genie out of the bottle.

When denied access to opioids, people, understandably, turn to heroin and other damaging and addictive drugs because they were trapped by these powerful forces. Few people willingly damage their bodies and destroy their families and careers, if not for powerful forces beyond their control.

As appalling as this failure is, what is even worse is that we fail to take reasonable, commonsense steps to stop it. The easiest solution is to provide more access to medical marijuana, already available in 28 States. This availability, by the way, has been driven as

a result of citizen action and not politicians, who have too often been afraid to touch it.

The evidence is powerful and overwhelming. Where there is access to medical marijuana to treat the problems that drove people on the path to addiction in the first place, there are fewer pills prescribed and overdose deaths drop.

It is clear that using medical marijuana is as effective, or perhaps even more effective, than opioids to treat pain. They cause less damage to people's health and are far less costly than pharmaceuticals. I provided the subcommittee taking testimony with the facts and citations that would justify digging deep into this potential solution.

Cannabis reduces overdose deaths, reduces opioid consumption, and it can prevent dose escalation and the development of opioid tolerance, which leads to that cycle, and too often, tragically, opioid deaths: 175 people a day.

As my friend, GREG WALDEN, pointed out in the subcommittee hearing yesterday, more people die in Oregon from opioid overdose than traffic accidents.

More benefits, fewer side effects, lower costs.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the evidence I gave to the Subcommittee on Health yesterday.

### PHYSICIAN GUIDE TO CANNABIS-ASSISTED OPIOID REDUCTION

(Prepared by Adrienne Wilson-Poe, Ph.D.)

Cannabis reduces opioid overdose mortality.

In states with medicinal cannabis laws, opioid overdoses drop by an average of 25%.

□ 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.

H7977

This effect gets bigger the longer the law has been in place. For instance, there is a 33% drop in mortality in California, where compassionate use has been in place since 1996.

This finding was replicated by Columbia's school of public health, using a completely different analysis strategy.

Cannabis reduces opioid consumption.

Cannabis is opioid-sparing in chronic pain patients. When patients are given access to cannabis, they drop their opioid use by roughly 50%. This finding has been replicated several times from Ann Arbor to Jerusalem.

This opioid sparing effect is accompanied by an enhancement of cognitive function once patients begin cannabis therapy: this effect is most likely due to the fact that patients reduce their opioid use.

Cannabis use is associated with a reduction in not only opioid consumption, but also many other drugs including benzodiazepines, which also have a high incidence of fatal overdose. In states with medicinal cannabis laws, the number of prescriptions for analgesic and anxiolytic drugs (among others) are substantially reduced. Medicare and Medicaid prescription costs are substantially lower in states with cannabis laws.

Cannabis can prevent dose escalation and the development of opioid tolerance.

Cannabinoids and opioids have acute analgesic synergy. When opioids and cannabinoids are coadministered, they produce greater than additive analgesia. This suggests that analgesic dose of opioids is substantially lower for patients using cannabis therapy.

In chronic pain patients on opioid therapy, cannabis does not affect pharmacokinetics of opioids, yet it still enhances analgesia. This finding further supports a synergistic mechanism of action.

Pre-clinical models indicate that cannabinoids attenuate the development of opioid tolerance.

Cannabis, alone or in combination with opioids, could be a viable first-line analgesic.

The CDC has updated its recommendations in the spring of 2016, stating that most cases of chronic pain should be treated with non-opioids.

The National Academies of Science and Medicine recently conducted an exhaustive review of 10,000+ human studies published since 1999, definitively concluding that cannabis itself (not a specific cannabinoid or cannabis-derived molecule) is safe and effective for the treatment of chronic pain.

When 3,000 chronic pain patients were surveyed, they overwhelmingly preferred cannabis as an opioid alternative.

97% "strongly agreed/agreed" that they could decrease their opioid use when using cannabis.

92% "strongly agreed/agreed" that they prefer cannabis to treat their medical condition.

81% "strongly agreed/ agreed" that cannabis by itself was more effective than taking opioids.

Cannabis may be a viable tool in medication-assisted relapse prevention.

CBD is non-intoxicating, and is the 2nd most abundant cannabinoid found in cannabis. CBD alleviates the anxiety that leads to drug craving. In human pilot studies, CBD administration is sufficient to prevent heroin craving for at least 7 days.

Cannabis users are more likely to adhere to naltrexone maintenance for opioid dependence.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There is a reason that up to 90 percent of the American public favors greater access to medical marijuana. Last year, voters in Florida approved their program by over 70 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government continues to interfere, threatening medical marijuana programs, which requires Congress to step in to shield it, as we have done last year and for the previous 2 years. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee denied us a chance to vote on it.

Last Congress, both Houses approved measures for VA doctors to be able to consult with veterans who have a serious overdose problem. Despite passing both Chambers, it was stripped out and the Rules Committee failed to allow us to vote on this as well.

Most tragically, Congress continues to allow the Federal Government to have a stranglehold on research to be conducted to be able to definitely answer these questions.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join my friend, Dr. ANDY HARRIS, and me on our research bill, H.R. 3391. There is no reason that the Federal Government denies research to be able to definitively answer these questions.

I am tired of looking at the opioid damage in my State and around the country, and have Congress propose Band-aids when there is a simple, commonsense, widely accepted, and popular approach: allow people access to medical marijuana.

The time to do it is now. Lives are being lost as we dither.

#### NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS AWARD

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of The Academy of Our Lady of Peace in New Providence, New Jersey, and the Woodland School in Warren, New Jersey, for being named Blue Ribbon Schools by the United States Department of Education.

New Providence is in Union County, and Warren is in Somerset County, New Jersey, both in the district I have the honor of representing.

The National Blue Ribbon Schools award honors public and private elementary, middle, and high schools where students perform at very high levels or where significant improvements are being made in levels of achievement.

The Academy of Our Lady of Peace and the Woodland School were cited as exemplary high-performing schools, as measured by State assessments and national tests.

This recognition is a testament to the outstanding work and dedication of the faculty and staff in creating schools where students master challenging content. These are among our youngest students, infectious in their enthusiasm because of the excellent schools they attend.

I commend Joel Castillo, principal of the Academy of Our Lady of Peace; and Jeffrey Heaney, principal of the Woodland School, for all of their hard work.

I also commend the faculty, parents, and the communities in general.

This prestigious award is noted throughout the country, and certainly the United States Department of Education is to be commended for presenting these awards.

The Academy of Our Lady of Peace and the Woodland School are proud examples of academic excellence and worthy of this national distinction.

#### ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, a little over a month ago, Hurricane Irma struck the Caribbean island of St. Maarten very hard.

Within a couple of days, I got a call from loved ones of a couple of constituents. They had family members trapped at a hotel in St. Maarten with dozens of other Americans. The power was out, they were running out of food and water, and incidents of looting were reported. So they called me, their Congressman, and I called the State Department to see what could be done.

Within 36 hours of my call, our U.S. citizens—nearly 150 of them—were evacuated from an island, in the ocean, surrounded by water.

Do you know where they were taken to for safety?

Puerto Rico. Yes, Puerto Rico, where it has now been 3 weeks since Hurricane Maria and most people do not have power or clean drinking water, and where the deterioration of the healthcare system is leaving people without critical treatments and causing the death toll to go up.

Now, in St. Maarten, this is what the State Department said, according to NBC News: "Evacuation efforts will prioritize U.S. citizens needing urgent medical care."

Within a few days, they had evacuated 1,200 Americans.

So, right now, if a thousand U.S. citizens are facing danger in Japan, Ethiopia, or Finland, our State Department would arrange to save them. But we have millions of Americans facing danger in Puerto Rico and we can't get the same help, not from the military, not from FEMA, and not from the State Department, because they don't assist U.S. citizens who are on U.S. soil, even if that soil is a colony in the ocean surrounded by water, as our President reminds us.

It took 36 hours to get evacuated from St. Maarten. Three weeks in Puerto Rico and still no plan for evacuation.

This morning, the President is tweeting that he wants to pull FEMA and the military out of Puerto Rico.

How long do we have to stay in Puerto Rico, Mr. President?

Until every Puerto Rican's name is taken off the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall or erased from the records of the Korean war, Afghanistan, and Iraq.

As long as it takes. They gave their lives and died.

Yesterday, a lot of us received military briefings from FEMA, the military, and Homeland Security. I wanted to know whether FEMA and the military are prepared to take people off the island, as we normally do in emergency situations. We did it in Houston, in Jacksonville, and New Orleans.

No, the Governor has not asked for help in evacuating people, they told me.

I asked: How many bridges, even temporary ones, have been constructed in Puerto Rico to replace those destroyed by the hurricane to allow for the transportation of supplies and the evacuation of people?

They said: None, Congressman. Zero. We have not erected any bridges. Again, because the Governor of Puerto Rico hasn't asked us to.

When I was there, I flew over the town of Maricao in the mountains, well known for coffee. There are six ways in and out of the town, and five of those bridges are gone.

Three weeks after D-day in 1944, the allies liberated the deepwater port of Cherbourg, one of the most important objectives in France. It took 20 days and we built bridges and communication lines along the way.

We made better progress in the 3 weeks after D-day than we are making on Puerto Rico. And in Puerto Rico, to the best of my knowledge, there are no Germans shooting at us.

Now, when I asked the officials about evacuating people from the island, they had no real answer. But if I remember correctly, FEMA and the military come to us to fund their budget every year. They are accountable to this Congress.

We are accountable to our constituents. Constituents are coming to me, as they did in St. Maarten, and are saying: Help us get our families out of danger's way.

Mr. Speaker, when will we be able to give these constituents an answer as to why their family members and loved ones aren't being allowed to leave the island and evacuated from danger?

This weekend, Members of Congress are going to Puerto Rico. I spoke with a few of them and said: Hey, at night, you should go to this place where it is really bad.

One stopped me, cut me off, and said: Congressman, we are not staying overnight.

So, on an island where 95 percent of the power is out, our Members of Congress are only going to see things during the day, not during the pitch-black darkness, which is what Puerto Ricans are living with every single night for the last 3 weeks.

Regardless of what my colleagues see during the day or what the President tweets in the morning, my friends stand in line for hours for food, if they can find it; my constituents are worried about their family members; and 5 million Puerto Ricans in the diaspora

have run out of patience. We want our people free to live in the United States of America wherever they can.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want the government to help get their families out of danger's way.

#### HONORING THE MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF STUART EPPERSON

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize North Carolina Fifth District constituent, Mr. Stuart Epperson, whose work has positively affected so many in North Carolina and so many across this great Nation.

Stuart, or "Stu," as his friends know him, is living proof that not only is the American Dream possible, it is achievable if you are simply willing to work hard for it. Stu's story is a model one for all.

□ 1015

Growing up on a small tobacco farm in Virginia, Stu learned hard work and perseverance. In the 1980s, Stu and his brother-in-law started the Salem Media Group to minister to and report positive news to families across the country.

Under his leadership, Salem Media Group and Salem Radio now host 120 radio stations, 67 of which are in the top 25 markets, and operate 2,400 affiliates.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when many Americans opt to turn off the news due to the negative content, Mr. Epperson's audience is tuning in to be inspired and to be informed.

The content put forth by the Salem Media Group serves as a beacon of hope to the many families seeking positive and instructive stories.

Mr. Speaker, when I consider the body of Mr. Epperson's work, I am reminded of the parable of the faithful servant in Luke 12:48. The Good Book tells us that: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required. . . ."

The Lord has certainly gifted Mr. Epperson with some amazing abilities, and in return, Mr. Epperson has used these talents to give back to multiple community activities.

Among those activities are the Winston-Salem Rescue Mission, Salem Pregnancy Care Center, One Kid at a Time mentoring program, and the Christian Association of Youth Mentoring, which he founded.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Stu would agree that the adage "behind every good man is a good woman" is a true one for him. Stu married the love of his life, Nancy Etsinger Epperson, 54 years ago. This lovely couple has 4 children and 21 grandchildren.

I commend Stu Epperson not only for his many accomplishments but also for

his dedication to ensuring that radio remains family-friendly and value-focused. In recognition of Stu's life and work, I am pleased to announce that soon Stu will be receiving the highly coveted Vision and Leadership Award from the Family Research Council. This award is justly deserved by such an accomplished man, and I add my salute to him.

I know that the community in Winston-Salem, this Nation, and the wider world have benefitted from Stu Epperson's many efforts to make the world a better place. I commend Mr. Epperson on his many accomplishments and his service to our Nation.

#### STRUGGLES IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to tell where and in what direction Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are heading today. There is not enough food, millions are struggling to live without drinking water and electricity, and only 8 percent of the roads are open to traffic.

Containers with supplies, medical supplies, and food and other commodities are sitting in containers on the docks in the Port of San Juan and are not moving towards the people and the communities that need them the most. Struggles in the Virgin Islands are less heard about but no less real.

The question is whether we, as a nation, are doing all we can for the citizens of this Nation. Let's compare. After an earthquake hit Haiti in 2010, where the infrastructure was severely damaged, the U.S. military mobilized as if we were going to war.

The very next morning, after the earthquake hit, an Army unit was airborne. Within 2 weeks, 33 ships and 22,000 soldiers had arrived, and more than 300 helicopters were delivering millions of pounds of food and water, not just to the port, but the people of Haiti.

By contrast, today, there are fewer than 14,000 military personnel assisting in relief efforts in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and there are only 88 helicopters and only 4 naval ships, one of them the USNS Comfort that are aiding 3.5 million Americans—3.4 million Americans in Puerto Rico, 100,000 Americans in the Virgin Islands.

In Haiti, Mr. Speaker, we airlifted 15,000 U.S. citizens in 2010 after the earthquake, but in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, we are unwilling to evacuate a single American, even those who have relatives and friends in the many communities across the 50 States of this great country.

As Americans are starving and Americans are desperate, our response needs to be more vigorous.

Now, let's be sure, the military is doing what we are asking them to do. This is not a criticism of the military

not doing what we are asking them to do, but the White House is not asking the military to do enough.

Mr. Speaker, the President must lead on this issue. We have got dedicated members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard who are willing, ready, and able to be in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to deliver the relief to our neighbors and our citizens.

We need to ask the Department of Defense to send more engineers, more transportation companies, and expeditionary sustainment battalions.

Yesterday, I asked a senior military leader: How many pontoon bridges have been erected in Puerto Rico to cross those washed out roads? Zero. How many miles of power transmission lines have been reestablished to get electricity out to more communities? The answer is zero.

We have military engineers on the ground, but they have not been asked to do that. We need to direct our military to provide the direct services on the local or, in military parlance, on the tactical level. I am not talking about long-term rebuilding of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by the United States military. I am talking about directing the Department of Defense to establish the minimum infrastructure necessary to do the job that we should be asking them to do, which is to provide relief to 3.5 million Americans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Strategic movements are good, military assessments and evaluations help, but what is needed is no less than what was done 7 years ago in Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, the President must lead on this issue, and the President must ask our military to do more.

#### NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is National Farmers Day. From farm to fork, our farmers work hard to put food on dinner tables across this country and around the world.

Today has traditionally been a day to recognize farmers and thank them for all their endless hard work. Records of National Farmers Day events date back to the 1800s.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers are the cornerstone of our rural communities. They face tough odds by the very nature of the business, and food security is national security.

Right now, there is a critical shortfall of skilled young and beginning farmers and ranchers. That is why, together with Congressman JOE COURTNEY from Connecticut and Congressman JOHN FASO from New York, we introduced the Young Farmer Success Act.

This legislation provides incentives for those who would like to pursue a

future in the agriculture industry by adding farmers to the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, which currently offers loan payback assistance for professions such as government service, teaching, and nursing.

Under the program, eligible public service professionals who make 10 years of income-driven student loan payments can have the balance of their loans forgiven.

On Monday, I heard from a number of young farmers in upstate New York in Congressman FASO's district. The House Agriculture Committee hosted a farm bill listening session at SUNY Cobleskill, and we covered topics from dairy to specialty crops to nutrition assistance programs, and we heard a lot of excellent feedback from those who shared their stories with us.

As the House Agriculture Committee works to craft the next farm bill, these listening sessions have allowed us to hear firsthand from those who are directly impacted by the farm bill. They provide us with real world examples of what is working and what isn't working.

With farmers in every region of this country, we heard from many different perspectives. This feedback will help us write the best farm bill possible.

Mr. Speaker, food security is national security, and it aids the long-term sustainability of our country. They provide fresh produce and products to communities throughout the country, and there is no better food than something grown locally.

Today, we celebrate our food producers on National Farmers Day, but we should also celebrate them every day for putting food on our tables and in our grocery stores. Let's face it, farming is a tough business. Long hours, unpredictable commodity prices, and, even more, unpredictable weather conditions, but it is also exciting, rewarding, and full of opportunities.

Generations of farmers have worked every patch of American soil caring for the Earth, their animals, and their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I want to wholeheartedly thank America's farmers for providing our country with safe, sustainable, healthy, and nutritious food every day. Happy Farmers Day.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE WAR POWERS ACT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, last weekend I was shocked to read the statements of the Republican chair of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate, Senator CORKER. He said that, "Trump has put us on the path to World War III."

This makes it essential that Congress assert its full powers under the Constitution of the United States.

In reaction to Nixon's secret bombing of Cambodia and the aftermath, Congress passed something called the War Powers Act. Unfortunately, there was a dispute between the two bodies, and, ultimately, the Senate prevailed and watered down the bill.

Instead of saying, "Before the President engages our troops in hostilities, that he or she must come to the Congress," instead, the bill ultimately adopted saying, "48 hours after the President has engaged our troops in hostilities, he or she must report to the Congress and then seek subsequent authorization, or the troops would be withdrawn after 60 days."

I have introduced legislation in this and preceding Congresses to fix that. That clearly does not represent the constitutional powers of the United States Congress. The Constitution is absolutely clear. Only Congress has the authority to declare war. Once war is declared, the President, under the Constitution, is the Commander in Chief and would act with one voice to conduct the war and coordinate military efforts.

So my bill would say—do away with the allowance of 48 hours and say: Before engaging U.S. troops and military in hostilities, that the President must first come to the Congress and seek a declaration of war. I think it is absolutely essential that this Congress act on this legislation and make it clear to the President of the United States that he does not have the authority to wake up one morning and tweet of an attack against another country and engage these people in an escalation that may end, as Senator CORKER says, in World War III.

This is a very dangerous time for our country. It is time for this separate and equal branch of the government to assert its full authority to rein in any and all dangerous activities by this President.

□ 1030

#### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment of our Constitution gives us this precious freedom of speech that we so cherish in America. Contrary to heated debate and public opinion, we, in the United States, rarely face the kind of persecution that necessitated this great protection. So I rise today to shed light on the abridgement of freedom of speech that is often widely discussed, but that few Americans ever have to endure.

Across the world, Mr. Speaker, individual freedom of speech is frequently infringed. A posted critique or just sharing one's views freely on the internet can be punishable, even by death.

Late one evening in September, a well-known Indian journalist, Gauri Lankesh, was murdered outside her

home. She was “an anti-establishment figure with a reputation for her fearless criticism of undemocratic elements within the parties in power.” The circumstances of her death were “strikingly similar” to the murders of three additional Indian activists.

Just weeks ago, another of India’s most prominent political journalists, Professor Kancha Ilaiah, known for critiquing India’s caste social order, was threatened by a Hindu member of India’s parliament. This member of parliament, who is an ally of the current BJP government, issued a statement that Kancha should be “publicly hanged.” Kancha subsequently received numerous death threats.

These threats had a significant effect. A mob tried to attack Professor Ilaiah with stones as he and a coworker were driving to a meeting. Kancha is now under self-imposed house arrest because he is simply not safe otherwise.

Was Professor Ilaiah’s crime significant?

Kancha was called a modern-day Dr. Ambedkar, who is known as the “Father of the Indian Constitution,” and Professor Ilaiah’s crime was he was the author of “Why I am Not a Hindu.”

A recent translation of his 2009 book “Post-Hindu India” is what seems to have sparked the threats against him. This book described the polarized context of modern-day India specifically dealing with the productivity of the Dalits and the “low” castes and the seeming spiritual and monetary monopoly of the “higher” castes. These critiques became even more relevant in India’s growing agrarian crisis, the resulting farmer suicides due to hopelessness, and the massive joblessness due to demonetization and economic slowdown.

Mr. Speaker, I stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to state unequivocally that the United States and the entire global community is, and should be, deeply concerned about this threat to the life of Professor Kancha Ilaiah, one of the world’s well-known intellectuals.

Our trusted ally and friend, India, is better than this, Mr. Speaker. Professor Kancha Ilaiah’s right and freedom to speak should not be infringed; and his protection, and that of those like him, should be of the utmost priority to the Indian Government. I am able to express freely this viewpoint because we have freedom of speech in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker. May we remember at what cost and for what purpose we were given this priceless freedom.

#### BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize

Breast Cancer Awareness Month for millions of us in the breast cancer community.

The statistics are sobering: one in eight women will get breast cancer in her lifetime.

Earlier this year, I received a note from a former staffer. I had watched this young woman blossom from a young and eager intern to ultimately serving as my executive assistant and scheduler before she departed the Hill for graduate school, marriage, and a future full of promise. In the note, she wrote:

“My wedding was about 2 months ago. It was the most magical night of my life. It was so incredible to be surrounded by so many friends and loved ones and good will. I can’t imagine ever being happier than I was that night.”

She went on to say:

“Unfortunately, things have gotten a little more complicated since then. While I was on my honeymoon, I noticed a small lump in my right breast. Since I had the benefit of working for you, I know that, while rare, it is possible that young women can get breast cancer, and I should take it seriously. I think you can probably guess where this is going . . .”

She continued:

“We have no idea how this happened to me. I guess some people get struck by lightning, some people are deathly allergic to peanuts, and some people get breast cancer at 29 with no family history.

“Luckily, it was caught early and the doctors have every confidence that it is fully curable and I will live a long and happy life.”

She ended the note by thanking me for advocating for breast cancer awareness, specifically for younger women.

She said:

“DWS,” as I am often referred to by staff, “keep fighting the good fight. It is saving the lives of people like me.”

Today, she is fighting the good fight, and I know she will win.

Unfortunately, just like my former staffer, I know all too well that it can strike even when you are young. In 2007, when I was only 41 years old, I learned I had breast cancer.

Like many others before me, when I was diagnosed, and later identified as a BRCA2 gene mutation carrier, I worried about many things: Would I be there to see my children grow up? Would I be able to beat this disease? Wasn’t I too young to have breast cancer?

Fortunately, with the passage of the ACA—the Affordable Care Act—insurance coverage cannot be taken away from people like me and like my former staffer. Access to affordable, quality healthcare is now a right, not a privilege.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect this right. Instead of calling for senseless votes to repeal this legislation, I call on my Republican colleagues to join me in recognizing Breast Cancer Awareness Month

by supporting those of us who are living healthier, stronger lives every day because of the Affordable Care Act.

The statistics for breast cancer remain alarming. The American Cancer Society estimates that 40,610 women will die from breast cancer in 2017 alone, making it the second most common type of cancer death in women.

Between the ages of 60 and 84, breast cancer incidence rates are markedly higher in White women than Black women. However, Black women have a higher incidence rate before age 45, and are more likely to die from breast cancer at every age. This is wholly unacceptable.

We must take action to provide women with the preventative services and screenings available while educating them on their risks and treatment options.

That is why, in 2009, I introduced the EARLY Act, a bipartisan bill that became law as part of the Affordable Care Act, to focus on equipping young women with the tools they need to make informed decisions regarding their breast health.

I am proud that the EARLY Act was reauthorized in 2014, and even more proud that it has, and is, helping young women like my former staffer.

This Congress, I also introduced the PALS Act with my good friend from Indiana, Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS.

This bill would extend the moratorium on the United States Preventive Services Task Force mammography screening guidelines to ensure women have access to lifesaving mammograms beginning at age 40.

It would also ensure women who have served our country—our women veterans—don’t have to face these same obstacles in getting the care they and their healthcare providers deem necessary.

Because many insurance companies use the USPSTF guidelines as the basis for coverage, 22 million women between ages 40 and 49 could be at risk of losing coverage for this lifesaving screening.

The bottom line is the vast majority of experts recommend beginning screening mammograms at age 40. Women need to be able to follow this guidance until scientific consensus can be reached.

As someone who was diagnosed at just age 41, I can tell you that women need guaranteed access to these tests beginning at age 40.

We must also ensure the National Institutes of Health has the funding it needs to continue their progress.

I will continue to use my voice and my vote as an appropriator to ensure that critical funding is provided through the annual appropriations bill for breast cancer research, services, and support.

My story and my former staffer’s story isn’t unique. That is why we must do more to support our mothers, sisters, daughters, and friends who are

battling or who have survived this deadly disease. And we must do everything we can to eradicate breast cancer once and for all.

I look forward to continuing to work together with all of you—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—and with the advocacy community to help women know their risk, discover cancer early, and access the best treatment possible.

#### HONORING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE

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

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I, along with my good friend, MARCY KAPTUR, reestablished the NASA Caucus.

Last week, I spoke about the 50th anniversary of my father's absolute air-speed record flight that happened on October 3, 1967. Two weeks ago was the 70th anniversary of the Air Force. On Saturday, we welcome the anniversary of supersonic flight.

For years, there was a thought that there was a barrier present to stop aircraft or inhibit flight controls. Many believed attempting to pass through this barrier would be fatal.

Well, on October 14, 1947, Captain Charles E. "Chuck" Yeager was dropped from a B-29 at about 45,000 feet and quickly accelerated through that invisible barrier we know as the speed of sound.

The first man to achieve Mach 1, we know that as something simple today, but for the last 70 years, it was because of one man that we get to do this.

General Yeager retired in 1975 as a brigadier general, after 34 years of flying, for the Army Air Corps and for the United States Air Force. What he achieved that day was something that many men didn't think would happen.

There were about two or three pilots at Muroc or the Army air field out at southern California that were trying to do it, but absolutely there was only one that did it. Captain Yeager, flying the Bell X-1, that he renamed Glamorous Glennis after his wife, was the man who achieved that.

I am proud to represent the men and women of Edwards Air Force Base with my good friend, Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY. And I understand what they do on a daily basis from the F-35, to the F-22, to all of the aircraft that happen out there at Edwards, to all of the flying expertise that they have on a daily basis. I am very proud of them. I am proud of what Edwards Air Force Base means to the country, and I am proud of what they mean to the history of this Nation. But I am most proud of the men and women because on a daily basis they create history. For that, I am most proud.

#### HONORING U.S. ARMY SERGEANT LA DAVID T. JOHNSON

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of U.S. Army Sergeant La David T. Johnson, who was killed in Niger, West Africa, during an ambush carried out by Boko Haram and other extremists linked to ISIS.

This tragic loss of a life, still so young and so full of promise and potential, is one of the saddest ironies that I could ever imagine. Sergeant Johnson was just 25 years old, the father of two children, and a beloved member of the Miami Gardens community in which I reside.

He and his two younger brothers, Keon and Richard, are proud members of the 5,000 Role Models of Excellence Project, an in-school dropout prevention program that I created soon after Sergeant Johnson was born, to ensure that he and other boys and young women of color have unfettered access to roads to success. Five thousand Role Models members all over the world are mourning his death.

Sergeant Johnson is married to Myeshia Johnson and has two children, and Myeshia is expecting their third child.

I sprung into action after Boko Haram kidnapped 276 schoolgirls in their boarding school in Nigeria. I traveled to Nigeria four times in my quest, and I have initiated the "Bring Back Our Girls Wear Red Wednesdays" in the Congress of the United States. I appreciate the support, especially from our leader, NANCY PELOSI.

I traveled there in August and met over 100 girls who were once hostages of Boko Haram. I wanted them to know that this Congress loves them and we will never, ever forget them.

Boko Haram actually means "Western education is a sin." They believe girls should be denied the privilege of an education, and they have killed more people than ISIS. In fact, they have joined forces with ISIS in the region and have killed over 20,000 Africans, sexually abused women and girls, and sends them on suicide missions using babies as decoys.

More than 1 million people have been displaced from their homes and are starving to death. What a tragedy. It would be an even greater tragedy to allow the deaths of Sergeant Johnson and his comrades—Staff Sergeant Bryan C. Black, 35, from Washington; Staff Sergeant Jeremiah W. Johnson, 39, from Ohio; and Staff Sergeant Dustin M. Wright, 29, from Georgia—be in vain.

Nearly a year ago, this Chamber voted unanimously for legislation that Republican Senator SUSAN COLLINS from Maine and I introduced that directs the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to jointly develop a 5-year strategy to end Boko

Haram's reign of terror. The law also calls for a plan to assist the Nigerian Government, the Multinational Joint Task Force, and international partners in their efforts to counter this regional threat.

□ 1045

Our soldiers were not there to fight but to provide training and assistance to the Nigerian Army forces and the multinational joint task force created to combat Boko Haram.

Yes, my heart breaks for this monumental loss, but it is also bursting with pride for all that he achieved and would have accomplished. During the few years in which he bravely served our Nation, he received several awards and accolades, including the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, and, ironically, the Global War on Terrorism Medal.

Boko Haram is a threat to the many nations across the globe that, like the United States, have committed monetary and human resources to help defeat this terrorist group, and we must never ever forget that this heinous organization's daily list of casualties could include one or more of our own, like Sergeant Johnson, Staff Sergeant Black, Staff Sergeant Jeremiah Johnson, and Staff Sergeant Wright.

May they rest in peace.

#### BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as an OB/GYN and now a U.S. Congressman, I want to continue to highlight October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

One out of eight women will develop breast cancer. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker. One out of eight women will develop breast cancer.

If you are a woman over the age of 35, you should ask your physician if you need a mammogram; and certainly if you are over the age of 50, every woman needs a mammogram every year.

A mammogram is quick, it is easy, and the great thing about mammograms is how easy it can be to catch breast cancer at its very early stages and give us a great chance to treat the problem.

Over my career as a physician, we have helped hundreds of women who have successfully fought this dreaded disease. There are great treatments out there and ways we can save lives, so I encourage every woman over the age of 35 to talk to their physician about a mammogram. It is one thing to be aware of breast cancer, but it is another thing to do something about it.

#### NATIONAL WOMEN'S SMALL BUSINESS MONTH

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the National Women's Business Council in recognizing October as National Women's Small Business Month.

Women bring unique and invaluable skills and experiences to the workplace. Across the country, there are over 9 million women-owned small businesses, and they contribute over a trillion dollars to our national economy.

In Kansas alone, there are more than 73 businesses owned by women, representing industries such as accounting, veterinary medicine, and management consulting.

As I have toured Kansas, I have met with women entrepreneurs in towns like Ellsworth and Emporia learning about how their businesses are growing local economies and the positive impact these businesses have on their communities. It is inspiring to see what these women have achieved and to hear their perspective on the challenges that small-business owners face.

I ask my colleagues to join me now in celebrating these women during National Women's Small Business Month.

RECOGNIZING THE KANSAS HEART AND STROKE COLLABORATIVE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, though mostly known as the top basketball program in the country, I want to acknowledge and salute the University of Kansas and our innovative work through the Kansas Heart and Stroke Collaborative.

The collaborative has worked diligently over the past 3 years to establish a new model and standard for how to efficiently treat the care of heart disease and strokes in rural areas. They provide better care in a way that saves overall costs and is truly a win-win.

Fifty-three counties in Kansas, with more than 90 hospitals, clinics, and offices, now are represented in the collaborative care model. Not only do they better the lives of patients in rural Kansas, they do so based on a model that is a poster child for other conservative-style demonstration projects.

In 2014, the University of Kansas partnered with Hays Medical Center and received a \$12 million, 3-year innovation grant. Now that 3-year window is closing, and I am pleased to say that the collaborative will continue as a self-sustaining entity.

Let me say that again. This will continue as a self-sustaining entity, continue to provide efficient care, and, literally, save thousands of rural Americans' lives and give them more meaningful life after their stroke or heart attack.

As a physician in rural Kansas for three decades, this is one of the greatest success stories I have ever seen, and it will always hold a special place in my heart, as I have seen it unfold right before my eyes.

The Kansas Heart and Stroke Collaborative provides hope and direction for rural healthcare in Kansas and beyond, and it should be looked at by other States.

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud Member of this House. I am always so honored to know that I have the preeminent privilege of standing in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. There are only 435 people who are elected as Members from the various States who have voting rights in Congress on legislation, who have this privilege, so it is an honor for me to do it. I want people to know that when I stand here, my words are sincere and my efforts are those that I believe can make a difference in the lives of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I called to the attention of the House of Representatives Articles of Impeachment, and I called these Articles of Impeachment to the attention of the House because it is a part of a process. It can be a three-step process, which has been used on multiple occasions in the past, a three-step process that allows the Member to give notice. After the Member gives notice, the Member does not have to allow a vote to take place immediately.

The Member can decide that, rather than have the vote take place within 2 days, the Member can give notice a second time and then allow that process to move forward, and the Speaker can then set a time for the Member to give a final notice, or present the actual Articles of Impeachment.

I have chosen to use the three-step process: initial notice; thereafter to come back before this House, which every Member has the privilege of doing and which has been done before, and again notice the House; and, thereafter, have the articles considered with a final reading.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is any secret that I have indicated that the President should be impeached. It is no secret. I don't think it is any secret that I have indicated that there will be a vote in Congress on Articles of Impeachment.

If perchance I have been misunderstood, allow me to make it perspicuously clear today: there will be a vote. There is a three-step process that we are pursuing. That process will continue when we return. And when we return, I assure everyone there will be a vote.

There has been some confusion. My suspicion is because where there are few facts, there is much speculation, so there has been some confusion about why we didn't go forward yesterday.

So now allow me to make it abundantly clear: no person, no living, breathing child of God influenced my decision to move forward as I have.

Others can give their opinions. No one did. I did not receive an opinion indicating that I should not go forward as I did.

I have made my decision. This is where I stand. If I stand alone, Mr.

Speaker, I have no fear of standing alone.

If Rosa Parks could sit alone in a racist Southern town to deal with injustice and bring about some form of justice, surely I can stand alone in the well of the Congress and stand alone on where I stand with impeachment.

If Dr. King could go to jail and write one of the greatest essays on human rights I have ever read, surely I can stand in the well of the Congress—if he could go to jail—and I can extoll and expand upon why I believe we have to move forward with impeachment.

Finally, this: those of you who bothered to read the Articles of Impeachment, and I beg that you would, because that is why this time is being made available, so that everyone can read it and understand why we are going forward, and those of you who will read them will find that I don't approve of anyone calling mothers dogs. I don't approve of it. I don't approve of it. I don't care who you are. When you say "SOB," you are saying that somebody's mother is a dog. I don't approve of that.

By the way, that is not widely published that that is in the Articles of Impeachment, but it is there. It is there for all to see.

So for those who believe that motherhood is sacred, for those who believe that a President of the United States ought not say "SOB," and you know what it means—I never use the B word. I never use profanity. But I want you to know this: I am going to move forward with those Articles of Impeachment, and motherhood is sacred.

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

RECOGNIZING MATT BELLINA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of my constituent, Matt Bellina, of Holland, Pennsylvania.

On April 9, 2014, at the age of 30, Matt was diagnosed with ALS, otherwise known as Lou Gehrig's disease. ALS attacks the nerve cells in the brain and the spinal cord, causing those with ALS to lose control of their muscles.

Matt graduated from Virginia Tech in May 2005 and received his commission into the U.S. Navy as a naval aviator. Following the onset of his symptoms, which include cramping hands, twitching arms, stiffness in his legs, Matt was grounded from flying. He continued to serve in the Navy in an administrative capacity until he medically retired in 2014, with the rank of lieutenant commander.

He eventually moved back home to Bucks County with his wife, Caitlin, and his young children to be surrounded by family and friends.



Although this disease stopped Matt's career in its tracks, he persisted and actively involved himself in the ALS community and became a strong advocate for right-to-try legislation.

Mr. Speaker, each year Americans like Matt Bellina receive the devastating news of a terminal diagnosis. Even with the amazing work done in American medical research, for too many families, access to these potentially lifesaving treatments will come too late or not at all.

Thousands of terminally ill patients suffer needlessly while awaiting final approval for drugs, therapies, and other medical technologies. While the Food and Drug Administration carries out its three-phase approval process, which can take years and cost billions of dollars, many patients simply want the chance to try treatments that are already demonstrated to be safe. A bill that was unanimously passed by the Senate will offer them a chance to extend their lives.

The Right to Try Act would ensure that terminally ill patients, together with their physicians and pharmaceutical manufacturers, can administer investigational treatments where no alternative exists. In fact, this bipartisan idea is already the law in 37 States.

A Federal right-to-try law would prevent the government from blocking access to potentially lifesaving medications. It would require patients to first try all other available treatments and be unable to participate in clinical trials.

For those patients caught between the traditional drug approval delays, the clinical trial process for which they do not qualify, and limited time, the right to try simply establishes the freedom for patients and their doctors to try therapies where the benefits far outweigh the risks. It gives them an option of trying to save their life.

Mr. Speaker, whether it is a father courageously battling ALS or a brave child living with Duchenne muscular dystrophy, they deserve the right to try.

#### MASS SHOOTING IN LAS VEGAS

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the tragedy that happened in my home town of Las Vegas last Sunday, October 1.

Last week, a horrific mass shooting took place in the community that I grew up in. Immediately when I heard the news on Sunday night, like so many people, I felt helpless, and I rushed to the hospital to see how I could help.

This shooting was the deadliest in modern U.S. history: 58 innocent people have died, and over 500 were injured.

The 58 innocent victims came from all walks of life. They came to Las

Vegas from all over the United States of America. Some were there to celebrate their birthdays, their favorite country singer, a night out with friends and family, and even celebrating their wedding anniversaries.

□ 1100

Even though these families will never get another Christmas, another Thanksgiving, or another birthday with their loved one, they will never forget them, and we won't either.

As we grieve for those who were killed or injured, and pray for their families, I want to recognize the heroes who bravely and selflessly rushed to help: law enforcement officers and first responders, including some who were off duty and attending the concert, who ran toward the gunfire to protect the concertgoers and provide desperately needed care for victims; people at the concert who shielded those around them, gave them medical care, and led others to safety, exposing themselves to the hail of bullets while they tried to save others; people driving by who used their cars to help take shooting victims to the hospitals; strangers helping strangers; the healthcare professionals, doctors, nurses, support staff, and volunteers who have been working tirelessly around the clock to care for the more than 500 injured people; hospitality industry employees, who rushed to help however they could; and the Las Vegas businesses and residents, who have generously donated their money, time, and blood to help the victims.

To all of these heroes, I say: Thank you. Thank you so much.

Over the coming days and weeks, I plan to speak on this floor about each individual victim to honor their life and to tell their story. I will also be speaking out about what Congress needs to do to prevent another tragedy like this from happening.

We should never forget the victims of October 1, 2017, but as we embark on the long process of healing, I am forever grateful for the incredible heart and spirit shown by the Las Vegas community. I have never been prouder to be a Las Vegas, and I have never been prouder to be a Nevadan, and I know that my city is and will always be Vegas Strong.

#### COMMANDER SETH ANTHONY STONE WAS A SOLDIER FOR THE LORD

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Commander Seth Anthony Stone, a native Texan, a devout Christian, and a true American hero, who left us far too early on September 30, 2017, at the age of 41 years old.

Twice the recipient of the Silver Star Medal, our Nation's third highest combat award, Seth was among the most highly decorated U.S. Navy SEALs.

As a SEAL platoon commander in Iraq during the Battle of Ramadi in 2006, he served alongside my son, Leif Babin, as they led some of the toughest sustained urban combat operations in the history of the SEAL teams.

Seth was a storied and an exceptional combat leader that helped turn the tide for America in two of the most pivotal battles of the Iraq war.

Seth and his SEAL platoon played an integral role in the victorious efforts of the U.S. Army's 1st Armored Division's Ready First Brigade Combat Team that transformed Ramadi from the most violent and dangerous place in Iraq to a stable, secure, and peaceful city.

In more than 6 months of continuous urban combat, a number of his SEALs were wounded and killed in action, including Master-at-Arms Second Class Michael A. Monsoor, when he dove onto a grenade to save three of his SEAL teammates next to him. For his actions, Petty Officer Monsoor was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor.

Seth returned to Iraq 2 years later and led a SEAL task unit that included American Sniper, Chief Petty Officer Chris Kyle, also from Texas.

Seth's outstanding combat record placed him in a very special class that included Petty Officer Michael Monsoor, Chief Petty Officer Chris Kyle, Petty Officer Marc Lee, and Petty Officer Ryan Job.

Seth epitomized the warrior ethos, risking his life on many occasions in combat against our Nation's mortal enemies. He saved countless U.S. servicemembers, and he helped bring stability to embattled regions of the world.

About his military service, Seth said:

It was my honor to fight for my country. The best life is one lived as a sacrifice for others. I love my country, and I love the teams. That is what drove me to fight so hard for America while wearing the SEAL Trident. At the same time, I did not really consider myself to be a SEAL but, rather, a soldier for the Lord.

In everything he did and throughout his life he served the Lord from a place of deep faith. He was a very special person. I was proud to know him, and I will be forever grateful for his service to our great country and the friendship and camaraderie that he had with my son and all those whom he served with.

While Seth has left us on Earth, his passion for his friends, his country, and his Lord will certainly live on and never be forgotten.

#### FEMA CAN DO BETTER FOR OUR FELLOW AMERICANS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there was applause from the gallery, and every American applauds.

Mr. Speaker, I have an alert for the Trump administration. The Trump-led FEMA, that is the Federal Emergency



Management Agency, part of the Department of Homeland Security, is falling far short on disaster relief in Puerto Rico. In fact, I think one could say they are actually perilously short on helping the people, our fellow citizens, in Puerto Rico.

It has now been 22 days, that is 528 hours, since Hurricane Maria destroyed Puerto Rico. Hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico still—still—have no fresh water, no power, little food, with many villages lacking any means for communication. Many have no dry cots or even dry sleeping bags to replace the wet mattresses and moldy surroundings that characterize the Puerto Rico of today.

Let me say that Puerto Rico is not a large island. It is a little over 100 miles wide, not much larger than my congressional district in Ohio which extends from Cleveland to Toledo. The difference with Puerto Rico is the topography is much more hilly.

I ask myself the question: Why hasn't FEMA had airdrops of vital sustenance from the very start? Where is that help to these far-flung villages that have been cut off because, when the rains came, they washed out bridges and roads that make all these tiny towns inaccessible? Inaccessible.

Fresh water packets can be airdropped. Our military does that all over the world. Why can't those fresh water packets be dropped in Puerto Rico?

We can drop packets with peanut butter and bread. We do that all over the world. Why can't we do that in Puerto Rico? Why can't we airdrop food?

Citizens in Ohio with families and friends in Puerto Rico about whom they are desperately worried have been told that many smaller towns where they have relationships lack relief and any assistance now 528 hours, 22 days, into this deep human tragedy.

I want to place in the RECORD, and I hope somebody at FEMA is listening, names of some of the villages that are completely cut off because roads and bridges were destroyed and no relief has come. No relief has come.

Ponce, in the south, is one. Utuado, Jayuya, Arecibo, Yauco, Corozal, Comerio, Loiza, Toa Baja, Cabo Rojo, and Llanadas. Those are names we have been given. Aid to these pockets of desperation is almost 3 weeks overdue. People need relief now.

FEMA also needs a better plan. In fact, they need a plan. I don't think they have any plan to immediately evacuate people to the mainland for respite. Places like Cleveland, Lorain, and Toledo, Ohio, we could accept people who now are living in conditions you would wish on no American.

We cannot risk more illness and death. Children should not be missing school after the horror they have experienced. We shouldn't have the level of hardship that has been subjected to people who are still enduring the devastation of Maria. What is happening there is inhumane.

Most of the television stations are down in San Juan, and that is where the Governor of Puerto Rico is most of the time when our codels go down there, but the desperation is in the countryside. It is outside of San Juan, which is inaccessible.

President Trump, the people of America and, let me tell you, those in Ohio need you to help their families and countrymen now. FEMA can do so much better for our fellow Americans.

FEMA's initials stand for Federal Emergency Management. So where is the emergency? Where is the management? And where is the Federal reputation for excellence and leaving no man or woman behind?

FEMA, shape up. America demands more, and Americans deserve more.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

#### THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL WAS A GIANT MISTAKE

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge President Trump to decertify the disastrous Iran nuclear deal. There are reports that decertification may come as early as tomorrow, and I certainly hope so.

The Iran nuclear deal was a giant mistake. It has been bad for America's national security, bad for our ally Israel's national security, and bad for the world.

By decertifying the flawed Iran nuclear deal before October 15, the administration has a chance to send a strong message that the United States will not sit idly by while the Iranian threat continues to grow.

The deal was premised on a naive notion that Iran would somehow evolve into a peaceful global partner, but that couldn't have been further from the truth. Make no mistake about it: Iran is not our friend, does not share our values, and should not have been trusted.

For decades, Iran has called the United States the Great Satan, and their leadership continues to call for the total annihilation of our ally Israel. Iran remains the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world and is actively working towards obtaining a nuclear bomb.

This much is clear: Iran has not upheld the spirit of this deal. Now is the time to reassert our authority on the world stage and hold Iran accountable.

I look forward to working with President Trump to keep America, our allies, and the rest of the world safe from Iranian aggression.

□ 1115

#### HONORING THE DISCOVERY OF HERNANDO DE SOTO'S 1539 ENCAMPMENT AND THE LOST NATIVE AMERICAN TOWN OF POTANO

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the discovery of Hernando de Soto's 1939 encampment and the lost Native American town of Potano, by the University of Florida professors, Dr. Fred White and Dr. Michele White, and University of Florida honor student Ethan White. This newly discovered archaeological site is the oldest confirmed New World contact site in the United States.

In one of the most important events in U.S. history, de Soto was the first European to discover the Mississippi River and explore an area that today would hold 10 States. Until this incredible archaeological discovery, there was no physical evidence of de Soto's 4,000-mile journey. The collection of artifacts recovered near Orange Lake, Florida, includes very rare King Ferdinand coins, Queen Isabella coins, and a King Enrique IV of Castile coin that is the oldest dated European artifact ever unearthed in the United States.

Other rare items include Murano glass beads and Spanish weapons and armor dated from the early 1500s. The artifacts were excavated in the lost ancient Native American town of Potano. Also discovered in the town of Potano were the remains of the first location of the San Buenaventura Franciscan mission built there in the 1580s. Within the floors of the 16th century mission, the team discovered the largest cache of medieval coins found in the American mainland so far.

Acknowledgment for confirmation and identification of the artifacts goes to a large and diverse group of scholars throughout the country. The recent scientific findings were published in the peer-reviewed International Journal of Archaeology and with the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Archaeological Research in Tallahassee, Florida. The collection of artifacts is at the Florida Museum of Natural History on the campus of my alma mater, the University of Florida.

NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, additionally, I would like to recognize today is National Farmers Day, a day when we say thanks to all of our farmers and ranchers for the work they do. Our agricultural industry, in a lot of ways, is the backbone of this country. It feeds our Nation and a big portion of the world, and accounts for 11 percent of overall employment.

Most people don't realize how farmers affect their life, but it is important to reflect on the interdependence between rural and urban life.

People often associate Florida with tourism, but agriculture is actually

Florida's number two industry, utilizing one-third of Florida's available land. Without agriculture, urban developments—in fact, all developments—could not flourish. There is a simple symbiotic relationship between families and communities, and that is, if you are hungry, you are going to eat. Every time you get hungry you think about your farmer, so thank a farmer today.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF BUD ADAMS

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting on National Farmers Day that I am able to rise and honor a true Florida legend, Mr. Bud Adams of Fort Pierce, Florida, and his contributions to the Florida cattle industry. He is an icon in Florida and the Nation's cattle industry.

Mr. Adams was a pioneer, a wildlife photographer, but more than anything else, he was a true American pioneer and cattle rancher. He was a real American cowboy in Florida, and they are known in Florida as Florida crackers. That name is derived from the sound of a bullwhip when it is used to round up and herd cattle.

After a stint in the Navy during World War II, Mr. Adams returned home to work and grow the family ranch. For the past 80 years, you could find Mr. Adams on horseback surveying the land and the cattle that they raised. He was a strong advocate for conservation and was nationally recognized for his leadership in preserving the land for future generations.

Even more so, Mr. Adams is known for creating the Braford breed of cattle, which is a cross between the Brahman cattle and the Hereford cattle, a heat-tolerant, heavy-beef-producing cow, ideal for the Florida climate. Mr. Adams was rightfully proud of this breed and went on to help found the United Braford Breeders Association.

Additionally, Mr. Adams was a proud member of the Florida Cattlemen's Association. He served as the president in 1958, and, for the last 59 years, he was always willing to offer a helping hand to the new Florida Cattlemen's leadership.

Mr. Adams will always be remembered for the impact he had on the Florida cattle industry and his willingness to nurture future generations of Florida cattlemen. He will be greatly missed.

#### SUPPORTING THE CARE CORPS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage my colleagues to support the Care Corps Demonstration Act.

By the year 2030, there will be more than 72 million older Americans. As they age, many of these seniors will require long-term support and services, placing a significant burden on our elder care system that is already strug-

gling to provide and finance services to our seniors.

The Care Corps Demonstration Act, which my colleague Congresswoman MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM and I have introduced, will address this growing need by placing Care Corps volunteers in communities where they will provide essential services to seniors that will allow these older Americans to remain independent. In turn, these wonderful volunteers will receive assistance in paying down their educational expenses.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, this program will help us train a new generation of healthcare providers to meet our Nation's demand for senior care services by giving our students essential, real-world experience in the field.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will create stronger communities across our Nation by bringing generations of Americans together. I encourage my colleagues to support our bill, the Care Corps Demonstration Act, of this session. The bill number, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 3493.

So please contact my congressional office or the office of Congresswoman MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM to cosponsor H.R. 3493.

#### NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize America's farmers on National Farmers Day.

I call our American farmers the thin green line because food security is national security. We can never discount the importance of our Nation's ability to feed itself, and we can do so only by the hard work of the men and women in the agricultural community.

In honor of National Farmers Day, I wanted to recite a poem first delivered by a radio personality, Paul Harvey, to the FFA Convention in 1978. The poem is as follows:

And on the 8th day, God looked down on his planned paradise and said, "I need a caretaker," so God made a farmer. God said, "I need somebody willing to get up before dawn, milk cows, work all day in the fields, milk cows again, eat supper, then go to town and stay past midnight at a meeting of the school board," so God made a farmer.

"I need somebody with arms strong enough to rustle a calf and yet gentle enough to deliver his own grandchild; somebody to call hogs, tame cantankerous machinery, come home hungry, have to wait for lunch until his wife is done feeding visit ladies, then tell the ladies to be sure and come back real soon, and mean it," so God made a farmer.

God said, "I need somebody willing to sit up all night with a newborn colt, and watch it die, and then dry his eyes and say, 'Maybe next year.' I need somebody who can shape an ax handle from a persimmon sprout, shoe a horse with a hunk of car tire, who can make a harness out of haywire, feed sacks, and shoe straps; who, planting time comes and harvest season, will finish his 40-hour week by Tuesday noon, and then painting

from tractor back, put in another 72 hours," so God made a farmer.

God had to have somebody willing to ride the ruts at double speed to get the hay in ahead of the rain clouds, and yet stop in mid-field and race to help when he sees the first smoke from a neighbor's place, so God made a farmer.

God said, "I need somebody strong enough to clear trees and heave bales, yet gentle enough to tame lambs and wean pigs and tend to the pink-combed pullets, who will stop his mower for an hour to splint the broken leg of a meadow lark."

It had to be somebody who would plow deep and straight and not cut corners; somebody to seed, weed, feed, breed, and rake and disc and plow and plant and tie the fleece and strain the milk and replenish the self-feeder and finish a hard week's work with a 5-mile drive to church; somebody who would bale a family together with the soft strong bonds of sharing, who would laugh, and then sigh, and then reply, with smiling eyes, when his son says that he wants to spend his life "doing what dad does," so God made a farmer.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

Reverend Joshua Leu, First Christian Church, Great Bend, Kansas, offered the following prayer:

God, I ask today that You would open these honorable men and women of the House to the significance, weight, and sacredness of the work that they get to do.

Remind them that the detailed decisions that they make here and now will not only have effects on the entire world, but will ripple through time for generations to come, making a way for all people.

So gift them, O Lord, with Your wisdom today and every day they serve so they can be a part of causing Your kingdom to come, Your will to be done, on Earth as it is in Heaven.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### WELCOMING REVEREND JOSHUA LEU

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute and say thanks during Pastor Appreciation Month. This one is particularly special, as one of my own church's pastors gave the opening prayer to this body just moments ago.

From baptisms to weddings to funerals, pastors give us encouragement to meet the demands of life. They give spiritual balance to a material world and are spiritual leaders for a nation deemed "one Nation under God."

I thank my current pastor, Pastor Josh Leu; his wife, Ashley; his lovely daughters, Karys and Khora. I also want to thank my pastor of 20 years, Pastor Bill Johnson, and his wife, Lois.

Thanks for all you have done for us, for my family, for my community, and for my church.

Like Pastor Bill always used to say: Have a good day, if you want to.

Mr. Speaker, let's all reach out to pastors and their families to tell them thanks for all they do for us.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was grateful to join Secretary Rick Perry and my colleagues, Congressman CHUCK FLEISCHMANN, Congressman JOE BARTON, and Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, yesterday to celebrate the Department of Energy's 40th birthday.

The goals presented of progressing our science, protecting our Nation, and promoting our energy were meaningful to me, having served as Deputy General Counsel under Secretary Jim Edwards of the Reagan administration. I was also grateful to have worked at the Savannah River Site, where I saw firsthand so many dedicated personnel.

In Washington, I served with General Counsel R. Tenney Johnson; was welcomed by Administrative Assistant

Marsha McQueen; and was trained by Deputy General Counsel Eric Fygi, who was recognized as an original DOE staff member.

I look forward to working with Secretary Perry to ensure continued progress on our nuclear cleanup missions, effective stewardship of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and continued research and development at our Nation's national labs. DOE now clearly promotes energy development to create jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear deal is far from perfect. There are outstanding issues, like ballistic missiles, that are and should be addressed outside the nuclear agreement.

Ultimately, the goal of this deal was to prevent Iran from attaining a nuclear weapon and averting all-out war. This is exactly what it has done.

Now, President Trump is threatening to pull out from the deal and break our commitments to Iran and our allies, with no evidence to prove that Iran has not complied. In fact, the IAEA and our U.S. military and intelligence sources unanimously agree that Iran has remained compliant to the agreement.

Walking away from the Iran nuclear agreement that, so far, is working will likely cause Iran to restart its nuclear weapons program, eliminate the possibility of diplomatic negotiations to denuclearize North Korea, kick off a nuclear arms race, and greatly increase the chances of nuclear war.

If President Trump breaks our commitment to the Iran deal, the American people have everything to lose and nothing to gain. For the peace and security of the American people, we must uphold our commitment to this nuclear deal.

#### RECOGNIZING ALABAMA STATE REPRESENTATIVE JAMES BUSKEY

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alabama State Representative James Buskey.

Representative Buskey recently announced that he will be retiring from the Alabama House of Representatives after 42 years of representing people in Mobile, Alabama.

He was first elected to the House in 1976, making him one of the longest-serving legislators in Alabama history. Outside of the legislature, Representative Buskey spent much of his life working in public education, including as a school administrator at E.S. Chastang Middle School in Mobile.

While we have had our share of political differences, I have always appreciated his institutional knowledge and respected his passion for our local community. I am honored to call James a friend and appreciate his decades of service to the people of Mobile and Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I wish James and his wife, Vergie, all the best upon his retirement and the years ahead.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF HANNAH AHLERS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 2017, a gunman opened fire on thousands of innocent people at a music festival in Las Vegas.

As our families mourn, I want to honor the life of Hannah Ahlers, a wife, mother, daughter, sister, friend to many, and beloved by her community, whose life was taken too soon. Her brother recently told me: "She was loved by everyone that met her . . . she was our sunshine."

Her beautiful personality was felt by all, from her family and friends, to the mothers she worked with in her children's schools, to the volleyball team she volunteered with. As her husband shared: "She wasn't too good for anybody; beautiful inside and out."

At 34, her dedication to family and community is felt in her home in the city of Beaumont and across the Inland Empire.

On behalf of my wife, Monica, and the entire 36th Congressional District, we join together as a community to mourn her heartbreaking loss and celebrate her life.

To Hannah's husband, Brian; her children, Briannah, Brice, and Hailey, our thoughts and prayers are with you. We commit to take up Hannah's mantle of dedication by serving our own communities. Her love and devotion will never be forgotten.

#### NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, when you eat today, you can thank a farmer.

Across this great Nation, over 3 million farmers work tirelessly each day to produce the food that feeds our families and keeps our country running.

From Grace-Way Dairy Farm in Lowville to Everett Orchards in Peru, I have been blessed to meet with so many farmers that make up the backbone of our north country economy. Many of these family farms in my district produce dairy, apples, honey, wine, and the most delicious maple in the country.

As Congress works on the next farm bill, we need to focus on supporting those who support our Nation's food supply.

Mr. Speaker, today, on National Farmers Day, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking the men and women who rise before the sun each and every day to make sure our families are fed.

#### HELPING FLOOD VICTIMS IN NEED

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Congress to help the neediest and most vulnerable flood victims from our Nation's recent hurricanes.

Our district in Houston and Harris County, Texas, is familiar with hurricanes and disaster recovery. We rebuilt our communities after Allison in 2001, and again in 2008, after Hurricane Ike.

Texans are proud and independent people. We take pride in our self-reliance and can-do attitude. However, many members of our community—low-income families, seniors, and disabled Americans—are in the greatest need and must rely on others for help.

Current rules can prevent the neediest victims from receiving assistance they need to recover and rebuild their homes, including denying individuals Federal assistance for being able to afford flood insurance premiums that can exceed over \$4,000 a year. That is out of range for most of these folks.

As America's elected representatives, we have a moral responsibility to act and protect our Nation's most vulnerable disaster victims, especially our seniors and disabled, from being left with nothing.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF JAMES B. BRIEN, JR.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Mr. Jim Brien of Mayfield in Kentucky's First Congressional District, who passed away on Friday, October 6.

Jim's decades of service established him as a titan within the western Kentucky legal community. Having served as assistant prosecutor for Mayfield, an assistant Commonwealth attorney, and as a partner at the Law Offices of Neely, Brien, Wilson, and Toombs, he developed an unparalleled legal knowledge and community network which he utilized to defend his fellow citizens and work tirelessly on their behalf.

He was widely respected for his selfless service to his family and community, as evidenced by his leadership in community organizations and his membership at the First Baptist Church in Mayfield.

For all who knew him, he was a dedicated public servant and a staunch advocate for Graves County, whose passion for bettering the community was rivaled only by his love for University of Kentucky football and basketball.

May God continue to bless his sons, James B. Brien III and Joshua V. Brien, and his family and friends, through which his legacy lives on.

#### NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the people of west Texas, home to 14 million acres of farmland, making it one of the largest agriculture production regions in the world.

I have spent a lot of time with these plowboys and cowboys over the years, and I can tell you this: these men and women don't work our land and our cattle for the money, and they certainly don't do it for recognition.

But today is National Farmers Day. Let's pause and pay tribute to the American farmer.

Farming was man's first profession. Farming saved and sustained our first colony at Jamestown. Farming helped fund the Revolution, securing the very freedoms we have and cherish today.

Farming has allowed us to feed and clothe our own people, and that food and fiber independence has contributed to America being the most powerful, most prosperous, and most generous Nation in the history of the world.

God bless our farmers.

#### BEWARE OF POLLS

(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, a recent Washington Post/ABC News poll professed to find that a majority of Americans supported amnesty for illegal immigrants. That is not hard to do, given how the survey was conducted.

The pollsters asked to speak only with the youngest adult at home; oversampled Democrats by at least 4 percent; used the word "undocumented" rather than "illegal;" questioned illegal immigrants, at least 3 percent of the population; and conditioned amnesty on requirements that can't be met.

Other than that, I am sure it was an accurate poll.

Beware of polls done by liberal media organizations that have an agenda of their own. The American people may not be getting the facts. They deserve better.

#### ADDRESSING OUR COUNTRY'S NATURAL DISASTERS

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of the victims of the California wildfires.

We have seen some devastating fires throughout California, specifically huge fires in northern California, that have already burned over 142,000 acres. It is one of the deadliest weeks in California wildfire history, already seeing 23 lives perish in those fires.

Today, we will see disaster relief funding here on the floor. It is important that, while we have already passed one funding bill, we pass another to address all natural emergencies across the entire country. We must also have funding available for Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria in devastated areas like Puerto Rico, Texas, and Florida.

We have had big challenges in this country, and it is time to make sure that we pass a second relief funding bill that will address many of those concerns in the disasters that we have seen across the country.

Shortly hereafter, we are going to see another funding bill come forward that will address some reforms. While some of our States have building codes and are addressing the impacts so that we don't see this devastation in the future, we need to make sure that these reforms are passed in the coming bill as well.

We have three major bills. We will pass one today. Another one is soon to follow. We have to address the country's national emergencies.

□ 1215

#### HONORING STAFF SERGEANT RYAN MCCARTHY AND STAFF SERGEANT CHAD HICKEY

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two valued members of Missouri's defense community, Staff Sergeant Ryan McCarthy and Staff Sergeant Chad Hickey. They are both stationed out of Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri's Fourth District, and these soldiers are exceptional representatives of their base, their State, and their service branch—the United States Army.

Both men recently received top honors at the Association of the United States Army's Annual Meeting and Exposition, where they were recognized for their leadership, excellence, and achievements.

Staff Sergeant McCarthy, who is right here, was named the Noncommissioned Officer of the Year by AUSA. A combat engineer with more than 9 years of service, McCarthy has served multiple deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan. His dedication and leadership represent the best ideals of our Army and America's fighting forces.

Another Fort Leonard Wood soldier, Staff Sergeant Chad Hickey, pictured here, was named Drill Sergeant of the Year. Hickey received the honor after winning a grueling fitness, endurance, and combat-readiness competition

against the Nation's top drill sergeants.

The fact that Staff Sergeant McCarthy and Staff Sergeant Hickey are both from Fort Leonard Wood is no surprise. The men and women stationed there serve with strength, seriousness, and purpose, setting an example of military leadership for the entire Army.

To Staff Sergeants McCarthy and Hickey, and to all of the soldiers stationed at Fort Leonard Wood, I wish to extend to each and every one of you and your families our gratitude and congratulations.

#### CONGRESSIONAL APP CHALLENGE

(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, technology connects the world in ways like never before. From everyday conveniences at our fingertips to improved communications, technology plays an ever-increasing role in our lives.

We are becoming more dependent on applications, or apps, and the students of today will become the leaders of tomorrow by developing such technology. That is why my office is proud again to participate in the Congressional App Challenge.

This competition allows K-12 students from across the country to practice their code-writing skills by developing an app. Winning apps will be displayed in the Capitol Building later this year.

The 2015 winner from my office, Lachlan Campbell, created an app to store recipes and discover new dishes. I am proud that this State College student was able to show off his talents in our Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that students from across Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District will put their skills to work, create an app, and submit it to the Congressional App Challenge.

Submissions will close on November 1, and I can't wait to see what our students create.

#### RECOGNITION OF BIOENERGY DAY

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Bioenergy Day, a day we celebrate natural renewable energy in America. On October 18, organizations across America will mark this special day by opening their doors to the public and highlighting how bioenergy is fueling America.

Forest by-products are a primary source of bioenergy, making my home State of Arkansas a leading producer in this field.

Across the country, bioenergy keeps the lights on and so much more. Bio-

energy produces just under 6 percent of the Nation's total energy supply and provides full-time jobs for tens of thousands of Americans, with more plants coming online in the near future.

We need to do more research to find economical ways to harness renewable energy in our abundant biomass that we all too often continue to see going up in flames and wildfires. As we approach October 18, I encourage all Americans to learn more about bioenergy, forest by-products, and the environmental benefits derived from our natural resources.

#### CREATING A TURNING POINT FROM A TRAGEDY

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise as a cosponsor of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act the House will be voting on later today.

Dr. Kirkpatrick was a promising young clinical psychologist assigned to the Tomah VA in Wisconsin. Committed to finding innovative treatments for PTSD, he expressed alarm that patients of the VA were being overmedicated, preventing him from providing the treatment they so desperately needed.

Rather than listen to his concerns, the VA retaliated against him and, ultimately, Chris was fired; and that very day, he took his own life. The VA investigation later found that Chris' concerns about overmedication were entirely founded.

Chris' story is a tragedy, but can also serve as a turning point. Just as our veterans have earned world-class care, their allies such as Chris deserve full protection should they bravely decide to document VA wrongdoing or abuse. By increasing these protections today, we are honoring Chris' memory, serving as a fitting memorial to a life that was tragically cut short.

#### 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 the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

#### ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS ACT, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 569) providing for the concurrence by the House in the

Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 569

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 2266, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

#### SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017".

#### DIVISION A—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS ACT OF 2017

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF FUND

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief Fund" for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$18,670,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$10,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations related to disasters: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall publish on the Agency's website not later than 5 days after an award of a public assistance grant under section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172) that is in excess of \$1,000,000, the specifics of each such grant award: *Provided further*, That for any mission assignment or mission assignment task order to another Federal department or agency regarding a major disaster in excess of \$1,000,000, not later than 5 days after the issuance of such mission assignment or mission assignment task order, the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website the following: the name of the impacted State, the disaster declaration for such State, the assigned agency, the assistance requested, a description of the disaster, the total cost estimate, and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That not later than 10 days after the last day of each month until a mission assignment or mission assignment task order described in the preceding proviso is completed and closed out, the Administrator shall update any changes to the total cost estimate and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That for a disaster declaration related to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, or Hurricane Maria, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, not later than 5 days after the first day of each month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall publish on the Agency's website, not later than 10 days after the first day of

each such month, an estimate or actual amount, if available, for the current fiscal year of the cost of the following categories of spending: public assistance, individual assistance, operations, mitigation, administrative, and any other relevant category (including emergency measures and disaster resources): *Provided further*, That not later than 10 days after the first day of each month, the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website the report (referred to as the Disaster Relief Monthly Report) as required by Public Law 114-4.

Of the amounts provided in this division for the Disaster Relief Fund, up to \$4,900,000,000 may be transferred to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for the cost of direct loans as authorized under section 417 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5184) to be used to assist local governments in providing essential services as a result of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, or Maria: *Provided further*, That such amounts may subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$4,900,000,000 under section 417 of the Stafford Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 417 of the Stafford Act, a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, of the United States shall be deemed to be a local government for purposes of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 417(b) of the Stafford Act, the amount of any such loan issued to a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, may be based on the projected loss of tax and other revenues and on projected cash outlays not previously budgeted for a period not to exceed 180 days from the date of the major disaster, and may exceed \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or the constitution of a territory or possession that limits the issuance of debt, a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, may each receive more than one loan with repayment provisions and other terms specific to the type of lost tax and other revenues and on projected unbudgeted cash outlays for which the loan is provided: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 417(c)(1) of the Stafford Act, loans to a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, may be cancelled in whole or in part only at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall determine the terms, conditions, eligible uses, and timing and amount of Federal disbursements of loans issued to a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a): *Provided further*, That FEMA may transfer up to 1.5 percent of the amount under this paragraph to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for administrative expenses to carry out under this paragraph the direct loan program, as authorized by section 417 of the Stafford Act: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this paragraph for transfer, up to \$150,000,000 may be transferred to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for the cost to lend a territory or possession of the United States that portion of assistance for which the territory or possession is responsible under the cost-sharing provisions of the major disaster declaration for Hurricanes Irma or Maria, as authorized

under section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5162): *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this paragraph for transfer, up to \$1,000,000 may be transferred to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for administrative expenses to carry out the Advance of Non-Federal Share program, as authorized by section 319 of the Stafford Act.

The amount provided under this heading is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

## TITLE II

### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### FOREST SERVICE

##### WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

###### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Wildland Fire Management", \$184,500,000, to remain available through September 30, 2021, for urgent wildland fire suppression operations: *Provided*, That such funds shall be solely available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts from which funds were previously transferred for wildland fire suppression in fiscal year 2017 to fully repay those amounts: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

##### FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

###### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund", \$342,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses for large wildland fire suppression operations of the Department of Agriculture and as a reserve fund for suppression and Federal emergency response activities: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(e)), such funds shall be solely available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts from which funds were previously transferred for wildland fire suppression in fiscal year 2017 to fully repay those amounts: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

#### DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS

##### WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

###### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Wildland Fire Management", \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities and funds necessary to repay any transfers needed for these costs: *Provided*, That such funds may be available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts to fully repay amounts previously transferred for wildland fire suppression: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

## TITLE III

### GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Each amount appropriated or made available by this division is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this division shall remain available

for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. The terms and conditions applicable to the funds provided in this division, including those provided by this title, shall also apply to the funds made available in division B of Public Law 115-56.

SEC. 304. Each amount designated in this division by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 305. (a)(1) Not later than December 31, 2017, in accordance with criteria to be established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as "OMB"), each Federal agency shall submit to OMB, the Government Accountability Office, the respective Inspector General of each agency, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate internal control plans for funds provided by this division and division B of Public Law 115-56.

(2) Not later than March 31, 2018, the Government Accountability Office shall review for the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate the design of the internal control plans required by paragraph (1).

(b) All programs and activities receiving funds under this division shall be deemed to be "susceptible to significant improper payments" for purposes of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), notwithstanding section 2(a) of such Act.

(c) Funds for grants provided by this division or division B of Public Law 115-56 shall be expended by the grantees within the 24-month period following the agency's obligation of funds for the grant, unless, in accordance with guidance to be issued by the Director of OMB, the Director waives this requirement for a particular grant program and submits a written justification for such waiver to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. In the case of such grants, the agency shall include a term in the grant that requires the grantee to return to the agency any funds not expended within the 24-month period.

SEC. 306. (a) The first proviso under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" in division B of Public Law 115-56 is amended by striking "State or unit of general local government" and inserting "State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))".

(b) Amounts repurposed pursuant to subsection (a) that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of such Act.

SEC. 307. Section 101(a)(7) of division D of Public Law 115-56 is amended to read as follows:

"(7) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017 (division G of Public Law 115-31), except the language under the heading 'FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund' in the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior."

SEC. 308. (a) Notwithstanding sections 1309, 1310, and 1310a of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016 - 4017a) and section 15(e) of the Federal Flood Insurance



Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414(e)), and any borrowing agreement entered into between the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, of the indebtedness of the Administrator under any notes or other obligations issued pursuant to section 1309(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) and section 15(e) of the Federal Insurance Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414(e)) that is outstanding as of the date of the enactment of this Act, an amount of \$16,000,000,000 is hereby cancelled. To the extent of the amount cancelled, the Administrator and the National Flood Insurance Fund are relieved of all liability to the Secretary of the Treasury under any such notes or other obligations, including for any interest due under such notes and any other fees and charges payable in connection with such notes, and the total amount of notes and obligations issued by the Administrator pursuant to such sections shall be considered to be reduced by such amount for the purposes of the limitation on such total amount under such section 1309(a).

(b) The amount of the indebtedness cancelled under subsection (a) may be treated as public debt of the United States.

(c)(1) This section 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)).

(2) The amount provided in this section is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 309.** Notwithstanding section 19(a)(2)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028), not to exceed \$1,270,000,000 of funds made available for the contingency reserve under the heading “Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program” of division A of Public Law 114–113 shall be available for the Secretary to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the Presidentially declared major disasters and emergencies: *Provided*, That funds made available to Puerto Rico under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2019, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 310.** Notwithstanding section 2208(1)(3) of title 10, United States Code, during fiscal year 2018, the dollar limitation on advance billing of a customer of a working-capital fund in such section shall not apply with respect to the advance billing of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. In the preceding sentence, the term “advance billing” has the meaning given the term in section 2208(1)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

This division may be cited as the “Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act of 2017”.

## **DIVISION B—BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017**

### **SECTION 1001. SHORT TITLE.**

This division may be cited as the “Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017”.

### **SEC. 1002. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES IN CERTAIN JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.**

(a) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES AUTHORIZED BY THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2005.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized for the following districts by subsection (b) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C.

152 note) are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs:

- (A) The district of Delaware.
- (B) The southern district of Florida.
- (C) The district of Maryland.
- (D) The eastern district of Michigan.
- (E) The district of Nevada.
- (F) The eastern district of North Carolina.
- (G) The district of Puerto Rico.
- (H) The eastern district of Virginia.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) SINGLE VACANCIES.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), the 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for each district specified in paragraph (1)—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(B) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(i) occurring 5 years or more after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(C) DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.—

(i) The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Maryland—

(I) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(II) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(ii) The 2d and 3d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Maryland resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(D) SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The 1st and 2d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the southern district of Florida—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of subsection (b) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES EXTENDED BY THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2005 AND THE TEMPORARY BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIPS EXTENSION ACT OF 2012.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized by section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and extended by subsection (c) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and further extended by section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) for the district of Delaware and the district of Puerto Rico are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 5th vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(B) DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO.—The 2d vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Puerto Rico—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note), subsection (c) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note), and section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

### **SEC. 1003. TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGE AUTHORIZED.**

(a) APPOINTMENTS.—The following bankruptcy judges shall be appointed in the manner prescribed in section 152(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, for the appointment of bankruptcy judges provided for in section 152(a)(2) of that title:

(1) Two additional bankruptcy judges for the district of Delaware.

(2) One additional bankruptcy judge for the middle district of Florida.

(3) One additional bankruptcy judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

(b) VACANCIES.—

(1) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 6th and 7th vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under subsection (a)(1) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(2) MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the middle district of Florida—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under subsection (a)(2) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.—The 2d vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the eastern district of Michigan—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under subsection (a)(3) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

### **SEC. 1004. BANKRUPTCY FEES.**

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(6) In” and inserting “(6)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “(B) During each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, if the balance in the United States Trustee System Fund as of September 30 of the most recent full fiscal year is less than \$200,000,000, the quarterly fee payable



for a quarter in which disbursements equal or exceed \$1,000,000 shall be the lesser of 1 percent of such disbursements or \$250,000.”

(b) DEPOSITS OF CERTAIN FEES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 THROUGH 2022.—Notwithstanding section 589a(b) of title 28, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022—

(1) 98 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited as offsetting collections to the appropriation “United States Trustee System Fund”, to remain available until expended; and

(2) 2 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to quarterly fees payable under section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this section, for disbursements made in any calendar quarter that begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 1005. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation**

“(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition, or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor’s discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor’s farming operation—

“(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

“(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

“(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

“(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

“(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

“(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 523(a)(1).

“(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

“(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

“(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

“(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “unless—” and all that follows through “the holder” and inserting “unless the holder”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).”;

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by inserting a comma after “all debts provided for by the plan”; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after “allowed under section 503 of this title”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “the kind” and all that follows and inserting “a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c).”; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “, except as provided in section 1232(c)” before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed.”

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) any bankruptcy case—

(A) that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) in which the plan under chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, has not been confirmed on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; and

(2) any bankruptcy case that commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in consideration of H. Res. 569.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H. Res. 569, making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the current fiscal year to help respond to recent devastating natural disasters.

Over the past 2 months, millions of Americans have had their lives forever altered by destructive hurricanes in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and by raging and deadly wildfires in the West.

We all support those who are victimized, particularly those who lost their lives or lost loved ones, and we will continue to be with them every step of the way with the Federal support they need as they recover and rebuild.

Our thanks go to the first responders, volunteers, and States who saved countless lives, protected communities, and demonstrated the best of humanity; that includes FEMA, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and many other Federal agencies for getting the first installment of relief to those in need.

However, with such massive, unprecedented damage, more help is clearly needed to continue to respond to these recovery efforts, to rebuild communities with dollars, with resources, with manpower, and with our support.

This emergency funding legislation, the second installment, addresses urgent short-term immediate priorities: replenishing FEMA’s Disaster Relief Fund, supporting ongoing Federal wildfire suppression efforts, providing debt relief for the Federal Flood Insurance Program, and other assistance that will help our fellow Americans in their time of greatest need.

To summarize the \$36.5 billion in emergency funding provided in this bill, in total, \$18.7 billion is provided for the Disaster Relief Fund. This includes \$13.77 billion for the most immediate response needs: lifesaving missions, emergency protection, the repair and restoration of public infrastructure like communications, power, transportation, and, yes, shelter, and financial assistance to individuals and families affected as they rebuild their lives.

This package also includes \$4.9 billion for community disaster loans, which will ensure local governments are able to provide basic municipal services such as police and fire protection and public education throughout this trying time.

In addition to the Disaster Relief Fund, this bill provides a one-time payment of \$1.27 billion to allow Puerto Rico and our fellow citizens to receive the same access to emergency disaster and nutrition program benefits that other States receive.

The bill also ensures that the National Flood Insurance Program is able to meet its existing claim obligations as Americans cope with the tremendous flood damage to their homes and communities.

For wildlife suppression, the bill contains \$576.5 million. As we have seen, the situation out West has grown even more desperate and deadly. We must ensure that those heroic firefighters can continue to save lives and protect property.

As we know, the needs of each disaster area are ever changing. Consequently, our Appropriations Committee and all of our Members continue to monitor the progress of recovery efforts as well as anticipate emerging needs.

This will be a long process, Mr. Speaker, and the second package or installment of the Federal support will certainly not be all that is needed over the long term.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill. It is important for the Nation, for the communities affected, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, since Hurricane Harvey wrought historic flooding in Texas, 12 major disasters have been declared. From a hurricane that damaged large swaths of Florida, storms that annihilated Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and wildfires burning in the West, Americans deserve certainty the Federal Government will stand by them in their time of need. This is particularly important after the President threatened to abandon Puerto Rico in his latest Twitter this morning.

Congress cannot turn its back on recovery, no matter how reckless the President's outburst may be, as Americans are suffering and simply trying to survive. This package provides critical disaster relief, flood insurance aid, and help for communities devastated by wildfires.

Puerto Rico would be aided by provisions to address its liquidity crisis by facilitating recovery, not paying creditors, and providing additional nutrition assistance. Additionally, the bill would continue aid to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands from the Department of Defense.

However, more must be done to provide medium- and long-term investments, including rebuilding ports, coastlines, airports, roads, bridges, repairing the electrical grid and other infrastructure, and ensuring the health needs of American citizens are met.

I urge your support for this bill and your continued focus on ensuring the full recovery of American communities devastated by natural disasters.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the distinguished ranking member of the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee.

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

This bill is a first step in helping Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands recover from the devastation of Hurricane Maria. It will provide FEMA and the governments of the islands with the funds needed to address immediate relief needs and begin the recovery process.

I do want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their commitment to this issue and for taking my phone calls at all different times, on weekends. You have been very helpful and very supportive.

□ 1230

Both will be visiting the island tomorrow and will be able to see firsthand the dramatic and comprehensive needs that Puerto Rico is facing.

Right now, 85 percent of the island still lacks electricity more than 3 weeks after the hurricane hit. One-third of the island doesn't have access to clean drinking water. Most of the island still lacks cellular service, hampering the vital information to deliver assistance in the areas that are needed.

Federal employees on the island now are doing important and vital work, but we need more boots on the ground. This funding provides them with the resources needed to do that in the short term.

But to succeed, there needs to be a commitment from the highest levels of government to ensure the recovery of all areas that are part of our Nation, including its territories. Unfortunately, given the President's latest Twitter rant this morning, it seems unlikely that we have that focus and commitment.

So it is up to us in Congress to make sure that the Federal Government doesn't forget about Puerto Rico, and that is what I intend to do in the days and months ahead. But to both of you and to our membership here, thank you for not forgetting Puerto Rico. This is an ongoing battle and an ongoing issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriations bill.

I want to commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the committee staff for their quick and thorough work

to put this supplemental package together, and I thank the leadership for its swift action in scheduling this for House consideration.

In fiscal year 2017, the Forest Service had a shortfall of nearly \$577 million in firefighting funds. To cover its immediate firefighting costs, the Forest Service borrowed from its nonfire programs, as well as the Department of the Interior.

The bill will replace and repay those borrowed funds and close the books on fiscal year 2017. Specifically, it provides \$526 million for the Forest Service and \$50 million for the Department of the Interior.

The cost of fighting fires on our national forests and other public lands has increased dramatically over the last 15 years, yet these fires and costs remain highly unpredictable.

Right now the West is on fire. In my home State of California, firefighters are battling 22 large wildfires that have burned nearly 170,000 acres. The bill gives the government the tools it needs to assist local officials to get those fires under control as soon as possible.

We, the Congress, need to fix the way we budget for wildland fire so that the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior can focus on managing our Federal lands appropriately. We also need to give them the necessary legal authorities and tools to improve the condition and management of our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the past few months have witnessed one of the most devastating natural disasters ever endured by our country. They include hurricanes, voracious wildfires in my home State of California that have killed at least 23 people, required mass evacuations, and burned more than 170,000 acres and thousands of homes and businesses.

By acting quickly on this emergency supplemental, we are sending a strong message that we are here for disaster victims, including our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. But this is just a downpayment. We still don't have the final damage estimates for many of the affected areas.

In the coming weeks and months, we will need to once again support FEMA's continued recovery efforts, including in Puerto Rico, despite the President's threats to abandon the people there. There will be more to do to address unmet needs through the Community Development Block Grant program and other disaster relief programs.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage support for this bill.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this funding package. This bill is a downpayment on the recovery from the recent fires and hurricanes.

I am pleased that it contains \$576.5 million to fully repay the funds that the U.S. Forest Service borrowed last fiscal year to pay for wildfire suppression. We have all seen the devastation and the tragic loss of life from large fires burning across our country.

Fiscal year 2017 was the most expensive year on record for wildfire suppression, costing \$2.4 billion. As the duration and severity of wildfires grows, costs will continue to rise.

Unfortunately, once again we have missed the opportunity to fix the way the Federal Government funds wildfire suppression.

Let me be clear: the next supplemental must include a legislative fix for wildfire spending, and it must adequately support the Department of the Interior and its vital efforts to help our country rebuild from the recent fires and hurricanes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), whose leadership in this time of crisis we all salute.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the Speaker of the House and the whole leadership, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and all of the members from the Appropriations Committee for allowing the Federal Government to help Puerto Rico in this dire situation.

On behalf of the 3.4 million American citizens that live in Puerto Rico and the nearly 5.5 million Puerto Ricans that live on the mainland, I rise today in strong support of this disaster supplemental appropriations bill. They have been focused on Puerto Rico since before the arrival of Hurricane Irma, and then during Hurricane Maria.

I also thank all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who have reached out during these past 3 weeks to express their encouragement and offer their assistance during this process. For that, my constituents and I will always be grateful to all of the Members of this House.

As you may know by now, Puerto Rico was hit by two major hurricanes. First, Hurricane Irma, which caused significant damage on the eastern part of the island. That was on September 6. Then, on September 20, a few days later, we got hit by Hurricane Maria, which caused unprecedented destruction throughout the whole island and which many people consider that hurricane to be the most catastrophic natural disaster ever on U.S. soil.

Today, 22 days after the storm hit, nearly 85 percent of our population remains without power, 44 percent without running water, and almost 58 percent without access to telecommunications. To this date, we still have towns like Las Marias, Maricao, Utuado, and many others in the central part of the island, that remain uncommunicated and can only be accessed by air since most of the roads and bridges were washed away. We are talking about more than 18 major roads and bridges that were just washed away. The death toll has reached 48 fatalities, and, unfortunately, certainly that number is going to increase in the coming days and weeks.

This unprecedented humanitarian crisis in our own Nation has begun what is likely to evolve into a mass exodus of Puerto Ricans to the U.S. mainland, further jeopardizing the island's long-term recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today telling you that the American citizens that live in Puerto Rico still are suffering in different ways. This is not the time to focus on how and when resources will be withdrawn from Puerto Rico, or how slowly we are going to rebuild the island. Today, 85 percent of our island is without electricity, yet 3.4 million American citizens living there just got less than 15,000 people working to recover the power grid. I just want to remind you that Florida got more than 61,000 people helping to recover their power grid in just 4 days. That is not acceptable in our case, and we are still American citizens.

I know a lot of problems persist. It is too difficult to address the issue when you are not part of the mainland, you are not part of the power grid. It is different when you get access and resources to Texas, Louisiana, or Florida, because you can drive or you can have helicopters. In our case, everything is by ship or air. That means it is more difficult for the Federal Government to assist directly. That is the reason we got more than 15,000 personnel from the Coast Guard, National Guard, Army Corps of Engineers, FEMA, Navy, and the assistance of all national guards—Virginia, Florida, and New York, just to name a few.

The Puerto Rican communities in the States and on the island are showing the way, along with private companies, NGOs, and countless volunteers throughout the whole Nation. But there is still a lot that needs to be done as we begin the reconstruction. That is the reason this supplemental is so important for us.

Allowing the people of Puerto Rico to access problems that we never have before, like SNAP, which will provide \$1.3 billion to receive the same emergency disaster and nutrition assistance benefits as the States, this is the first time this Congress has allowed this to happen to Puerto Rico.

I thank the Members and leadership of the House for allowing this money.

This is the bill that provides for \$18.7 billion to FEMA to have the disaster relief fund to help in lifesaving missions across the island for emergency protection and removal of debris—we continue to have a lot of debris on the island—and the repair and restoration of our infrastructure. That is going to be a matter of discussion on another day because we can't rebuild or redo the infrastructure we did before from the fifties or the sixties. We need to redo a lot of things on our power grid.

It will provide also—and this is a very important area—\$7.4 billion to have liquidity to the local government of Puerto Rico just to match Federal funds that are needed to these recovery actions. This is the second step this House has taken in terms of helping the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, people that are American citizens. This is the second step. The first one was the first supplemental that was approved.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. So this is the second step. This is not going to be the last one. We are going to need a lot more help in the coming months, and I know we can count on this House and on this Congress to make that happen.

The people of Puerto Rico are grateful, they are resilient, and they are going to continue to show us the way to recover. It is going to take a lot of time, a lot of resources, a lot of money, and a lot of commitment as U.S. citizens, like we are.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Military Construction, Veteran Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, let me just start by saying to the people of Puerto Rico: Despite President Trump's indifference and soft bigotry, we will be there for the people of Puerto Rico until the last American's life returns to normal.

While I rise to support this critical emergency appropriations bill, this supplemental leaves much to be desired. This legislation provides vital recovery funds to my home State of Florida, as well as Texas; the U.S. Virgin Islands; Puerto Rico; and California, where wildfires remain ablaze. However, it neglects to include SBA loans for small businesses and homeowners, as well as making smart investments in our ports, coastlines, water systems, and electrical grids.

This bill also neglects to address the devastating agricultural losses, especially to Florida's \$10 billion citrus industry. It is also important to note that, in Florida, this vital funding will not be able to address the public health hazard of debris strewn across our

lawns and streets as Governor Scott shamefully refuses to allow our cities to fully access FEMA funds.

While the majority has said these and other issues can be part of future omnibus negotiations, this delay will leave constituents waiting months longer to receive the services they so desperately need. They should not have to wait.

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

□ 1245

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman, and the ranking member from New York for their work.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Puerto Rico, 3.5 million of our fellow citizens, are suffering. The mayor of my home town, Yabucoa, where Maria made landfall, is predicting that as many as 5,000 residents are potentially facing starvation.

More than 85 percent of the island is without electricity. One-third of Puerto Ricans lack access to drinkable water, which will surge the number of bacterial infections and mosquito-borne illnesses.

As Puerto Rico faces this humanitarian crisis, the President of the United States is tweeting out threats to withdraw assistance. That is an outrage. It is an insult. It is an abdication of the President's solemn duty to protect the safety and security of the American people. American citizens everywhere deserve better.

Where the President is failing to lead, Congress must act, and act now.

The legislation we are debating today is far from sufficient. It is not enough, but it is a start. It is a downpayment in helping the response process. It will keep FEMA operating, removing debris and distributing food and water.

It also helps Puerto Rico's Government address a looming cash shortfall. With the government running out of money by November 1, vital services could be suspended when residents can least afford it.

This bill would provide a short-term cash infusion for the government to keep going. The way this assistance is structured under the law, these funds will likely not be paid back, which is reasonable, given the challenges Puerto Rico faces. Some of those challenges have been created by the lack of action of the Congress when it comes to Medicaid.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. There is going to need to be much more assistance in the future. Puerto Rico will need help rebuilding its energy grid, repairing telecommunications networks, and putting its ports, bridges, and roads back together, and we cannot forget shoring up the island's Medicaid system, something that was critical before Maria, but is even more important now.

This problem is of Congress' making, and we must fix it. Make no mistake. Those priorities will require more money, and we will need to come back and address them in a few weeks.

The people of Puerto Rico are American citizens. And, you know, what? Even when so many of my brothers and sisters are suffering in Puerto Rico, are facing a humanitarian crisis, at last, 50 percent of the people in this country who didn't know that Puerto Ricans are American citizens are learning that fact.

Yes, American citizens, when, in 1898, Puerto Rico was invaded and taken over by the U.S. Government. So now it is our responsibility to make Puerto Rico whole.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), chairman of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by first recognizing one of our own, who has been a superb representative for Puerto Rico in these very difficult times. You rarely see somebody with the talent, the energy of the representative of Puerto Rico here in Congress. Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN has been, frankly, a hero, and I just wanted to mention that, because she has really made all of us understand the situation, and she has done so with great dignity and great passion and great brilliance. I just had to say that.

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the chairman for being incredibly accessible and engaged. Florida has gotten hit rather hard, as you know. This bill totals \$36.5 billion. \$18.67 billion of that goes directly to FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, and it also ensures that our National Flood Insurance Program has the resources that it needs to pay the claims, also an important grant food and aid loan eligibility to Puerto Rico, which is crucial.

So far, Mr. Speaker, Florida has received \$740 million for assistance for individuals through FEMA, and is working through over 608,000 applicants. Think about that.

As we continue to recover, again, I look forward to continue working with the chairman, who has been phenomenal.

Specifically, we are going to have to deal with the agricultural impact of

this storm, and again, particularly on the citrus industry, that has been devastated by this storm.

This is an important bill. It is an important bill. I want to thank the chairman for bringing it up so quickly. We must pass it. I look forward to working with Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and with all our colleagues through this process, because we are going to need more assistance as the days and the months go.

So this is an important bill. I urge your support.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, millions of our fellow Americans in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are looking to Congress and the administration to work together to provide aid and assistance in recovery and rebuilding.

I disagree with the President of the United States that we are going to leave Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or any other American precipitously before we have done the job we need to do.

The recent hurricanes have left 3.6 million Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands still without power, fuel, clean water, food, electricity, and access to medical facilities. That is unacceptable, I say to the administration.

We are witnessing a humanitarian disaster of historic proportions, and it will get worse if we do not come together as a nation and bring to bear the full force of the Federal Government to assist.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor to effect that end.

That is why I have called on President Trump to muster every Federal resource, to muster and ensure that aid and supplies can reach those who need them, and to work on restoring power, water, and communications. Because many are still out of reach, we do not yet know the full extent of the damage and loss of life.

Today's Washington Post has a front page story chronicling the tragedy that continues as of now to unfold in Puerto Rico, where nightfall brings complete darkness, and diseases are spreading by way of contaminated water. The island has been plunged into the 19th century. The Virgin Islands shares that status.

This supplemental must be followed in the weeks and months ahead by additional measures to provide disaster relief funding and financial assistance to bring the infrastructure of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands up to 21st century standards in order to prevent a repeat of what has occurred.

According to a letter sent to the congressional leadership on October 7, by the governor of Puerto Rico, Ricardo Rosselló, the damage of that island is

estimated to cost as much as \$95 billion, which is 150 percent of Puerto Rico's gross national product.

This funding package is an important step, though it fails to provide urgently needed Medicaid funding to help the 1.6 million in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands who rely on Medicaid for their healthcare.

Congress must do its part and ensure that the resources are available, but it is up to the administration to make certain that the resources we provide get to those who need them.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in passing this bill, and I call on the President again to take every necessary measure to address this humanitarian crisis affecting our fellow Americans.

Mr. President, do not send a message to any American that we will turn our backs on them. That is not fair, it is not right, and you ought to correct the statement you made this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico has no power. The U.S. Virgin Islands has no power. St. Johns is completely collapsed in the U.S. Virgin Islands. The people are dying from contaminated water.

Mr. President, how can you abandon the American people?

This bill is going to provide FEMA assistance to keep giving so they can have it. It is going to give \$16 billion to the senior citizens in my district, who have paid their flood insurance, who are desperate to get their houses repaired, to get the mold out after being impacted by Hurricane Harvey.

Yes, I woke up this morning to the outrage of the fires and people dying in California. That is what is in this bill.

I can't imagine that a President would make this comment of walking away, but I am here to fight for those who have been impacted by Hurricane Harvey. We are still suffering. Senior citizens are out of their homes. We have been evicting people in public housing. We need community development block grants. The Army Corps of Engineers is greatly needed.

The funding that we ask for is not in here, block grants is not in here, and as well the restoration that we need. We will fight. I will not turn my back on Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands and vote "no". I will vote "yes"—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is out of order.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And help Americans, but Hurricane Harvey has to be in the next bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. \* \* \*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), who I believe just returned.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY for bringing more disaster relief legislation to the floor today.

I am pleased to see much-needed support for ongoing disaster response efforts in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and other hurricane-affected areas, including direct assistance to families, debris removal operations, and emergency protective measures carried out by FEMA, and additional activities of numerous other Federal agencies that are on the ground working around the clock to help us to recover and rebuild.

I cannot thank enough all of our Federal and local personnel helping us through this. I have been on the ground after Irma, after Maria, and just recently, and I tell you, their support is invaluable.

I am particularly pleased to see the subdivision of \$5 billion for Disaster Direct Loan Program to assist local governments and with measures taking into account the unique aid and flexibility needed for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

Multiple loans will be available based on different types of losses and unanticipated spending needs, and waivers of amount limits are also helpful. Additional loans to pay for local matching requirements is an important support.

However, I am deeply concerned about the important relief that was left out of this bill and the administration's disaster relief request last week. This does not incorporate the medium and long-term assistance that played a clear critical role in the recovery following previous disasters like Katrina and Sandy, and the Virgin Islands cannot afford to wait for this to be a higher priority of the Federal Government.

The package does not include community development and social service block grant funding, Economic Development Administration funds, supplemental housing assistance, nor additional funds for repair of our water infrastructure, ports, community facilities, airports, roads, parks, wetlands, and fisheries.

Damage sustained in all of these areas has been catastrophic, and waiting around until another end of the year for auxiliary funding for these pressing needs is not acceptable.

Perhaps most concerning is the lack of Medicaid program assistance to the territory. Even before two consecutive Category 5 hurricanes that decimated our hospitals and medical infrastructure, the Virgin Islands was forced to operate a Medicaid program that is capped in an amount that has no relationship to local needs, and our rate of Federal matching funds, our FMAP, is limited to an arbitrarily low 55 percent

Federal to 45 percent local contribution.

□ 1300

Thousands of our citizens go without adequate care due to this treatment every year, in addition to the impacts on our providers and hospitals due to uncompensated care, but after these back-to-back storms, there is no revenue being generated in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico at this time. Our tourism-related economy is gone. We will miss this entire year, at the very least.

With our public health and social welfare needs, we are in dire need of supplemental Medicaid support, including a temporary 100 percent Federal contribution, just like what was provided to Americans living in Louisiana and Texas following Katrina.

I was pleased to see Ranking Member PALLONE's proposal to provide this 100 percent temporary Federal share with a substantial plus-up to our allotment so that the American citizens—yes, American citizens—in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico can have the benefit of Medicaid in this time of greatest need.

This has not been a part of this package. Virgin Islanders cannot wait until Christmas for a Medicaid program. We need it now.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the destruction that this historic hurricane season has wrought on Texas, Florida, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Gulf Coast, I am very pleased that, in addition to the emergency relief funds for wildfires that are burning on both ends of California, the bill also includes liquidity and emergency nutritional assistance for Puerto Rico, where they are facing particularly difficult challenges in their recovery efforts. This bill also provides for partial debt forgiveness of \$16 billion for the National Flood Insurance Program.

I am encouraged to see that the administration finally understands what we have been saying for a long time: we need to forgive the debt of the NFIP, which FEMA has repeatedly stated it will never be able to repay.

Following the losses that will be incurred as a result of the recent hurricanes, the NFIP needs debt forgiveness more than ever. But let's be clear. The partial debt forgiveness will leave the NFIP with a crushing level of debt. Although this is a step in the right direction, we should forgive all of the debt that the NFIP has accrued from catastrophic storms like Katrina and Sandy instead of burdening the NFIP policyholders with hundreds of millions of dollars in interest payments every year.

Before this hurricane season, NFIP policyholders were already paying more in interest than the entire NFIP spends on salaries and expenses or funding mitigation or paying for flood maps.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a senior member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our ranking member for yielding time to me and for her tireless leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from northern California, let me just say that my thoughts and prayers are with our neighbors in the North Bay.

I remember the Oakland Hills. I represent Oakland and Berkeley, California; and just as many helped us then, we will help our neighbors now.

I am deeply grateful to our firefighters and our first responders who have been working around the clock to extinguish these fires.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of this emergency supplemental. Our neighbors in the North Bay, the Gulf Coast, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Texas, they need our help, and they need it now. Communities are devastated, and many are still without power and water. This is a life-and-death situation for so many.

Make no mistake, the recovery process is just beginning, and we cannot forget our Caribbean neighbors who are also suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental is a good first step. It is a good first step in a very long process, but we must provide more long-term assistance to help communities rebuild and to help them recover very quickly, and we must leave no one behind.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my partner, our chairman, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know that he understands, as we all do, this is not a Republican or Democratic issue. This is our responsibility, to face the tremendous challenge that we see: people are suffering, schools are closed, more than three-quarters of the island does not have any energy, no clean water, need for food, need for basic services.

I am very pleased to work with the chairman of the committee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and I know that we will both be going to the island of Puerto Rico to actually see firsthand what has to be done, and it is clear it has to be done now.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to travel to Puerto Rico this past Saturday with a bipartisan group of legislators. We traveled

there with Resident Commissioner GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, who has been an absolutely outstanding advocate for Puerto Rico during this difficult time. I have a few takeaways from that:

One, it was a sobering experience to see how widespread the devastation is on the island. Every single aspect of the island of Puerto Rico was affected.

Secondly, the full commitment of the Department of Defense, of FEMA, of every Federal Government agency and the effort to recover that is being conducted in conjunction with the Governor and folks on the ground in Puerto Rico is great to see. It is an effective initial recovery effort that has saved and has sustained lives. Millions of meals and millions of bottles of water have been distributed.

A third takeaway is this will require a sustained active and effective effort.

I want to thank the chairman for introducing this bill today, which is absolutely necessary to bring back the economy on the island of Puerto Rico. The top priority now is to rebuild the grid, which is absolutely essential to getting the economy in Puerto Rico moving. That is why we need this aid package. It is an important step along the long road to recovery for our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico, as well as for all of those impacted by hurricanes in the South and those out West battling wildfires.

One thing I saw as well: the American people come to the assistance of other citizens in need, and that is true whether it is in Houston, Florida, or in Puerto Rico.

Again, I would like to thank the chair for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) as well as with my colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

On our committee, we try to get the work of the Nation done, and at this point in history we have had some incredible tragedies and natural disasters. As a group, as this House, we must act quickly to ensure that the Federal Government fulfills its duty to millions of Americans in need. Whether they are from Texas or whether they are from Florida or whether they are from Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, they are all citizens. Whether they are from the West, who have been fighting these deadly fires, they deserve our support.

This will be the second installment of emergency funding. There will be others. I know people are concerned that not every State's needs are met, but this is a good step in the right direction, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation so we can get this money out the door as quickly as possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to stand with the hundreds of thousands of Texas families victimized by Hurricane Harvey, and urge our state and federal officials to

use available resources to help our fellow Americans in their time of need.

With nearly four-and-a-half feet of rain and 130 mile per hour winds, Hurricane Harvey is the largest and most expensive natural disaster to hit Texas in living memory. At least 270,000 homes and residences were damaged in our state. Most tragically, over 75 innocent people lost their lives as a result of Harvey, most of them in Harris County.

Later today the U.S. House of Representatives will be voting on a \$36.5 billion disaster supplemental bill to sustain relief and recovery efforts in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

This is not a perfect bill. I would have strongly preferred Congress provide dedicated funds to rebuild Houston and the Texas Gulf Coast, especially dedicated funding towards our region's flood control infrastructure and immediate housing needs for hurricane victims.

However, this supplemental will sustain the current recovery efforts till the damages caused by these devastating hurricanes can be fully assessed. Today's supplemental is on top of \$15 billion in emergency funding Congress passed last month in the immediate aftermath of Harvey.

The bipartisan Texas Congressional Delegation is committed to securing the substantial federal funds Houston and the Texas Gulf Coast need to rebuild and be prepared for the next big storm before the holiday season.

Our local officials, in particular the Governor of Texas and the state legislature, have the opportunity right now to act and ramp-up rebuilding efforts through our state's Economic Stabilization Fund.

Popularly known as Texas's "rainy day fund," the ESF currently has over \$10 billion available for emergencies. There can be no question that the destruction caused by Harvey and the immediate needs of tens of thousands of Texans are an emergency and are the reason why our state has been investing in a rainy day fund in the first place.

Harris County Judge Ed Emmett and Houston Mayor Sylvester Turner have already called on Governor Greg Abbott to use his authority to tap the rainy day fund and help Texans in need and rebuild our infrastructure.

I join Judge Emmett and Mayor Turner in calling on the governor to immediately authorize emergency funding through our rainy day fund and help rebuild Houston and Harris County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 569.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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



□ 1315

DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 562, I call up the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 562, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:  
S. 585

*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 “Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection 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—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY**

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Stays; probationary employees.

Sec. 103. Prohibited personnel practices.

Sec. 104. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.

Sec. 105. Suicide by employees.

Sec. 106. Training for supervisors.

Sec. 107. Information on whistleblower protections.

**TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES**

Sec. 201. Prevention of unauthorized access to medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 202. Outreach on availability of mental health services available to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 203. Protocols to address threats against employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 204. Comptroller General of the United States study on accountability of chiefs of police of Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers.

**TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY**

**SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title—

(1) the term “agency”—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to whether one or more portions of title 5 of the United States Code are inapplicable to the entity; and

(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

(2) the term “employee” means an employee (as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) of an agency; and

(3) the term “personnel action” has the meaning given that term under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code.

**SEC. 102. STAYS; PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.**

(a) **REQUEST BY SPECIAL COUNSEL.**—Section 1214(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay under this subsection, the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(b) **PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.**—Section 1221 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay to an employee in probationary status under subsection (c), the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(c) **STUDY REGARDING RETALIATION AGAINST PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report discussing retaliation against employees in probationary status.

**SEC. 103. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.**

Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

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

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

(3) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) access the medical record of another employee or an applicant for employment as a part of, or otherwise in furtherance of, any conduct described in paragraphs (1) through (13).”.

**SEC. 104. DISCIPLINE OF SUPERVISORS BASED ON RETALIATION AGAINST WHISTLE-BLOWERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers**

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302, without regard to whether any other provision of this chapter is applicable to the entity; and

“(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(2) the term ‘prohibited personnel action’ means taking or failing to take an action in violation of paragraph (8), (9), or (14) of section 2302(b) against an employee of an agency; and

“(3) the term ‘supervisor’ means an employee who would be a supervisor, as defined under section 7103(a), if the entity employing the employee was an agency.

“(b) **PROPOSED DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the head of the agency employing a supervisor, an administrative law judge, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Special Counsel, a judge of the United States, or the Inspector General of the agency employing a supervisor determines that the supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action, the head of the agency employing the supervisor, in accordance with the procedures required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) for the first prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor—

“(i) shall propose suspending the supervisor for a period of not less than 3 days; and

“(ii) may, in addition to a suspension described in clause (i), propose any other action, including a reduction in grade or pay, that the head of the agency determines appropriate; and

“(B) for the second prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor, shall propose removing the supervisor.

“(2) **PROCEDURES.**—

“(A) **NOTICE.**—A supervisor against whom an action is proposed to be taken under paragraph (1) is entitled to written notice—

“(i) stating the specific reasons for the proposed action; and

“(ii) informing the supervisor of the right of the supervisor to review the material which is relied on to support the reasons for the proposed action.

“(B) **ANSWER AND EVIDENCE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A supervisor who is notified under subparagraph (A) that the supervisor is the subject of a proposed action under paragraph (1) is entitled to 14 days following such notification to answer and furnish evidence in support of the answer.

“(ii) **NO EVIDENCE FURNISHED; INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.**—After the end of the 14-day period described in clause (i), if a supervisor does not furnish evidence as described in clause (i) or if the head of the agency determines that such evidence is not sufficient to reverse the proposed action, the head of the agency shall carry out the action.

“(C) **SCOPE OF PROCEDURES.**—An action carried out under this section—

“(i) except as provided in clause (ii), shall be subject to the same requirements and procedures (including regarding appeals) as an action under section 7503, 7513, or 7543; and

“(ii) shall not be subject to—

“(I) paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7503(b);

“(II) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7513; or

“(III) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7543.

“(3) **DELEGATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (B), the head of an agency may delegate any authority or responsibility under this subsection.

“(B) **NONDELEGABILITY OF DETERMINATION REGARDING PROHIBITED PERSONNEL ACTION.**—If the head of an agency is responsible for determining whether a supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action for purposes of paragraph (1), the head of the agency may not delegate that responsibility.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.”.

**SEC. 105. SUICIDE BY EMPLOYEES.**

(a) **REFERRAL.**—The head of an agency shall refer to the Special Counsel, along with any information known to the agency regarding the circumstances described in paragraphs (2) and (3), any instance in which the head of the agency has information indicating—

(1) an employee of the agency committed suicide;

(2) prior to the death of the employee, the employee made any disclosure of information which reasonably evidences—

(A) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation; or

(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety; and

(3) after a disclosure described in paragraph (2), a personnel action was taken against the employee.

(b) **OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL REVIEW.**—For any referral to the Special Counsel under subsection (a), the Special Counsel shall—



(1) examine whether any personnel action was taken because of any disclosure of information described in subsection (a)(2); and

(2) take any action the Special Counsel determines appropriate under subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code.

**SEC. 106. TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS.**

In consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency (or senior ethics official of the agency for an agency without an Inspector General), the head of each agency shall provide training regarding how to respond to complaints alleging a violation of whistleblower protections (as defined in section 2307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 107) available to employees of the agency—

(1) to employees appointed to supervisory positions in the agency who have not previously served as a supervisor; and

(2) on an annual basis, to all employees of the agency serving in a supervisory position.

**SEC. 107. INFORMATION ON WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.**

(a) EXISTING PROVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4505a(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(B) Section 5755(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(C) Section 110(b)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (5 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “section 2302(f)(1) or (2)” and inserting “section 2302(e)(1) or (2)”.

(D) Section 1217(d)(3) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3657(d)(3)) is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(E) Section 1233(b) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3673(b)) is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 2307. Information on whistleblower protections**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), has the meaning given that term in section 2302; and

“(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(2) the term ‘new employee’ means an individual—

“(A) appointed to a position as an employee of an agency on or after the date of enactment of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017; and

“(B) who has not previously served as an employee; and

“(3) the term ‘whistleblower protections’ means the protections against and remedies for a prohibited personnel practice described in paragraph (8), subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (9), or paragraph (14) of section 2302(b).

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF HEAD OF AGENCY.—The head of each agency shall be responsible for the prevention of prohibited personnel practices, for the compliance with and enforcement of applicable civil service laws, rules, and regulations, and other aspects of personnel management, and for en-

suring (in consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency) that employees of the agency are informed of the rights and remedies available to them under this chapter and chapter 12, including—

“(1) information regarding whistleblower protections available to new employees during the probationary period;

“(2) the role of the Office of Special Counsel and the Merit Systems Protection Board with regard to whistleblower protections; and

“(3) how to make a lawful disclosure of information that is specifically required by law or Executive order to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs to the Special Counsel, the Inspector General of an agency, Congress, or other agency employee designated to receive such disclosures.

“(c) TIMING.—The head of each agency shall ensure that the information required to be provided under subsection (b) is provided to each new employee of the agency not later than 6 months after the date the new employee begins performing service as an employee.

“(d) INFORMATION ONLINE.—The head of each agency shall make available information regarding whistleblower protections applicable to employees of the agency on the public website of the agency, and on any online portal that is made available only to employees of the agency if one exists.

“(e) DELEGEES.—Any employee to whom the head of an agency delegates authority for personnel management, or for any aspect thereof, shall, within the limits of the scope of the delegation, be responsible for the activities described in subsection (b).”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“2307. Information on whistleblower protections.”.

**TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES**

**SEC. 201. PREVENTION OF UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO MEDICAL RECORDS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(A) develop a plan to prevent access to the medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs by employees of the Department who are not authorized to access such records;

(B) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the plan developed under subparagraph (A); and

(C) upon request, provide a briefing to the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to the plan developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed assessment of strategic goals of the Department for the prevention of unauthorized access to the medical records of employees of the Department.

(B) A list of circumstances in which an employee of the Department who is not a health care provider or an assistant to a health care provider would be authorized to access the medical records of another employee of the Department.

(C) Steps that the Secretary will take to acquire new or implement existing technology to prevent an employee of the Department from accessing the medical records of another employee of the Department without a specific need to access such records.

(D) Steps the Secretary will take, including plans to issue new regulations, as necessary, to ensure that an employee of the Department may not access the medical records of another employee of the Department for the purpose of retrieving demographic information if that demographic information is available to the employee in another location or through another format.

(E) A proposed timetable for the implementation of such plan.

(F) An estimate of the costs associated with implementing such plan.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 202. OUTREACH ON AVAILABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AVAILABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a program of outreach to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to inform those employees of any mental health services, including telemedicine options, that are available to them.

**SEC. 203. PROTOCOLS TO ADDRESS THREATS AGAINST EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure protocols are in effect to address threats from individuals receiving health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs directed towards employees of the Department who are providing such health care.

**SEC. 204. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES STUDY ON ACCOUNTABILITY OF CHIEFS OF POLICE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTERS.**

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to assess the reporting, staffing, accountability, and chain of command structure of the Department of Veterans Affairs police officers at medical centers of the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. BLUM. 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 S. 585, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

This bill addresses problems that were exposed in the tragic case of whistleblower retaliation at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick was a doctor employed on a probationary basis by

Veterans Affairs, who committed suicide hours after he was fired for questioning overmedication of the veterans he cared for.

This bill would, for the first time, create minimum disciplinary standards to require that managers who retaliate against whistleblowers are punished. First offenders would receive at least 3 days of suspension, and repeat offenders would face mandatory termination.

The Kirkpatrick Act also adds whistleblower protections to Federal employees hired on a probationary basis, like Dr. Kirkpatrick. Agencies will be required to grant priority to requests for transfer from probationary period whistleblowers.

The bill would create a number of other whistleblower protections, many of which are overdue. For example, accessing the medical file of a whistleblower for the purpose of retaliation would be declared a prohibited personnel action. The Department of Veterans Affairs would also be required to devise a plan to prevent that sort of unauthorized medical file access.

The bill also requires apparent suicides by whistleblowers to be referred to the Office of Special Counsel for further investigation. Agencies would be required to initiate training programs for supervisors and information disclosures for employees regarding whistleblower protection.

The Senate passed this bill by voice vote earlier this year, and passage through the House would send the bill to the President's desk for signature and enactment.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to honor the memory of Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick and to protect future whistleblowers.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the committee with oversight jurisdiction over Federal workers and agencies, I am one of the staunchest supporters of whistleblower protections in the Congress. I strongly support enhancing protections for the brave men and women who put their careers on the line to speak out against waste, fraud, and abuse.

I fully support the intent of S. 585 to protect whistleblowers who face investigations in retaliation for their disclosures. But I am disappointed that the Republican leadership chose not to consider this measure under regular order.

House Republicans rushed this legislation directly to the floor, bypassing any consideration by the Oversight Committee or the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which have jurisdiction over the bill. It is especially disappointing that my committee was not given the opportunity to address constitutional and privacy concerns raised by the Trump administration's Office of Personnel Management about the

bill. That is what I said: the Trump administration's concerns about it.

It is even more disheartening that the Rules Committee issued a closed rule for this bill. They blocked all three germane amendments that I submitted, including an amendment to fix the problems identified by the OPM.

The measure before us today would change the procedures for disciplining Federal supervisors who retaliate against employees who blow the whistle. It would require agency heads to impose suspensions of at least 3 days for a first offense, and termination for a second offense whenever an agency head, administrative law judge, the Merit Systems Protection Board, a Federal judge, or an inspector general finds that a supervisor retaliated against an employee who blew the whistle.

It also would reduce the length of the notice requirement for proposed disciplinary action from 30 days to 14 days. It would eliminate the option to hold a hearing if a supervisor contests a proposed disciplinary action. It would change the current burden of proof for demonstrating retaliation from a preponderance of the evidence to require agency heads to impose disciplinary action in any case in which a supervisor does not furnish evidence or if the head of the agency determines that such evidence is not sufficient to reverse the proposed action.

The bill also would require an agency head, when an employee may have committed suicide, to refer any information to the Office of Special Counsel indicating that the employee had blown the whistle and that the agency took personnel action against the employee.

The OPM has questioned whether some of the provisions in the bill would withstand constitutional scrutiny if challenged in court, and I agree with the OPM on that issue.

For example, the OPM explained that the bill's requirement to propose minimum penalties of 3 days' suspension for the first offense and termination for second offenses could violate due process protections. These protections require agencies to notify employees of factors they will consider regarding proposed penalties for findings of wrongdoing and to provide employees with meaningful opportunities to respond. The United States Supreme Court and Federal Circuit Courts have ruled that Federal employees are entitled to these protections. After all, they are Americans.

But according to the OPM, the bill would eliminate agency consideration of many of the 12 factors that were set forth by the Merit Systems Protection Board in *Douglas v. Veterans Administration* in 1981. The Board uses these so-called Douglas factors to assess the reasonableness of penalties, and agency officials who propose or decide adverse actions against employees must concurrently consider these factors.

Concerns have also been raised that by reducing the current requirement

for 30 days' notice of adverse action to 14 days, lowering the existing burden of proof, and eliminating the option for hearings, the bill could be challenged on the basis that it does not give supervisors sufficiently meaningful opportunities to respond to accusations of retaliation.

In addition, although the intent of the bill is to enhance protections for whistleblowers, there is some concern that it would be misused to harm whistleblowers. For example, an agency head could utilize the bill's abbreviated disciplinary processes in bad faith to retaliate against supervisors who blow the whistle on high-level waste, fraud, or abuse.

Lastly, the provision requiring agency heads to refer information to the Office of Special Counsel regarding employees who may have committed suicide raises important privacy questions. The bill does not include any provision requiring agencies to obtain permission from family members before sharing information about an employee's death. It is unfortunate that the House has failed to take the opportunity to fix these flaws in this measure.

The second amendment that I presented would have protected the privacy interests of employees who commit suicide by requiring written permission from their next of kin before agency heads disclose the details about the death.

And another amendment that I submitted would have made corrections in the underlying bill to ensure that managers who violate whistleblower rights will be held accountable, while safeguarding due process rights.

Finally, the third amendment was the text of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination Act of 2017, which passed the House by a voice vote under suspension of the rules earlier in this Congress, and also passed the House by a vote of 403-0 in the last Congress.

This amendment would have expanded the protections for employees who suffer retaliation and discrimination. It also would have prohibited the use of nondisclosure agreements to prevent employees from disclosing waste, fraud, or abuse to Congress, to the Office of Special Counsel, and inspector generals.

I expect the bill, as it now stands, to engender substantial litigation that may have to be addressed by the courts. It would, indeed, be unfortunate if that litigation resulted in overturning disciplinary action against an employee who retaliated against a whistleblower, when we could have acted today to address the constitutional concerns.

As I said before the Rules Committee, sometimes I think we can get so caught up in our partisan battles, that even when we come with good suggestions as to how to make a piece of legislation better and more effective and certainly come within the bounds

of the Constitution, we are blinded by what we see; and that is this battle between Republicans and Democrats, Mr. Speaker, and we don't come up, sometimes with the very best product.

But even with all that, because I am so concerned about whistleblowers, I plan to vote for the bill.

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

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act, which will enhance whistleblower protections for employees at the VA and lead to better care for our Nation's veterans.

This bill is named in honor of Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick, a Wisconsinite, who tragically took his own life after being fired from the Tomah VA Medical Center in my congressional district in Tomah, Wisconsin.

Dr. Kirkpatrick was a clinical psychologist who specialized in treating some of the toughest and most pressing issues our veterans face today: PTSD, substance abuse, and chronic pain.

During his time at Tomah, Dr. Kirkpatrick noticed a disturbing trend of overprescribing of opioids to patients.

□ 1330

Dr. Kirkpatrick had the courage to blow the whistle to his superiors about what he rightly saw as dangerous pain management practices at the time. Sadly, the overprescribing issues that Dr. Kirkpatrick tried to warn about continued to occur at Tomah VA.

In 2015, a Wisconsin veteran named Jason Simcakoski tragically lost his life at the facility due to the dangerous pain management practices at the Tomah VA. Last year, I worked with the Simcakoski family to pass the bipartisan Jason Simcakoski PROMISE Act to improve pain management practices at the VA so that no other veterans and their families have to go through what the Simcakoski family had to.

Although Dr. Kirkpatrick is no longer with us today, his dedication to serving veterans and his courage to stand up for what was right is why we are here today. This act will ensure that no one is retaliated against for coming forward with concerns about waste, fraud, abuse, and malpractice at the VA. The bill offers a number of new protections for whistleblowers and will help ensure that supervisors found guilty of retaliation are held responsible for their actions.

Dr. Kirkpatrick was dedicated to improving lives and serving our Nation's veterans. The bill before us today will honor the memory of Dr. Kirkpatrick by helping to make sure no one has to go through what he did.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and one who has been a staunch supporter of whistleblowers.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with many of the gentleman's concerns and comments regarding the lack of a real legislative process here. The bill could be better. But nonetheless, like the ranking member, I will be supporting the legislation despite those concerns because it is absolutely urgent.

I have a totally dysfunctional management at the VA hospital in Roseburg, Oregon. A number of years ago, a whistleblower came to me and said that substandard care was being provided. We asked the Office of Inspector General to look into it. They whitewashed it, and then it came out in the Senate testimony that the Office of Special Counsel had found that this doctor had been penalized as a whistleblower because he was pointing to substandard care.

I asked for another investigation and ultimately found, yes, indeed, substandard care was being provided by the head surgeon. He was suspended from his duties but is still the head surgeon. Now he has run another very accomplished doctor, under very dubious circumstances, out of my Eugene clinic. This is a surgeon who served 29 years, honorably, in the military, 10 years at my regional hospital with rave reviews, and, after 30 days at my new VA clinic in Eugene, was dismissed in the most unusual way with no allegations put forward.

Mr. Speaker, again, it seems that we are having issues here when the quality is substandard that this one person is able to basically just get rid of the folks who are raising concerns about the care of veterans. Again, this shouldn't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the record two letters regarding the dismissed doctor.

OCTOBER 17, 2017.

DEAR MR. DEFAZIO: I am a contracted physician in the emergency department at the Roseburg VA. I have been working at this facility since 2010. During that time I have truly enjoyed providing care for the veterans. However, I have significant concerns regarding the administration and inefficiencies in healthcare, in the VA system. Unfortunately, it seems that advancement of careers and the fluffing of numbers supersede patient care.

Despite the build up of these concerns over the years, I have recently become aware of an action that compels me to go beyond the normal chain of command. One of the surgeons working at the Eugene campus—still under the Roseburg administration—was fired recently under very concerning circumstances.

Dr. Scott Russi was working at the Eugene VA for less than 1 month when he was pushed out and fired. I know Dr. Russi from the private sector. In addition to working at the Roseburg VA, I have worked for the last

ten years at Sacred Heart RiverBend—a trauma, stroke, and cardiac center—and one of the largest hospitals in the state. I worked alongside Dr. Russi for many years at RiverBend and I found him to be not only extremely competent and hardworking, but always very professional. I was sad to see him leave RiverBend, but I was encouraged that he would be working in the VA system as I felt he would significantly improve the quality of care for the veterans.

I find it very disheartening that a group of administrative physicians, who rarely practice medicine, are able to strike down such a promising figure simply because they seem to have felt threatened by him. I know there are many people who are upset by this firing and who have concerns about this system in general. I have tried many times to discuss my concerns with people in the administration and have been met with, at best, excuses and, at worst, threats. It is clear to me as somewhat of an outsider and observer (as I am not actually a VA employee) that physicians who are dedicated to patient care and most skilled are threatening to the administration. These physicians are often ostracized and pushed out—and when they can't be pushed out, false rumors are spread about them. I have considered stepping away from the VA system due to these continuing frustrations. It is disheartening to see these veterans treated with such carelessness. However, I feel that someone has to stay and actually care for them, but, if I stay, I also want to try to make the system a better place for them. For many, this is their only health care.

I wish this was as exaggerated as it may sound, but unfortunately this is only a small piece of a huge problem. If you are interested in more details, I am more than happy to discuss this further. In general, I keep my head down and do what I think is best, but this presents itself as a moment when speaking out is necessary and right.

Thank you,

CHARLOTTE RANSOM, MD.

CONGRESSMAN DEFAZIO: I am writing to ask for your help. I am a surgeon and a veteran having attended the Usafa and graduating in 1984, completing medical school on Hpsp scholarship and spending the next 29 years on active duty. I deployed four times as a combat surgeon and once as a hospital commander, my last deployment in 2012 was as the Dccs of Craig Joint Theater Hospital, Bagram Ab, Afghanistan. I retired in October of 2013 and settled in Oregon as a trauma surgeon eventually becoming the Trauma Medical Director at Riverbend. I was the on-call surgeon the tragic day Ucc suffered the active shooter event. I recently left my civilian practice to serve our Veterans, for reasons I think you would understand; I have seen the care my comrades have been given and found it wanting, and serving my Vets is therapeutic for my Ptsd and the sorrow I carry for not being able to save more soldiers. I am the new surgeon at the Va Eugene Hcc and have been working there part-time since January of this year and full time since 23 July. Today I was handed a summary suspension of clinical privileges as a surgeon by the parent Va, Roseburg and Dr. Dinesh Ranjan the chief of surgery. I have been denied the opportunity to defend my reputation, denied the opportunity to stand before my peers, and denied any opportunity to see the allegations. And tonight, I have spoken with two Va physicians (Dr. Lisa Brandenburger and Dr. Philo Calhoun) whose lives were dedicated to serving Veterans but were irreparably damaged by Dr. Ranjan. I am now being targeted by Dr. Ranjan because he recruited me with the promise of a salary of \$385,000. I signed a contract for that

amount but I am being paid \$280,000. Because I expressed to the Eugene Hcc administrator I felt I was misled about the salary, Dr. Ranjan has gone after my clinical privileges, had them summarily dismissed and placed me at risk of being reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank (Npdb). I have been suspended from patient contact for 30 days for an investigation. If the investigation finds me deficient, I will be reported to the Npdb. If the investigation extends beyond 30 days, I will be reported to the Npdb. If I am fired or quit my job, I will be reported to the Npdb. If I am reported to the Npdb I will never work again as a surgeon.

I know it all sounds unbelievable, I think it is unbelievable as I try and wrap my head around the events of these last few days. I ask you not to send a congressional inquiry to Mr. Paxton, as that would make my life worse. What I thought would be my dream job, now has become a nightmare.

Respectfully,

SCOTT RUSSI.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, since this has come out, I have had dozens of calls from nurses and doctors and other workers in the VA system in my region—in Eugene, Springfield, and southern Oregon, down to Roseburg, at those two facilities—because of this mismanagement. They say that the care is not up to standards, just like this particular physician was not providing modern care when he did colonoscopies.

We need—vitaly need—this legislation and the strongest protection for whistleblowers. This isn't about protecting bad managers. It is about promoting qualified and keeping qualified employees, which we are having a hard time doing in my area. It is about providing the best care to our veterans, and that isn't going to happen if people can be intimidated or just shown the door when they raise concerns.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS for yielding me time to speak about this important legislation to protect whistleblowers.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns that were brought up yesterday in the Rules Committee and today on the floor about the procedure for bringing this bill to the floor without full House committee process. However, I will support the bill because it is so important.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act will provide protection for employees at the Department of Veterans Affairs who blow the whistle on wrongdoing in the agency.

As the ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I know full well that whistleblowers are vital to the VA to protect the health and well-being of the men and women who have so bravely served our country. Although we have numerous protections currently in place for whistleblowers, those who are committed to silencing

them still manage to find ways to retaliate, which we saw with tragic consequences at the Phoenix VA Health Care System and in Dr. Kirkpatrick's case.

In addition to serving on the House Veterans Affairs' Committee, my role as the founder and co-chair of the Bipartisan Heroin Task Force makes VA's retaliation against another VA doctor, Dr. Kirkpatrick, an especially troublesome tragedy. When he tried to raise the alarm over concerns that another VA doctor was overprescribing opioids that may have led to patient deaths, he was aware that doing so could be harmful to his own position at the Tomah VA Medical Center.

Dr. Kirkpatrick's action was laudable. Veterans have been acutely impacted by the opioid epidemic, and his efforts to reduce prescription rates for veterans is not only a good example for VA physicians, but for all physicians in the U.S. today.

Title II of this bill puts in place a number of requirements for the VA to protect VA employees from several retaliatory measures. It requires the Secretary to put in place a plan to prevent unauthorized access to medical records of VA employees, along with outreach to ensure that VA employees are aware of mental health services available to them.

These and other improvements in title II will not only help prevent the type of retaliation that Dr. Kirkpatrick suffered, they will improve care for veterans to also help make the VA a better place to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

As I close, I take the opportunity to reiterate that I strongly support the objectives of S. 585. If there is anything that we agree on in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, it is that we must protect whistleblowers.

Many of the investigations that we have conducted have been as a result of somebody who saw something and said something. Like Dr. Kirkpatrick, I am sure, in most of those instances, it was very difficult for them because they, on the one hand, wanted to improve a situation or address a problem, but at the same time, they knew that it was possible that they, themselves, might be harmed and their families might be harmed. So they make a very, very difficult choice, a very difficult choice.

I am horrified that Dr. Kirkpatrick was so agonized by the treatment he endured at the Veterans Administration that he saw no options for himself. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he saw no way out. I worry that there are civil servants today who are enduring that same agony.

But we say to them that we will protect you with all we have got, and that is why I appreciate Senator JOHNSON'S

work on S. 585, and I share his commitment to protecting whistleblowers. For that reason, as I said earlier, I will vote in favor of this legislation.

That said, I wish that the Republican leadership had taken the opportunities that my amendments provided to improve this bill. These issues of equal protection are nothing to play with because we begin to chip away and chip away and chip away at employees' rights, and the next you know, those rights begin to disappear. Those are the kind of rights that are a part and the fabric of this thing we call a democracy. I think we have to be very, very, very careful. It is going to be interesting to see what the courts have to say about this legislation.

My amendments would have addressed the constitutional concerns raised by OPM—and I emphasize OPM. This was not the Obama OPM. This was the Trump OPM.

My amendments would also have protected the privacy of employees who take their own lives.

My amendments would have added to the underlying bill additional protections for employees who suffer retaliation or discrimination, protections that the House has already approved.

I believe this is a missed opportunity and it is sad. I truly hope that future litigation does not undo the advances that this bill seeks to make in the protections provided for the courageous men and women willing to blow the whistle on wrongdoing. In this day and age, we need the whistleblower more now than we have ever needed them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to support this bill to protect some of the boldest, most courageous people in our Nation, the whistleblowers.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 585 the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017. As Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, protecting whistleblowers at VA is of paramount concern to ensure that we provide high quality healthcare and benefits to our nation's veterans.

This bill authored by Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin was named in honor of Dr. Christopher Kirkpatrick, a former VA doctor who served our veterans at the Tomah, WI medical center. Many of us know that the Tomah VA medical center has been a facility plagued with the overprescribing of opioids to our veterans. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a brave patriot who blew the whistle on these over prescriptions and the harm that was being done to veterans, however, instead of commending him for coming forward, VA fired him on trumped up charges, which ultimately led to him taking his own life.

In my opinion, the corrosive culture within this facility and VA's actions toward Dr. Kirkpatrick left a chilling effect not only in Tomah, but across the Department. I believe that these actions made whistleblowers feel questioned and worried that they would be punished instead of being lauded and encouraged to come forward.

It is because of brave whistleblowers like Dr. Kirkpatrick that my Committee has been able to expose issues and scandals across the VA. It is because of whistleblowers that we were able to uncover the manipulation of wait times at the Phoenix Medical Center; the falsifying of records in the Philadelphia Regional Office; the fact that a VA employee participated in an armed robbery in Puerto Rico and stayed on the job following their arrest; and many more egregious behaviors at the Department that put veterans in harm's way.

I have confidence that Secretary Shulkin is committed to protecting whistleblowers, so that we never again lose another talented doctor, like Dr. Kirkpatrick. The best way to help him in this mission is to send a clear message to all VA employees, at every level in the Department, and within every level of management, that there are stiff penalties for those who retaliate against the men and women who are brave enough to come forward and protect veterans.

S. 585 builds off of our work this Congress that started with the passage of the bill I championed, the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017, which provides the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the tools he needs to hold poor employees accountable. I am pleased that the bill before us today would make needed changes to our outdated civil service laws for all Federal Government employees, which have become so archaic and complex that they tend to put the rights of retaliators above the rights of whistleblowers.

The bill before us would also provide needed reforms to information regarding VA employees who die by suicide, additional penalties for accessing a veteran's medical record, and other needed provisions to ensure that we put the needs of whistleblowers and veterans first.

I appreciate Senator JOHNSON and Representative DUFFY for their work on this important bill and I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress will have an opportunity to vote on legislation that will bolster protections for whistleblowing patriots, while vastly improving care for veterans at the VA.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act is the product of hundreds of hours of Congressional hearings, meetings with stakeholders, and hard work by dozens of lawmakers here in Washington, to make sure that the tragic abuse that Dr. Kirkpatrick faced will never happen again.

As some of you may know, Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick was a clinical psychologist at the VA in Tomah, WI. He was a veteran, a graduate of Northwestern University, and a caring individual who dedicated his career to providing innovative treatments for veterans suffering from PTSD. Most notably, he created a yoga program to help vets at the VA in Chicago. He was known to be very well-liked by the patients he served.

In 2009, Dr. Kirkpatrick expressed concerns that his patients were being heavily overmedicated. It became so bad, he said, that he was unable to properly do his job. He wanted to do what was right for veterans, and as a veteran himself, he couldn't stand to see how careless some of the VA staff were being with high levels of dangerous medications.

Unfortunately, instead of looking into Dr. Kirkpatrick's claims, the facility's chief of staff

told him to mind his own business, and to instead focus on his own work. Shortly thereafter, Dr. Kirkpatrick was called to a disciplinary meeting and given a written reprimand.

This type of retaliation went on for months. Then, in July, Dr. Kirkpatrick complained again that a dangerous veteran had not been properly discharged, despite recommendations from a treatment team. A week after making the complaint, Dr. Kirkpatrick was fired from the VA.

He was devastated. He begged for an opportunity to stay, and expressed concerns that he had been given too many complex cases, and that the emotional toll was too high. Again, his concerns were ignored.

That night, Dr. Kirkpatrick wrote a note to his girlfriend in Chicago, another to the kennel he wanted to take care of his dog, and one final note for the mailman. It read: "Please call 911—tell them to go to red barn building."

He had taken his own life. He was 38 years old.

Dr. Kirkpatrick's death was the product of a broken system—a system that encourages retaliation against whistleblowers, while ignoring the underlying causes of their concerns.

If Dr. Kirkpatrick's death wasn't tragic enough, a subsequent investigation at the VA found that a patient had died from "mixed drug toxicity", and that Dr. Kirkpatrick's concerns were completely warranted.

Not only did whistleblower retaliation cost Dr. Kirkpatrick his life, it cost the life of a patient as well.

That's why I urge you all to vote yes on the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act.

A yes vote means that VA personnel will no longer be able to access a whistleblower's medical records as means of discrediting them, which a separate investigation found happens far too often.

A yes vote means that federal agencies have to notify the Office of Special Counsel when a suicide takes place.

A yes means clear disciplinary actions for supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, training for supervisors on how to properly respond, and a requirement that employees are made aware of the mental health services at their disposal.

A yes vote also means keeping upholding normal burdens of proof to strengthen protections for employees. This legislation calls for the Inspector General, Office of Special Counsel, or a Merit Systems Protection Board Administrative Judge to "determine" that a supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action, meaning through the normal preponderance of the evidence for any other disciplinary action under Chapter 75 of title 5. This does not mean some arbitrary process for some bureaucrat to create later on.

I want to be clear: this legislation strengthens protections for patriots—for those who are trying to do the right thing. For those who care about veterans and their safety. And for folks like Dr. Kirkpatrick, so that no one ever has to go through what he went through.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 562, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'Halleran moves to recommit the bill S. 585 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

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

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ DISCLOSURE OF VIOLATIONS RELATING TO AIR TRANSPORTATION.**

This Act, and any amendments made by this Act, shall apply to any employee who makes a protected disclosure of information relating to a violation by the head of an agency, or other political appointee, of any law, rule, or regulation concerning travel, including the improper use of air transportation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, increasing accountability and transparency across our government is a shared principle we can all agree on among this body. Whether at the VA or other Federal agencies, the American people deserve to know that Federal officials from the top down are being held to the standards we expect of them.

We owe it to our veterans, to our seniors, and to the hardworking American taxpayers to ensure that their tax dollars are utilized appropriately and efficiently, as intended. Waste, fraud, and abuse, have no place at our agencies, and those who help uncover it deserve our admiration and our protection.

I am proud that we are coming together to increase protections for whistleblowers of Federal agencies, a long overdue effort. But, Mr. Speaker, in light of recent reports and events that have revealed a disturbing pattern of improper use of tax dollars on air travel by senior Federal officials, I believe we must go further.

The reports of Cabinet officials abusing the rules for air travel that applied to them are not isolated. Not one, not two, not three, but at least four Cabinet officials are facing scrutiny for irregular and irresponsible use of agency resources for official and nonofficial air travel. In light of Secretary Price's recent resignation, it is clear that Congress must conduct greater oversight.

□ 1345

That is why I am offering this final amendment on the underlying bill.

My amendment simply extends whistleblower protections that are created under the bill to Federal employees who disclose information about travel, including improper use of aircraft.

Not only would this make clear to agencies that any violation of laws, rules, or regulations concerning travel or government aircraft is unacceptable, it will also ensure those who come forward to expose any wrongdoing will have appropriate protection from retaliation.

Regardless of party, those who serve the American public must be held to the highest ethical standards. Our ability to hold government officials accountable to taxpayers is a hallmark of our democracy, and we must work to uphold that principle. The resources invested to agencies to fulfill their missions of serving Americans should not be abused or frivolously flaunted for personal gain or convenience.

This is not about Republicans or Democrats. We must come together to stand up for accountability and transparency. The moment we begin treating disregard for the rules by our elected and appointed officials as partisan politics, we risk ceding the very values that make our democracy great and unique in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my commonsense amendment on behalf of American taxpayers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit.

This bill addresses critical flaws in how the Federal Government addresses whistleblower retaliation.

The consequences for whistleblower retaliation are very real. There is a chilling effect of whistleblower reports or unjust termination. In some cases, like that of Dr. Kirkpatrick in the Department of Veterans Affairs, the consequences are literally life and death.

We have the opportunity to send this bill to the President for a signature today and fix this now. Why wait? And at what cost to Federal employees, veterans, and taxpayers?

I support the gentleman from Maryland's effort to pass this provision which I previously cosponsored myself, but let's not let one good bill get in the way of another.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and support the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. 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.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1355

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Langevin moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2810 be instructed as follows:

(1) To disagree with subsection (c) of section 336 of the Senate amendment.

(2) To recede from section 1064 of the House bill.

(3) To disagree with section 1087 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Army has a surplus of pistols. The M-1911 A-1, a .45-caliber pistol—the Armed Forces standard issue sidearm for more than 50 years—was replaced in the 1980s by a newer model.

Since then the Army has accumulated stores of surplus M-1911 pistols which are housed at taxpayer expense in Alabama.

There is no national security reason to keep these pistols. The Army stopped issuing them 30 years ago, yet the Army has been prevented from disposing of them due to parochial interests tied to the Civilian Marksmanship Program, or CMP.

The CMP's proponents basically want to transfer the pistols to a private corporation so that it can sell them. Do we want this to happen? We have the opportunity in this year's NDAA to stop this transfer of tens of thousands of M-1911 A-1 pistols which constitutes a multimillion-dollar government giveaway.

It is also important to note that this would make our streets more dangerous at a time when gun violence is all too common.

The CMP was established in 1903—just to put this in historical context—following the Spanish-American War when American militiamen demonstrated distressingly poor marksmanship. At that time, our Nation needed a better trained and organized militia, and the CMP helped the government build a broader base of able citizen-soldiers.

Now, the program was an important component of our national defense back then. But today, Mr. Speaker, over a century later, we have a professional military and many rifle clubs, and the CMP is, quite frankly, no longer needed. Congress clearly understood this when it privatized the CMP in 1996.

Now, as an initial capital investment at a time when earmarks were still common, Congress provided the newly chartered corporation with a stock of rifles, ammunition, and other spare parts. The CMP could sell the surplus equipment—mostly M1 Garand rifles—in order to fund its activities until it became self-sufficient.

□ 1400

However, it was never Congress' intent to equip the CMP with handguns, or it would have provided the corporation with surplus M-1911-A1 .45-caliber pistols at that time.

Now, more than two decades later, the CMP is running out of rifles to sell. The reality is that it is in dire financial straits as, more than 20 years later, the program is still reliant on rifle sales to support its activities.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly not the taxpayers' responsibility to bail out the CMP. To do so would be an unprecedented government handout at a time when earmarks have been banned for years.



So what makes this program so special?

There is nothing.

Beyond this, it would flood our streets with handguns—the guns that are most often used by criminals. I believe this would be extremely dangerous when, more than 2 years ago, the first attempt was made to effectuate this earmark, I heard the argument that storing surplus pistols, as the Army is now doing, is a waste of government funds. Well, I agree. However, a handout is not the answer.

There is no national security reason to put these guns on our streets. In fact, an increase in the number of handguns will only result potentially in more violence.

So, Mr. Speaker, we should allow the Army to dispose of these pistols by melting them down, as it plans to do with other surplus arms.

Senate language in the NDAA exempts M-1911-A1 pistols from Army disposal, but I urge my colleagues to support the motion to instruct the conferees to reject this exemption. There is no reason to store these pistols. There is no reason to flood our streets with them. There is no reason to give an earmark, again, to a private corporation. They should be melted down and repurchased for other military uses, which is exactly what this motion supports.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise against the motion to instruct. I believe this is the first motion to instruct that the House has voted on so far this year and this Congress, so not all Members may not realize that, as the House and the Senate are about to go to conference committee to work out differences in the House and Senate versions of whatever bill they are focused on, procedurally it is possible to have a motion to instruct conferees, such as the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered.

That motion is not binding on the conferees, but it is an attempt to have a vote on an issue that a Member or group of Members think is important or that they can make a point upon.

The subject of this motion to instruct is the disposal of excess weapons, as the gentleman from Rhode Island mentioned.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, I know of no evidence that—as the government has over the years disposed of these weapons, there is no evidence that any of them have been improperly used. They must be disposed of fully consistent with the law, and that includes background checks and the rest, and the proceeds support safety programs, which I would suspect that all of us think is a worthwhile endeavor.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, the House has regularly expressed its opinion and its will with amendment votes both on the floor and in committee

over the years. We have voted on this program a number of times and it has consistently been the will of the House that this program should continue. As a matter of fact, in this year's bill, we had a vote in committee and the amendment to provide for this program was adopted.

So, to me, Mr. Speaker, the most important point to make is this: the bill before us is one that helps this Congress fulfill the first responsibilities of the Federal Government, and that is to defend our citizens.

It also provides the support that the men and women who serve our Nation in the military must have if they are to carry out the missions to which they are assigned.

That is the purpose of this bill, that is the focus of this bill: to defend the country and to support our troops. That will continue to be the focus as the House and Senate move into conference.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have great respect for the chairman and his leadership of the Armed Services Committee. No one questions his commitment to defending the Nation in support of our military, but we don't need to support earmarks to a private corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against provisions in the House and the Senate National Defense Authorization Act that would allow the transfer of all surplus pistols to the Civilian Marksmanship Program—or CMP—for sale to the public.

Allowing the transfer of this large volume of guns for sale to the public moves the CMP into the retail gun market and away from its statutorily mandated functions. This is a program meant to instruct citizens in marksmanship and promote safety in the use of firearms, not to deal firearms.

The Army has opposed such provisions in the past, and I am here to oppose any NDAA provisions that would allow the transfer of any surplus Army firearms to the CMP.

I join my colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN, in calling for all surplus firearms to be melted down and not distributed to the public.

There are over 300 million guns in America, nearly one for every citizen. We have lost way too many lives to gun violence.

The Department of Defense should not participate in freely distributing their guns onto our streets.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Civilian Marksmanship Program is an organization that was established initially by this Congress because we needed institutions to help

people better understand gun safety and how to handle weapons. It has fulfilled a vital mission.

Fortunately, in recent years, we have been able to not have to fund it anymore by being able to self-fund through the refurbishment and sale of surplus weapons.

It has been their mission for a century. These 1911s are surplus pistols that were used up until the early nineties by our military. Since that time, statutorily, they were made available to law enforcement and allied countries.

As you might imagine, most law enforcement and allied countries would rather have new, modern weapons, rather than surplus. So we have approximately 100,000 of these weapons in storage at the Anniston Army Depot in my district. It costs us in the neighborhood of \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year in direct cost to store these weapons.

What the Armed Services Committee and this Congress in preceding NDAs has repeatedly done has been to instruct the Department of the Army to start turning those over to the Civilian Marksmanship Program at 10,000 a year until the full 100,000 has been eliminated from our storage.

The CMP—the Civilian Marksmanship Program—takes those weapons as they get them, completely refurbishes them, and then sells them to collectors. These are not weapons that wind up on the streets. They generally cost between \$800 and \$1,000, and they are sold to collectors.

To be able to buy one, you have to go through the same background check as any other buyer. But not just anybody can buy these. You have to either be in law enforcement, the military, or an active member of a gun club.

These are not a danger to the public. In fact, this whole process of taking this money, the CMP then sells the weapons and it goes into their trust fund to allow them to continue to train Americans in gun safety, is a vital mission that we should be supporting. This Congress has repeatedly supported it over the years.

It is my hope that the full body will reject this motion by my friend and colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN. It has been defeated repeatedly in the Armed Services Committee, and I hope it will be defeated again today.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just mention many wonderful organizations around the country that would love to have earmarks, but we don't do earmarks anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a provision in the NDAA authorizing the transfer of nearly 100,000 surplus military-grade firearms to the Civilian Marksmanship Program for sale to the public.

This multimillion-dollar government handout to a private corporation is bad policy. It places more military-grade



weapons on our streets and in our communities.

The horrific violence on October 1 in Las Vegas, the deadliest mass shooting in modern American history, has forever altered the lives of hundreds of thousands of families related to those 22,000 victims that were there the day of the shooting.

It is now more urgent than ever that we take meaningful action on passing gun safety measures. That should be our priority, yet here we are taking a step backwards.

Instead of bringing legislation on the floor to ban the manufacture of bump stocks that allow semiautomatic rifles to fire hundreds of rounds per minute, instead of being on the floor to ban the sale of high-capacity magazines used to inflict widespread carnage, or instead of being on the floor to expand background checks to all commercial gun sales so that felons and the seriously mentally ill and terrorists cannot obtain access to dangerous weapons, we are here debating a provision that increases a number of military weapons on our streets.

I know we can uphold the Second Amendment while taking reasonable steps to reduce the toll of gun violence inflicted on our communities. Putting nearly 100,000 more military-grade firearms designed for Army use into our neighborhoods is not a reasonable step in the right direction.

According to its text, the provision included in this bill mandates the immediate transfer of an unlimited number of guns to the Civilian Marksman Program for sale to the public.

This program was originally created to instruct Americans in marksmanship, promote firearms safety, and conduct friendly shooting competitions in controlled environments.

The NDAA provision we are speaking of today would turn this program into a mass firearms retailer, with the new mission to sell as many military-grade weapons to the public as possible. It defies logic and common sense. Gun violence has become a public crisis.

So I urge my colleagues to join together and work across the aisle to decrease the scope and devastation caused by tragic mass shootings. No community across America should be forced to experience the grief and trauma that my community and others like mine have gone through in these past few years.

I ask all Members of Congress to support the Democratic motion to instruct conferees to remove this dangerous provision from the NDAA.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Congress intended for the CMP to become self-sufficient after it was privatized in 1996. It was never meant to be the recipient of another multimillion-dollar government hand-out years later, especially not a hand-out of tens of thousands of pistols

which then would be used immediately for sale to the public to fund its operations.

Again, perhaps one could argue that, when earmarks were around, they needed this to fund their operations. Again, there was a time when earmarks were in existence. Earmarks are no longer regular order. They don't exist anymore. They were done away with several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that I don't hold with the need for the CMP to receive Federal support.

On another note, I don't often see eye to eye with the NRA, but I must agree with the statement on the NRA's website that the Association is "the premier firearms education organization in the world."

□ 1415

Well, the NRA does not receive Federal support from its education programs, which are widely accessible, and in our professional military, the need for marksmanship training for national security purposes has evaporated. Even if we truly think the CMP is deserving of a government subsidy, Congress should do so through the appropriations process, not through a provision that is, quite frankly, again, an earmark.

As my colleagues so well know, earmarks were banned in the 112th Congress, yet the provisions at issue in the House-passed NDAA would transfer millions of dollars, ostensibly, in government property to a corporation that is in the congressional district of the measure's chief advocate. And while I have deep respect for my colleague, the government shouldn't be engaged in this type of practice.

The government has occasionally transferred surplus property to non-profit corporations for education or other purposes; however, it has never done so with the intent that the property be immediately sold, with the proceeds going to the corporation's bottom line. So if that isn't an earmark, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. It is blatant subversion of congressional order, and it would set, I believe, a very dangerous precedent.

I hope that my colleagues would join me in upholding the rules of the House and support the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to highlight the danger of this transfer, potentially, to public safety. Injecting tens of thousands of new pistols onto our streets by providing them to the CMP, I believe, could be disastrous, as handguns are regularly used in crime.

Now, in 2013, of the 6,498 homicides committed by a firearm for which the type of weapon was known, 89 percent were handgun related—89 percent. Only 4 percent were carried out using a rifle, the type of firearm the CMP has traditionally sold.

The qualities that made the M1911A1 .45-caliber pistol a fun sidearm is the fact that it is easily concealed, extremely reliable, and packs quite a

punch, all qualities that make it prized also among criminals. In fact, the Department of Justice has tracked 1,768 M1911A1s over the last decade due to their involvement in criminal activity.

In a time when mass shootings have become all too common and 93 Americans are killed with guns every day, the last thing we need is more guns on our streets.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, the bill before us, overall, is a fine mark. I was proud to support it in committee, overall, because it provides for our national defense. It supports key programs of the Department of Defense to make sure our warfighters have every advantage possible. We never want to send our warfighters into a fair fight, and this bill, overall, goes a long way toward ensuring for our national defense and provides great support for our men and women in uniform.

Unfortunately, this CMP issue has been an unnecessary distraction. It is something I don't believe belongs in the bill. I believe that and, again, I made the point that we have done away with earmarks, and so we shouldn't be using an earmark and subverting congressional authority and will through the regular order process, through the appropriations process, to help to fund a private organization.

Again, there are many, I am sure, meritorious organizations around the country that would love to have an earmark, but we don't do them anymore, and we shouldn't be doing a side-step here to give a private organization such an earmark.

As I said, I have highlighted again the potential for guns to fall into the wrong hands. And although the owners of the weapons may be of good character and those who purchased the guns, to fund, again, the operations of the CMP, a private organization, even if they have them in their home, if there is criminal activity that takes place, whether it is an act of violence or if the home is broken into and the weapon is stolen, which happens every day in America that a law-abiding citizen has a weapon that gets in the wrong hands, that weapon is then used in the crime. The more weapons out there, the more likely something like that could potentially happen.

This is what we are trying to prevent. We want to do this in a responsible way. Again, we want to make sure that the guns don't just wind up out in our streets, and we want to make sure that they are melted down like other surplus equipment.

The Army surely does not need to store them any longer. We want to get rid of them. We want the Army to be able to do that, but they should be able to do what they do with other surplus equipment, and that is melt it down,

perhaps use that melted down material for making other weapons that the Army does need that are relevant at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the language in the current NDAA. We should work together and support my motion to instruct so that, as we go to conference, we have clear direction from the House as to what the House believes we should do and not allow these weapons out in our communities. We shouldn't be supporting earmarks.

As I said, I know that the Senate provision does in fact have a provision there that would allow these weapons to be melted down, and that is the way that we should go. I believe that we have an opportunity to make that statement right here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the full House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just really want to support Mr. LANGEVIN for his leadership on this issue, something that we brought up in committee, and a program that really should be just discontinued, and I think the motion to instruct is perfectly appropriate.

It was a program that was originally created, and the reason that we were selling back firearms to the public from the U.S. military, the program was literally created because we were worried that there wouldn't be enough people in our country that knew how to fire a weapon if we should need to draft them into a war. That is why the program was created.

Obviously, for a whole bunch of reasons, that is no longer applicable. We have an all volunteer military. They are trained to shoot. They know how to shoot. We don't need to train random folks with weapons from the military.

Also, originally, the program was simply aimed at rifles; and now they have thrown in, I think it is, around 100,000 pistols that they want to sell back to the public, in general. And this company makes money, the taxpayers don't, and we put 100,000 more weapons out on the streets.

I think if there is one thing we should be able to agree on is that there is more than enough firepower out there amongst the public. We should not be taking military weapons and selling them back out into the public, and this motion, this amendment that Mr. LANGEVIN first brought up has a very simple solution. We will hold onto those weapons; we will melt them down. I think that is the appropriate response. We do not need to sell more firearms out there into the public.

I think the gentleman from Rhode Island has done an outstanding job showing leadership on this issue. I urge us to adopt this motion to instruct, and I urge the conference committee to adopt this as part of the final National Defense Authorization Act that we ultimately will pass.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The gentleman from Rhode Island has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers other than myself, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member SMITH for speaking on behalf of this motion to instruct. I deeply appreciate his leadership on the Armed Services Committee and his years of service, as I do, again, have deep respect for Chairman THORNBERRY and his leadership as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Case in point, the NDAA this year, and as has been the case in past years, has been truly a bipartisan effort, and it's one of the reasons I truly enjoy serving in the Armed Services Committee is because of the bipartisan cooperation that is demonstrated when it comes to protecting our country, when it comes to providing for our national defense, especially supporting our men and women in uniform. It is a bipartisan effort. It is unfortunate that in this one particular case we have this difference of opinion.

We are, again, a program that was initially intended to train marksmen years ago when we didn't have a professional military. Maybe it had merit and the organization was supported, but we have a professional military now, great marksmanship programs and training programs, as well as private organizations that do this. But it doesn't require or need a government subsidy, and so it wouldn't be appropriate in this case any further to continue to support this private organization, the CMP program with, ostensibly, a earmark.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering a National Defense Authorization Act measure that would transfer thousands of military weapons to a civilian nonprofit, the Civilian Marksmanship Program. These guns will then make their way into the public for purchase.

The Army has recommended against this proposal. One of their concerns, not a surprise, is public safety. For us to go against the recommendations of our own military on this matter is, frankly, absurd. Every single day, our country—our country—experiences horrific gun violence, and the last thing we should be doing is going against the advice of our military and putting more guns onto American streets.

Those who are in support of the measure claim that transferring these weapons to the Civilian Marksmanship Program will save the government the cost of storing these guns, but the

amount of money to be saved to store some weapons is really negligible, and that small cost is nothing compared to the potential cost to human life by unleashing these handguns for the public to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to employ common sense here. Listen to the advice of our Army and support the motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her comments and support of the motion to instruct. I also want to commend her and thank her for her leadership on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, just to once again reiterate, a priority of the overall NDAA that we worked on in a bipartisan, collaborative way, this one sticking point is this provision in the NDAA that, again, amounts to an earmark, and it could potentially put tens of thousands of additional weapons on our streets that could wind up in the wrong hands. It is an unnecessary step.

□ 1430

Again, when the CMP was first created, it had a legitimate purpose. That purpose is no longer needed, per se, for the military in terms of marksmanship training. There are other organizations out there that do that, but we also have the professional military.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the provisions in the House-passed NDAA would give a multimillion-dollar handout in the form of .45-caliber pistols to the Civilian Marksmanship Program. It is an unnecessary and unwise use of taxpayer property that would potentially make our streets less safe.

My motion will instruct our House conferees to reject this earmark and allow the Army to melt down and repurpose its surplus firearms, as it does with other firearms or surplus equipment.

Congress needs to find solutions to the endemic gun violence that is plaguing our Nation right now. We saw, it seems, time after time, multiple incidents where firearms get into the wrong hands and are misused, causing loss of life and sometimes, unfortunately, sadly, in significant numbers, just as we saw, as Ms. ROSEN mentioned, with the terrible shooting in Las Vegas: 58 people lost their lives and hundreds more were injured. It was a terrible tragedy for Nevada, for those who lost their lives, and for those who were injured; and, really, it was a tragedy once again that has plagued and affected our country.

It has to stop. We should not be adding to the problem by injecting tens of thousands of handguns onto our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island. As he said, we make every effort to ensure that the support for the men and women who serve in the military is on a bipartisan basis. The gentleman from Rhode Island is a key leader on a number of those issues, whether it is cyber, directed energy, and a host of others.

I appreciate all of the Members on both sides of the aisle who have spoken. That bipartisan support is what helped lead us to pass the House version of this bill by the biggest majority in 8 years. That does not mean we agree on everything, obviously, but when it comes to supporting the military, their interests are first, and I think we need to keep it that way.

The subject of this motion to instruct is a long-running program designed to support safety programs. While we have had votes on this on the floor and in committee over the years, it has never been a particularly controversial program, even though the gentleman from Rhode Island has consistently been against it from the start. But the point is that in both the House and the Senate bills this year, there are provisions dealing with these programs. We come to some resolution every year, and for 55 straight years the conference report has gotten signed into law.

I would like to correct one point, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that the Army is opposed to this program. As a matter of fact, both Mr. ROGERS and I have talked to the Army about this, and they have not expressed in any sense that they are opposed to it. They were waiting to see what direction they are given, and they are happy to go implement that.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, our country has been buffeted by a number of tragedies: hurricanes; of course, wildfires going on now in the West. And the horrible, horrific murders in Las Vegas are much on our minds, as are the victims and the whole communities.

It is important to take time and to learn what that investigation yields so that we can, hopefully, prevent it from happening in the future.

I just want to point out that there is nothing, whether these provisions stay or go, that is going to have any effect on an event like we just saw in Las Vegas. As a matter of fact, in the history of this program, I know of no single instance where one of these weapons that has been disposed of for gun safety programs has been used improperly. As a matter of fact, most of these weapons go up on a mantle somewhere. They are collectors items. So it would be inappropriate, in my opinion, to try to tie that horrible tragedy in Las Vegas, or others, to these particular programs.

That leads me to the last point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, and

it is similar to the first. On a bipartisan basis, this House and, indeed, this Congress, come together to support the men and women who risk their lives to defend us. The world is getting more dangerous, and, unfortunately—the fault of both parties in both the executive and legislative branches of government—we cut our military too much. We are seeing the effects of that through declining readiness, through increasing accidents, and a whole variety of things where the fruits of that neglect is becoming more apparent.

But I think it is crucial, as we begin to rebuild and repair our military, that we not let other agendas, other issues, impair our ability to do so. I am concerned, for example, that some Republicans say: Oh, yeah, I will increase funding for defense, as long as you can cut that money in other parts of the budget.

I am concerned when Democrats say: Oh, I am for increasing defense, as long as you increase other parts of the budget.

I am concerned when anybody brings any other agenda, any other issue, that impedes our ability to support the men and women who serve our Nation. We ought to do our best to support them on the basis of those issues alone and let other debates, whatever they may be, stand on their own as well.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, motions to instruct are, of course, non-binding. I think, in this case, the better vote is to vote “no.” There are provisions dealing with this in both the House and the Senate bill. I hope that we can come to a reasonable conclusion on these provisions and the whole bill. But the goal is to defend the country and to support the men and women who serve. We can never be distracted from that goal.

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

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1440

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

#### 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:

The motion to instruct on H.R. 2810;  
The motion to permit closed conference meetings on H.R. 2810, if offered;

The motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 569;

The motion to recommit on S. 585; and

Passage of S. 585, if ordered.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

YEAS—184

Adams	Clark (MA)	Ellison
Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Engel
Barragán	Clay	Españillat
Bass	Cleaver	Esty (CT)
Beatty	Cohen	Evans
Bera	Connolly	Foster
Beyer	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Fudge
Blumenauer	Costa	Gabbard
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Gallego
Bonamici	Crist	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Gomez
F.	Cummings	Gonzalez (TX)
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Gottheimer
Brown (MD)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Bustos	DeGette	Grijalva
Butterfield	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Capuano	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Carbajal	DelBene	Hastings
Cárdenas	Demings	Heck
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Higgins (NY)
Cartwright	Deutch	Himes
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Chu, Judy	Doyle, Michael	Jayapal
Cicilline	F.	Jeffries

Johnson (GA) McGovern  
 Johnson, E. B. McNerney  
 Jones Meeks  
 Kaptur Meng  
 Keating Moore  
 Kelly (IL) Moulton  
 Kennedy Murphy (FL)  
 Khanna Nadler  
 Kihuen Napolitano  
 Kildee Neal  
 Kilmer Nolan  
 Krishnamoorthi Norcross  
 Kuster (NH) O'Halleran  
 Langevin O'Rourke  
 Larsen (WA) Pallone  
 Larson (CT) Panetta  
 Lawson (FL) Pascrell  
 Lee Payne  
 Levin Pelosi  
 Lewis (GA) Perlmutter  
 Lieu, Ted Peters  
 Lipinski Pingree  
 Loeb sack Pocan  
 Lofgren Polis  
 Lowenthal Price (NC)  
 Lowey Quigley  
 Lujan Grisham, Raskin  
 M. Rice (NY)  
 Luján, Ben Ray Richmond  
 Lynch Rosen  
 Maloney, Roybal-Allard  
 Carolyn B. Ruiz  
 Maloney, Sean Ruppertsberger  
 Matsui Rush  
 McCollum Ryan (OH)  
 McEachin Sánchez

Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Speier  
 Suozzi  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Tsongas  
 Vargas  
 Clyburn  
 Eshoo  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce (CA)  
 Russell  
 Rutherford  
 Sanford  
 Scalise  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Swaldao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smucker  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg

Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Cheney  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Coffman  
 Cohen  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cook  
 Cooper  
 Correa  
 Costa  
 Costello (PA)  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crist  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davidson  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 Davis, Rodney  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 Demings  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DeSaulnier  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donovan  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Dunn  
 Ellison  
 Emmer  
 Engel  
 Espallat  
 Estes (KS)  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Farenthold  
 Faso  
 Ferguson  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Foy  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Garrett  
 Gianforte  
 Gibbs  
 Gohmert  
 Gomez  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gottheimer  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guthrie  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Handel  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Hill  
 Himes  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hoyer  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd  
 Issa  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jeffries  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Kaptur  
 Katko  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kihuen  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger  
 Knight  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latta  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (MN)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Rouzer  
 Lofgren  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham,  
 M.  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin

NOT VOTING—12

Black  
 Bridenstine  
 Clyburn  
 Eshoo  
 Huffman  
 Jordan  
 Lawrence  
 Long  
 Marino  
 Palazzo  
 Renacci  
 Thompson (CA)

□ 1508

Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KIND, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. HOLLINGSWORTH, ROHRABACHER, DENHAM, DENT, and COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas and LOEB SACK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and the Senate on H.R. 2810 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be discussed, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 8, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

YEAS—414

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

Labrador  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 Lewis (MN)  
 LoBiondo  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 MacArthur  
 Gaetz  
 Marchant  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Posey  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Rice (SC)  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Barr  
 Bost  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Bergman  
 Beyer  
 Biggs  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Bost  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Budd  
 Burgess  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Capuano  
 Carabajal  
 Cárdenas  
 Carson (IN)

Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guthrie  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Handel  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Hill  
 Himes  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hoyer  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd  
 Issa  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jeffries  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Kaptur  
 Katko  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kihuen  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger  
 Knight  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latta  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (MN)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Rouzer  
 Lofgren  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham,  
 M.  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marchant  
 Marshall  
 Mast  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNerney  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Norcross  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 O'Halleran  
 O'Rourke  
 Olson  
 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  
 Rice (NY)  
 Rice (SC)  
 Richmond  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney, Francis  
 Rooney, Thomas  
 J.  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rosen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce (CA)  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Russell  
 Rutherford  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner

Serrano	Taylor	Walters, Mimi	Butterfield	Hanabusa	Napolitano	Valadao	Walz	Wilson (SC)
Sessions	Tenney	Walz	Byrne	Handel	Neal	Vargas	Wasserman	Wittman
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman	Calvert	Harper	Newhouse	Veasey	Schultz	Womack
Shea-Porter	Thompson (PA)	Schultz	Capuano	Hartzler	Nolan	Vela	Waters, Maxine	Woodall
Sherman	Thornberry	Waters, Maxine	Carbajal	Hastings	Norcross	Velázquez	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth
Shimkus	Tiberi	Watson Coleman	Cárdenas	Heck	Nunes	Visclosky	Weber (TX)	Yoder
Shuster	Tipton	Carson (IN)	Carson (IN)	Herrera Beutler	O'Halleran	Wagner	Webster (FL)	Yoho
Simpson	Titus	Webster (FL)	Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	O'Rourke	Walberg	Welch	Young (AK)
Sinema	Tonko	Welch	Carter (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Olson	Walden	Westerman	Young (IA)
Sires	Torres	Wenstrup	Cartwright	Himes	Pallone	Walters, Mimi	Wilson (FL)	Zeldin
Slaughter	Trott	Westerman	Castor (FL)	Hollingsworth	Panetta			
Smith (MO)	Tsongas	Williams	Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Pascarell			
Smith (NE)	Turner	Wilson (FL)	Cheney	Huizenga	Paulsen	Amash	Gallagher	Meadows
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Wilson (SC)	Chu, Judy	Hultgren	Payne	Banks (IN)	Garrett	Messer
Smith (TX)	Valadao	Wittman	Cicilline	Hunter	Pelosi	Barr	Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Smith (WA)	Vargas	Womack	Clark (MA)	Hurd	Perlmutter	Barton	Gohmert	Mullin
Smucker	Veasey	Woodall	Clarke (NY)	Issa	Peters	Bergman	Goodlatte	Noem
Soto	Vela	Yarmuth	Clay	Jackson Lee	Peterson	Biggs	Gosar	Norman
Speier	Velázquez	Yoder	Cleaver	Jayapal	Pingree	Bishop (MI)	Griffith	Palmer
Stefanik	Visclosky	Yoho	Coffman	Jeffries	Pocan	Blackburn	Harris	Pearce
Stewart	Wagner	Young (AK)	Cohen	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)	Blum	Hensarling	Perry
Stivers	Walberg	Young (IA)	Cole	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin	Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Suozi	Walden	Zeldin	Collins (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Polis	Brooks (AL)	Hill	Ratcliffe
Swalwell (CA)	Walker		Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Posey	Buck	Holding	Rokita
Takano	Walorski		Comstock	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Budd	Hudson	Rothfus
			Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Quigley	Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
			Connolly	Joyce (OH)	Raskin	Comer	Jones	Sanford
			Conyers	Kaptur	Reed	Davidson	Jordan	Schweikert
			Cook	Katko	Reichert	DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
			Cooper	Keating	Rice (NY)	Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
			Correa	Kelly (IL)	Rice (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Stewart
			Costa	Kelly (PA)	Richmond	Duncan (TN)	Lewis (MN)	Walker
			Costello (PA)	Kennedy	Roby	Emmer	Loudermilk	Walorski
			Courtney	Khanna	Roe (TN)	Foxx	Marchant	Wenstrup
			Cramer	Kihuen	Rogers (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Massie	Williams
			Crawford	Kildee	Rogers (KY)			
			Crist	Kilmer	Rohrabacher			
			Crowley	Kind	Rooney, Francis			
			Cuellar	King (IA)	Rooney, Thomas			
			Culberson	King (NY)	J.			
			Cummings	Kinzinger	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Curbelo (FL)	Knight	Rosen			
			Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Roskam			
			Davis, Danny	Kuster (NH)	Ross			
			Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Roybal-Allard			
			DeFazio	LaHood	Royce (CA)			
			DeGette	LaMalfa	Ruiz			
			Delaney	Lance	Ruppersberger			
			DeLauro	Langevin	Rush			
			DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Russell			
			Demings	Larson (CT)	Rutherford			
			Denham	Latta	Ryan (OH)			
			Dent	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez			
			DeSantis	Lee	Sarbanes			
			DeSaulnier	Levin	Scalise			
			Deuch	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky			
			Diaz-Balart	Lieu, Ted	Schiff			
			Dingell	Lipinski	Schneider			
			Doggett	LoBiondo	Schrader			
			Donovan	Loebsock	Scott (VA)			
			Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Scott, Austin			
			F.	Love	Scott, David			
			Dunn	Lowenthal	Serrano			
			Ellison	Lowey	Sessions			
			Engel	Lucas	Sewell (AL)			
			Españat	Luetkemeyer	Shea-Porter			
			Estes (KS)	Lujan Grisham,	Sherman			
			Esty (CT)	M.	Shimkus			
			Evans	Luján, Ben Ray	Shuster			
			Farenthold	Lynch	Simpson			
			Faso	MacArthur	Sinema			
			Ferguson	Maloney,	Sires			
			Fitzpatrick	Carolyn B.	Slaughter			
			Fleischmann	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NE)			
			Flores	Marshall	Smith (NJ)			
			Fortenberry	Mast	Smith (TX)			
			Foster	Matsui	Smith (WA)			
			Frankel (FL)	McCarthy	Smucker			
			Frelinghuysen	McCaul	Soto			
			Fudge	McClintock	Speier			
			Gabbard	McCollum	Stefanik			
			Gaetz	McEachin	Stivers			
			Gallego	McGovern	Suozi			
			Garamendi	McHenry	Swalwell (CA)			
			Gianforte	McKinley	Takano			
			Gomez	McMorris	Taylor			
			Gonzalez (TX)	Rodgers	Tenney			
			Gottheimer	McNerney	Thompson (MS)			
			Gowdy	McSally	Thompson (PA)			
			Granger	Meehan	Thornberry			
			Graves (GA)	Meeks	Tiberi			
			Graves (LA)	Meng	Tipton			
			Graves (MO)	Mitchell	Titus			
			Green, Al	Moolenaar	Tonko			
			Green, Gene	Moore	Torres			
			Grijalva	Moulton	Trott			
			Grothman	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas			
			Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Turner			
			Gutiérrez	Nadler	Upton			

NAYS—69

NOT VOTING—11

NAYS—8

NOT VOTING—11

Amash	Grijalva	Massie
Blumenauer	Jones	Sanford
DeFazio	Labrador	

Black	Huffman	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Lawrence	Renacci
Clyburn	Long	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Marino	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1515

So the motion to close portions of the conference was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 569) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment, 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 New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 69, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

YEAS—353

Abraham	Bass	Boyle, Brendan
Adams	Beatty	F.
Aderholt	Bera	Brady (PA)
Aguilar	Beyer	Brady (TX)
Allen	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Amodel	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Brownley (CA)
Babin	Blumenauer	Buchanan
Bacon	Blunt Rochester	Bucshon
Barletta	Bonamici	Burgess
Barragán	Boat	Bustos

Black	Huffman	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Lawrence	Renacci
Clyburn	Long	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Marino	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1523

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 232, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

YEAS—190

Adams	Bass	Beyer
Aguilar	Beatty	Bishop (GA)
Barragán	Bera	Blum

Blumenauer	Green, Al	O'Rourke	Jenkins (WV)	Mitchell	Sensenbrenner	Brownley (CA)	Gallagher	Lowenthal
Blunt Rochester	Green, Gene	Pallone	Johnson (LA)	Moolenaar	Sessions	Buchanan	Gallego	Lowey
Bonamici	Grijalva	Panetta	Johnson (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	Buck	Garamendi	Lucas
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Pascarell	Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Shuster	Bucshon	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
F.	Hanabusa	Payne	Jones	Murphy (PA)	Budd	Gianforte	Lujan Grisham,	M.
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Pelosi	Jordan	Newhouse	Smith (MO)	Burgess	Gibbs	M.
Brown (MD)	Heck	Perlmutter	Joyce (OH)	Noem	Smith (NE)	Bustos	Gohmert	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brownley (CA)	Higgins (NY)	Peters	Katko	Norman	Smith (NJ)	Butterfield	Gomez	Lynch
Bustos	Himes	Peterson	Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Smith (TX)	Byrne	Gonzalez (TX)	MacArthur
Butterfield	Hoyer	Pingree	Kelly (PA)	Olson	Smucker	Calvert	Gosar	Maloney,
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Pocan	King (IA)	Palmer	Stefanik	Capuano	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Carbajal	Jayapal	Polis	King (NY)	Paulsen	Stewart	Carbajal	Gowdy	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Price (NC)	Kinzinger	Pearce	Stivers	Cárdenas	Granger	Marchant
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Knight	Perry	Taylor	Cárdenas	Granger	Marchant
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin	Kustoff (TN)	Pittenger	Tenney	Carson (IN)	Graves (GA)	Marshall
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)	Labrador	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)	Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Masie
Castro (TX)	Keating	Richmond	LaHood	Poliquin	Thornberry	Cartwright	Graves (MO)	Mast
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Rosen	LaMalfa	Posey	Tiberi	Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Matsui
Ciçilline	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard	Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Tipton	Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	McCarthy
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Ruiz	Lance	Reed	Trott	Chabot	Griffith	McCaul
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Ruppersberger	Latta	Reichert	Turner	Cheney	Grijalva	McClintock
Clay	Kildee	Rush	Lewis (MN)	Rice (SC)	Upton	Chu, Judy	Grothman	McCollum
Cleaver	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)	LoBiondo	Roby	Valadao	Ciçilline	Guthrie	McEachin
Cohen	Kind	Sánchez	Loudermilk	Roe (TN)	Wagner	Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	McGovern
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes	Love	Rogers (AL)	Walberg	Clarke (NY)	Hanabusa	McHenry
Conyers	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky	Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Walden	Clay	Handel	McKinley
Cooper	Langevin	Schiff	Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Walker	Cleaver	Harper	McMorris
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Schneider	MacArthur	Rokita	Walorski	Coffman	Harris	Rodgers
Costa	Larson (CT)	Schrader	Rooney, Francis	Rooney, Mimi	Walters, Mimi	Cohen	Hartzler	McNerney
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)	Rooney, Thomas	Rooney, Thomas	Weber (TX)	Cole	Hastings	McSally
Crist	Lee	Scott, David	Massie	J.	Webster (FL)	Collins (GA)	Heck	Meadows
Crowley	Levin	Serrano	Mast	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup	Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Meehan
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)	McCarthy	Roskam	Westerman	Comer	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter	McCaul	Ross	Williams	Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Meng
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sherman	McClintock	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)	Conaway	Higgins (NY)	Messner
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Sinema	McHenry	Rouzer	Wittman	Conaway	Hill	Mitchell
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sires	McKinley	Royce (CA)	Womack	Connolly	Himes	Moolenaar
DeGette	Lowenthal	Slaughter	McMorris	Russell	Woodall	Conyers	Mooney (WV)	Moore
Delaney	Lowe y	Smith (WA)	Rodgers	Rutherford	Yoder	Cook	Holding	Moulton
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham,	Soto	McSally	Sanford	Yoho	Cooper	Hollingsworth	Mullin
DelBene	M.	Speier	Meadows	Scalise	Young (AK)	Correa	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Demings	Luján, Ben Ray	Suozzi	Meehan	Schweikert	Young (IA)	Costa	Hudson	Murphy (PA)
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Swozwell (CA)	Messer	Scott, Austin	Zeldin	Costello (PA)	Huizenga	Nadler
Deutch	Maloney,	Takano				Courtney	Hultgren	Napolitano
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)				Cramer	Hunter	Neal
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Titus	Black	Huffman	Palazzo	Crawford	Hurd	Neal
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Tonko	Bridenstine	Lawrence	Renacci	Crist	Issa	Newhouse
F.	McCollum	Torres	Clyburn	Long	Thompson (CA)	Crowley	Jackson Lee	Noem
Ellison	McEachin	Tsongas	Eshoo	Marino		Cuellar	Jayapal	Nolan
Engel	McGovern	Vargas				Culberson	Jeffries	Norcross
Espallat	McNerney	Veasey				Cummings	Jenkins (KS)	Norman
Esty (CT)	Meeks	Vela				Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Nunes
Evans	Meng	Velázquez				Davidson	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Foster	Moore	Visclosky				Davis (CA)	Johnson (LA)	O'Rourke
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Walz				Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	Olson
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman				Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Gabbard	Nadler	Schultz				DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Palmer
Gallego	Napolitano	Waters, Maxine				DeGette	Jones	Panetta
Garamendi	Neal	Watson Coleman				Delaney	Jordan	Pascarell
Gomez	Nolan	Welch				DeLauro	Joyce (OH)	Pasulsen
Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)				DelBene	Kaptur	Payne
Gottheimer	O'Halleran	Yarmuth				Demings	Katko	Pearce

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1531

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 568]

AYES—420

Abraham	Cole	Frelinghuysen	Abraham	Barragán	Blum
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Gaetz	Adams	Barton	Blumenauer
Allen	Collins (NY)	Gallagher	Aderholt	Bass	Blunt Rochester
Amash	Comer	Garrett	Estes (AZ)	Beatty	Bonamici
Amodei	Comstock	Gianforte	Allen	Bera	Bost
Arrington	Conaway	Gibbs	Amash	Bergman	Boyle, Brendan
Babin	Cook	Gohmert	Amodei	Beyer	F.
Bacon	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte	Arrington	Biggs	Brady (PA)
Banks (IN)	Cramer	Gosar	Babin	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Barletta	Crawford	Gowdy	Bacon	Bishop (GA)	Brat
Barr	Culberson	Granger	Banks (IN)	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (AL)
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (GA)	Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)
Bergman	Davidson	Graves (LA)	Barr	Blackburn	Brown (MD)
Biggs	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)			
Bilirakis	Denham	Griffith			
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Grothman			
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Guthrie			
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Handel			
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Harper			
Brady (TX)	Donovan	Harris			
Brat	Duffy	Hartzler			
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling			
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler			
Buchanan	Dunn	Hice, Jody B.			
Buck	Emmer	Higgins (LA)			
Bucshon	Estes (KS)	Hill			
Budd	Farenthold	Holding			
Burgess	Faso	Hollingsworth			
Byrne	Ferguson	Hudson			
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga			
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hultgren			
Carter (TX)	Flores	Hunter			
Chabot	Fortenberry	Hurd			
Cheney	Fox	Issa			
Coffman	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (KS)			

Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Smith (TX)	Wagner
Rush	Smith (WA)	Walberg
Russell	Smucker	Walden
Rutherford	Soto	Walker
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Walorski
Sánchez	Stefanik	Walters, Mimi
Sanford	Stewart	Walz
Sarbanes	Stivers	Wasserman
Scalise	Suozzi	Schultz
Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Schiff	Takano	Watson Coleman
Schneider	Taylor	Weber (TX)
Schrader	Tenney	Webster (FL)
Schweikert	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Scott (VA)	Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup
Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Westerman
Sensenbrenner	Tiberi	Williams
Serrano	Tipton	Wilson (FL)
Sessions	Titus	Wilson (SC)
Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Wittman
Shea-Porter	Torres	Womack
Sherman	Trott	Woodall
Shimkus	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Shuster	Turner	Yoder
Simpson	Upton	Yoho
Sinema	Valadao	Young (AK)
Sires	Vargas	Young (IA)
Slaughter	Veasey	Zeldin
Smith (MO)	Vela	
Smith (NE)	Velázquez	

## NOT VOTING—13

Black	Huffman	Renacci
Bridenstine	Lawrence	Scott, David
Clyburn	Long	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Marino	
Goodlatte	Palazzo	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1538

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2810:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THORNBERRY, WILSON of South Carolina, LOBIONDO, BISHOP of Utah, TURNER, ROGERS of Alabama, FRANKS of Arizona, SHUSTER, CONAWAY, LAMBORN, WITTMAN, COFFMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, COOK, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. KNIGHT, BACON, SMITH of Washington, BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, LARSEN of Washington, COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. GABBARD.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 11 of rule X: Messrs. NUNES, STEWART, and SCHIFF.

From the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of section 1262 of the House bill, and section 4 of the Senate amendment, and modifications com-

mitted to conference: Messrs. JOHNSON of Ohio, BERGMAN, and YARMUTH.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 221, 551, 555, and 3509 of the House bill, and sections 236, 551–53, 3116, 5508, and 6001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. FOXX, Messrs. BYRNE, and SCOTT of Virginia.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 313, 314, 601, 723, 727, 729, 732, 3118, and 3122 of the House bill, and sections 601, 701, 725, 732, 1089A, 1625, and 3114 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALDEN, BARTON, and PALLONE.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 862 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BARR, WILLIAMS, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 864, 1032, 1039, 1040, 1058, 1201, 1203–05, 1211, 1222, 1223, 1231, 1232, 1234, 1243, 1246, 1247, 1265, 1270A, 1272, 1276, 1278, 1280, 1301, 1302, 1521, 1522, 1687, 2841, and 3117 of the House bill, and sections 111, 861, 867, 1011, 1203–05, 1212, 1213, 1231–33, 1241–45, 1250, 1261–63, 1270B, 1270C, 1282, 1283, 1301, 1302, 1531, and 1651 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, DONOVAN, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 515, 1062, 1063, 1067, 1080, 1695, 2843, and 3510 of the House bill, and sections 520A, 529, 1035, 1081, 1083, 1217, 1264, and 14013 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLATTE, ISSA, and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 601, 1062, 1265, 2827, 2828, 2831, 2832, 2844, 2863, subtitle F of title XXVIII, and section 2863 of the House bill, and sections 311, 338, 601, 1263, 1264, 2850, and 12801 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. GRIJALVA.

□ 1545

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 323, 501, 801, 803, 859–860A, 873, 1101–09 of the House bill, and sections 218, 544, 557, 801, 812, 821, 822, 829, 852, 902, 931, 934, 938, 1045, 1093, 1094, 1101, 1102, 1104–06, 1111–13, 2821, 2822, 6005, 6012, 10804, 11023–25, and 11603 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MEADOWS, ROSS, and LYNCH.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 223 of the House bill and sections 897, 898, 1662–64, and 6002 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SMITH of Texas, LUCAS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of sections 801,

860B, 867, 1701–04, 1711–13, 1721–23, 1731–37, and 1741 of the House bill, and sections 854, 862, 897, 898, 899C, 10801, and 10802 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CHABOT, KELLY of Mississippi, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 122, 311, 546, 601, 1082, 1617, 1695, 3501, 3502, 3505, and 3507–10 of the House bill, and sections 331, 601, 1048, 6002, 13501, 13502, 13508, 13513, 13607, and 14013 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri, HUNTER, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of sections 572, 573, 576, 578, 1077, and 2841 of the House bill, and sections 731, 1084, 1088, 1264, 11001, 11008, and 14004 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, BILIRAKIS, and WALZ.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of section 701 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. TBERI, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. NEAL.

There was no objection.

#### STRENGTHENING STATE AND LOCAL CYBER CRIME FIGHTING ACT OF 2017

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1616) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017".

##### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 381 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### "SEC. 822. NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized for fiscal years 2017 through 2022 within the United States Secret Service a National Computer Forensics Institute (in this section referred to as the 'Institute'). The Institute shall disseminate information related to the investigation and prevention of cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and educate, train, and equip State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges.

"(b) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the Institute shall include the following:

"(1) Educating State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on current—



“(A) cyber and electronic crimes and related threats;

“(B) methods for investigating cyber and electronic crime and related threats and conducting computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) prosecutorial and judicial challenges related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(2) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers to—

“(A) conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations;

“(B) conduct computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) respond to network intrusion incidents.

“(3) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on methods to obtain, process, store, and admit digital evidence in court.

“(c) PRINCIPLES.—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Institute shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that timely, actionable, and relevant expertise and information related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats is shared with State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers and prosecutors.

“(d) EQUIPMENT.—The Institute may provide State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers with computer equipment, hardware, software, manuals, and tools necessary to conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(e) ELECTRONIC CRIME TASK FORCES.—The Institute shall facilitate the expansion of the network of Electronic Crime Task Forces of the United States Secret Service through the addition of State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers educated and trained at the Institute.

“(f) SAVINGS PROVISION.—All authorized activities and functions carried out by the Institute at any location as of the day before the date of the enactment of this section are authorized to continue to be carried out at any such location on and after such date.”

(b) FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, amounts appropriated for United States Secret Service, Operations and Support, may be used to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 821 the following new item:

“Sec. 822. National Computer Forensics Institute.”

**SEC. 3. PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF ECONOMIC, HIGH TECHNOLOGY, INTERNET, AND OTHER WHITE COLLAR CRIME.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“PART MM—PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF WHITE COLLAR CRIME**

**“SEC. 3030. SHORT TITLE.**

“This part may be cited as the ‘National White Collar Crime Control Act of 2017’.

**“SEC. 3031. ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM.**

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance is authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement with or make a grant to an eligible entity for the purpose of improving the identification, investigation, and prosecution of white collar crime (including each category of such

crimes set forth in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b)) by providing comprehensive, direct, and practical training and technical assistance to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government.

“(b) WHITE COLLAR CRIME DEFINED.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘white collar crime’ includes—

“(1) high-tech crime, including cyber and electronic crime and related threats;

“(2) economic crime, including financial fraud and mortgage fraud; and

“(3) Internet-based crime against children and child pornography.

**“SEC. 3032. PURPOSES.**

“The purposes of this part include the following:

“(1) To ensure that training is available for State, local, tribal and territorial law enforcement agencies and officers nationwide to support local efforts to identify, prevent, investigate, and prosecute cyber and financial crimes, including those crimes facilitated via computer networks and other electronic means, and crimes involving financial and economic impacts such as intellectual property crimes.

“(2) To deliver training to State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, and other criminal justice professionals concerning the use of proven methodologies to prevent, detect, and respond to such crimes, recognize emerging issues, manage electronic and financial crime evidence and to improve local criminal justice agency responses to such threats.

“(3) To provide operational and technical assistance and training concerning tools, products, resources, guidelines, and procedures to aid and enhance criminal intelligence analysis, conduct cyber crime and financial crime investigations, and related justice information sharing at the local and State levels.

“(4) To provide appropriate training on protections for privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties in the conduct of criminal intelligence analysis and cyber and electronic crime and financial crime investigations, including in the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures by State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement agencies to protect and enhance privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties protections and identify weaknesses and gaps in the protection of privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

**“SEC. 3033. AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.**

“A grant or cooperative agreement awarded under this part may be made only for the following programs, with respect to the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of certain criminal activities:

“(1) Programs to provide a nationwide support system for State and local criminal justice agencies.

“(2) Programs to assist State and local criminal justice agencies to develop, establish, and maintain intelligence-focused policing strategies and related information sharing.

“(3) Programs to provide training and investigative support services to State and local criminal justice agencies to provide such agencies with skills and resources needed to investigate and prosecute such criminal activities and related criminal activities.

“(4) Programs to provide research support, to establish partnerships, and to provide other resources to aid State and local criminal justice agencies to prevent, investigate, and prosecute such criminal activities and related problems.

“(5) Programs to provide information and research to the general public to facilitate the prevention of such criminal activities.

“(6) Programs to establish or support national training and research centers regionally to provide training and research services for State and local criminal justice agencies.

“(7) Programs to provide training and oversight to State and local criminal justice agencies to develop and comply with applicable privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties related policies, procedures, rules, laws, and guidelines.

“(8) Any other programs specified by the Attorney General as furthering the purposes of this part.

**“SEC. 3034. APPLICATION.**

“To be eligible for an award of a grant or cooperative agreement under this part, an entity shall submit to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance an application in such form and manner, and containing such information, as required by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

**“SEC. 3035. ELIGIBILITY.**

“States, units of local government, not-for-profit entities, and institutions of higher-education with demonstrated capacity and experience in delivering training, technical assistance and other resources including direct, practical laboratory training to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government and over the Internet shall be eligible to receive an award under this part.

**“SEC. 3036. RULES AND REGULATIONS.**

“The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this part, including rules and regulations for submitting and reviewing applications under section 3035.”

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out—

(1) part MM of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) section 401(b) of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (34 U.S.C. 30103(b)).

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

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2266**

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 85

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2266, the Clerk of the House of*

Representatives shall make the following correction: Amend the long title so as to read: "Making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2017, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### HONORING BRIAN McQUEEN

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brian McQueen, a constituent and a dear friend from the 22nd District who has dedicated his life to public service.

For 34 years, Brian worked in the Whitesboro Central School District—as a teacher for 19 years and as a principal thereafter. Brian also took his compassion for our community to the Whitesboro Volunteer Fire Department, where he served as fire chief from 1999 to 2002. He currently serves as a lieutenant and safety officer, in addition to serving on the board of directors of the Firemen's Association of the State of New York.

In 2013, Brian was diagnosed with B-cell non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Brian joined members of the Barneveld Fire Department to found the Believe 271, a foundation to assist volunteer firefighters and EMTs who are battling cancer and life-threatening diseases. Since that day, Believe 271 has provided financial and emotional support to firefighters and their families throughout Oneida and Herkimer Counties.

With increased exposure to smoke and toxins, firefighters are at a much higher risk of contracting cancer. Brian's tireless advocacy is a testament to his dedication and his compassion for all volunteer firefighters who risk their lives to keep our communities safe, and it is an honor to recognize my friend and a great community partner, Brian McQueen, today.

#### REAUTHORIZING CHIP FUNDING

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey, nearly 231,000 children rely on

the Children's Health Insurance Program. CHIP gets them to the doctor. CHIP gets them to the hospital. CHIP saves their lives.

But last month, Republican Members of Congress made a choice to put on another repeal-and-replace dog and pony show and let CHIP expire.

Mr. Speaker, what do my Republican colleagues have against needy children? Who thought it would be a good idea to put 9 million children's health at risk for political gains? So much for compassionate conservatism.

Mr. Speaker, CHIP is vital to the Nation's future. Along with Medicaid, CHIP has cut the rate of low-income, uninsured children nationally by half—from 14 percent to 7 percent. But if Congress doesn't immediately reauthorize long-term CHIP funding, children will not get to see their doctors. They won't have access to hospitals, and some may die.

#### TAX REFORM

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of our framework for tax reform to put American workers and businesses first.

I come from Michigan, and the last time our tax system was updated, Steve Yzerman was the captain of the Detroit Red Wings. Hockeytown is rebuilding, and it is about time our Tax Code was rebuilt. We have the opportunity to reform and reduce taxes for American workers and the small businesses that create jobs for those workers.

America's nearly 30 million small businesses are the engine of our economy, employing nearly 60 million workers, half of the United States workforce. But our current Tax Code is a monstrosity. When combined with State and local taxes, small businesses pay up to 50 percent of their income to the government.

Polling indicates that small- and mid-size businesses would use their tax savings to invest in their businesses: opening new locations, upgrading equipment, and increasing hiring and wages.

Tax reform is about rewarding work and prosperity for all Americans. Let's get on with that work.

#### DACA

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, Delila is a graduate student at the University of California, Riverside, who exemplifies the American spirit. As a young woman, she worked two and three jobs to support her family and help her father, who was their sole provider.

Three years ago, when her father suffered a stroke, Delila stepped up and kept the family afloat while he recovered. She went on to take a full-time position as a sexual assault advocate in our community. Delila says that job allowed her to help those who live in fear and live without hope.

This year, she will graduate with a master's degree, and there is no question that she is destined to accomplish great things. The only question is where she will accomplish them.

Delila is a DREAMer, and her future in this country depends on whether we pass the Dream Act. Once again, I am asking my colleagues to do the right thing. Pass the Dream Act so people like Delila can continue to make our communities proud.

#### THE HOLY CITY OF JERUSALEM

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

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support our friend and ally, Israel, and to stand for the obvious proposition that the people of Israel and the Jewish people have an ancient connection to the city of Jerusalem.

This connection has been forged through millennia of shared faith and shared history, yet the U.N. is actually trying to rewrite history:

They condemn Israel and call it an occupying power in Jerusalem;

They prevent Israeli scientists from excavating, even though past findings have been significant to Christians, Muslims, and Jews alike;

They have been silent when Israel's culture has been attacked, including the desecration and burning of holy sites.

Each year brings new horrors from the U.N. Their cruelty and attempts to erase history and their anti-Semitism cannot be tolerated any longer.

Today I am introducing a resolution reaffirming the connection of the Jewish people to the city of Jerusalem and condemning UNESCO's attempts to punish and delegitimize Israel.

I encourage my colleagues to show solidarity with Israel, to support the President's removal of the United States from UNESCO, and to support this resolution I have proposed.

#### CLEAN POWER PLAN

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Clean Power Plan. This rule was intended to combat and mitigate the effects of climate change and create first-ever limits to carbon pollution from U.S. power plants.

As we deal with the devastation created by some of the strongest hurricanes in recorded history and the wildfires that are raging through Western States, we can't stand idly by while

this administration eliminates the Clean Power Plan, condemning future generations to scarce resources, harsher climates, and economic uncertainty.

Extreme weather has cost the U.S. economy at least \$240 billion over the past 10 years. Climate change increases the frequency and severity of extreme weather. Shouldn't we focus on hardening and securing our infrastructure and making it more resilient to climate change?

The Clean Power Plan would also reduce plant pollutants that cause asthma attacks and respiratory illnesses, and it is projected to prevent thousands of premature deaths, tens of thousands of asthma attacks, and provide at least \$20 billion in total health benefits.

The denial of science by this administration is alarming and dangerous. I urge my colleagues to stand up for clean energy and our environment and take positive action to address climate change.

□ 1600

#### HURRICANE RELIEF BAILOUT

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, buried in today's disaster supplemental spending bill is a \$16 billion taxpayer bailout of the National Flood Insurance Program. That is nearly half the cost of this bill. This bailout does not come with a single reform that would put the program on the path to sustainability.

This taxpayer bailout maintains a program that has resulted in taxpayer-subsidized development and reconstruction of homes that repeatedly flood.

Madam Speaker, why are we not reforming this program that puts residents and first responders in harm's way? How much more debt are we willing to let this program pile onto the next generation?

Americans in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands need help, and I would have liked to vote for the relief portion of today's legislation, but the multibillion-dollar taxpayer bailout of an unreformed program made the bill unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider the path we are on. We could have had a bill that not only provided relief to hurricane victims, but would have provided relief for taxpayers and the next generation as well, but we did not.

We will get another chance for fiscal sanity in December, when we reconsider the additional disaster funding and funding for the rest of 2018. Let's hope we make better progress at that time.

#### TAX REFORM

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I came to Washington to cut taxes for the residents of north Jersey. Our taxes are simply too high.

This morning, at The Heritage Foundation, the Speaker claimed that the rest of the country is propping up New Jersey. That is backwards. Currently, New Jersey pays in so that States like Wisconsin can cash out.

New Jersey is already a grand subsidizer of other States. We are one of the top 3 percent taxpaying districts in the entire country and at the bottom in what we get back. We need to change that.

New Jersey only gets back 33 cents for every dollar we send to Washington. New Jersey residents get \$3,076 less, as this shows, than what they pay in. West Virginia, for example, gets \$4.23 back for every dollar it sends in.

New Jersey is not America's piggybank.

Our one saving grace has been the State and local property tax deduction: the ability to deduct those higher State, local, and property taxes before we have to send in our tax checks every April. It allows us to avoid double taxation. Eliminating these State and local tax deductions will cost New Jersey an average of a \$3,500 tax increase per resident. Property values will go down more than 10 percent.

So I am fighting to remove this tax hike provision from the tax reform bill that can hurt our businesses and our citizens.

#### PROUD OF VIRGINIA'S ASSISTANCE TO DISASTERS

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, Congress approved the second tranche of emergency funding for those affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria, and the wildfires in the Western United States.

I would like to take a second and shine a light on Virginians who have stepped forward to help our fellow Americans impacted by these natural disasters.

Just the other day, I pulled up to a restaurant in Virginia Beach, where there was a steady line of vehicles coming in the parking lot to drop off goods and essential items. Hundreds came together to give money and items for the people of Puerto Rico.

From Hampton Roads to Richmond, to Roanoke, Virginia rose to the occasion. We had soldiers and sailors and coastguardsmen and civilians deploy forward to help in Florida, Texas, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. We had National Guardsmen, Spanish speakers, FEMA workers, EMS units, helicopters, drones, boats, and medical supplies, and much more.

We should all be very proud of Virginia's vast efforts, their leadership, and their compassion. Virginia has never been afraid to lead.

#### REOPENING OF PFEIFFER CANYON BRIDGE

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

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to recognize the reopening of the Pfeiffer Canyon Bridge in Big Sur, California.

After 4 years of drought, my district on the central coast of California finally got the rain it needed, but a little too much. As a result, this year there were many large-scale landslides, including this one, as we see here to my right, which knocked out the pilings of the Pfeiffer Canyon Bridge, causing this bridge to fail.

This left a community of people isolated and numerous businesses without revenue for at least 8 months. But over that same amount of time, the people of Big Sur, the people and government of Monterey County, the engineers and construction crews, and the California Department of Transportation demonstrated a lot of grit, guts, determination, and dedication. They listened to each other and came together to fix this bridge.

Tomorrow I will be able to attend the opening of this bridge. We will be able to show our pride for the record pace of construction, of government working together to get things done, the businesses that struggled but remained open in Big Sur during this time, and, most importantly, we will show our pride in the people of Big Sur and the communities on the central coast of California.

#### UNIFIED SPAIN

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

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Spain Caucus to discuss why a unified Spain is both legally, culturally, and economically justified, and how it best serves United States foreign policy interests.

First, the illegal Catalan independence referendum was held in violation of the Spanish constitution and in defiance of the federal government. Catalunya, as an autonomous region within Spain, enjoys many rights and privileges under the Spanish constitution, but self-determination is clearly not one of them.

The historical and cultural ties between Spain and Catalunya are strong. Spain and Catalunya have a shared history, being united since the reign of Ferdinand and Isabel over 500 years ago, and later, under the governance of the Kingdom of Aragon, similar to how

it is a part of the Kingdom of Spain today.

Because of this history, Catalunya has a pluralistic society, with a mix of Spaniards and Catalans, and where both cultures' languages are regularly spoken.

Lastly, the deep economic ties Catalunya shares with Spain are evidence that Spain should be united. Catalunya relies heavily on Madrid for its financial sector, infrastructure, and its social security deficit.

A united Spain is a friend of the United States. A strong, united Spain has been a reliable ally in fighting the spread of Islamic extremism. Our relationship with Spain is invaluable to our foreign policy interests, and we need to speak out on behalf of a unified Spain.

#### HONORING 50TH COMPANY, INFANTRY OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL CLASS OC 24-69

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

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a special group worthy of our recognition for the sacrifices they have made for our country.

This month, the surviving members of the 50th Company, Infantry Officer Candidate School's Class OC 24-69 will have their first reunion at Fort Benning, 48 years after pinning on the gold bars of second lieutenants.

The men in the 50th Company came from 42 different States, representing all walks of life and backgrounds. They accepted the risks and volunteered to become Army officers at the height of the Vietnam war.

After graduation, over half received orders to Vietnam. Two classmates made the ultimate sacrifice: James Du Pont and Thomas Edgren. Many others earned the Purple Heart.

At the reunion in Fort Benning, these men will renew the bonds forged 48 years ago. Please join me in pausing to reflect on their sacrifices and extending them our thanks.

#### CONGRATULATING ELIZABETH DENT

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the tremendous work of Elizabeth Dent, who has been an invaluable part of the staff of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture for the past 3 years. Elizabeth came to work with the subcommittee I chair after working several years with a former appropriator, Congressman Jack Kingston.

Elizabeth has been a valuable member of the subcommittee team. She is diligent, dedicated, and keen to details, something that is very important to the appropriations work.

She is always eager to volunteer and lend a hand to accomplish whatever

tasks may be needed in assisting in the agricultural community. She has become an integral part of the team, and she will be greatly missed on our subcommittee.

Elizabeth will be leaving the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture to work for the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Committee. I thank her for her outstanding work. The Senate Appropriations Committee is very fortunate to have her work on the staff. We wish her all the very best, and we look forward to working with her in her new capacity.

#### ACA BIRTH CONTROL MANDATE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in defense of every woman's access to healthcare and right to make her own personal healthcare decisions in private consultation with her physician and her family.

Last week, President Trump issued a shameful executive order that will allow employers to deny women insurance coverage for contraception. This rolls back progress under the Affordable Care Act that required insurance companies to cover birth control without a copay.

This is outrageous. Employers have no role dictating what healthcare women can and cannot have. That is a decision between a woman and her doctor.

Nearly 9 in 10 women will use birth control at some point in their lives. This order is a direct attack on their healthcare.

President Trump tried to sneak this change through, announcing it on a Friday afternoon before a long weekend. Well, we noticed and so did millions of other women that this order will adversely impact.

We are paying attention and we are not about to stop speaking out and working to protect women's access to healthcare.

#### FALLEN TTU OFFICER FLOYD EAST, JR.

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen hero, Officer Floyd East, Jr. Officer East was a police officer for the Texas Tech University Police Department. On Monday, October 9, Officer East completed his final patrol to protect and serve.

Officer East has been described by friends as someone you could rely on and someone who was always there to help or just listen. No doubt, he represented the very best of the values of Texas Tech.

His loss reminds us that policemen and -women put their lives at risk

every day. He left behind a loving wife, Carmen, who generously allowed him to dedicate his life to keeping us safe.

To his children, Ana and Monica: Our prayers are with you. Scripture tells us that "there's no greater love than for a man to lay down his life for his friends." That was God's greatest gift to this world and that was your dad's greatest gift. Our Red Raider family is behind you, and we will never forget Floyd and how he held the thin blue line. God bless your family.

#### ALDO'S STORY

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Aldo Solano of Woodburn, Oregon.

Aldo was only 6 years old when his family first immigrated to the United States from Colima, Mexico. Economic distress, corruption, and a lack of opportunities pushed his parents to leave everything behind and head to the Willamette Valley. They wanted a different life for Aldo and his siblings, one where they could go to school and pursue their dreams.

Aldo has done just that. At Woodburn High School, he served as vice president of his class. While earning good grades, he participated in sports and volunteer opportunities like 4-H Latino Summer Camp, encouraging young people to enter the STEM field.

After graduating, Aldo became a DACA recipient. Through DACA, he has been able to work for the Latino Health Coalition, where he worked to pass Cover All Kids, a State law to ensure access to healthcare for every child in Oregon. This winter, he will begin working towards a public health degree at Portland State University.

Without DACA, none of this would have been possible for Aldo. Young people across the country are relying on us. We need to pass a clean Dream Act that will recognize Aldo and over 800,000 DREAMers as equal members of our community.

#### AMERICAN PHARMACISTS MONTH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of October 2017 as American Pharmacists Month.

During this month, I would like to recognize all pharmacists across America to ensure that Americans have access to important and often lifesaving medications.

As the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I am proud to recognize the work that pharmacists are doing to promote a healthy America. Every day, pharmacists provide vaccines for a number of illnesses and

carefully counsel patients on prescriptions and over-the-counter medications to help heal sickness and reduce pain. Pharmacists are also considered one of the top two most trusted professions in America.

During October, as well as throughout the year, I encourage everyone to visit your pharmacist, ask questions about your prescriptions, receive advice about preventative care, and get to know the person who provides your medicine and works to keep you healthy.

Thank you, fellow pharmacists, for all that you do. Please know that your work is appreciated and you are an important part of keeping our Nation healthy.

#### GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we are now a few days after the most violent and largest massacre in modern American history in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Many that you encounter has a story, amazingly, about who was there during that week. They obviously were not at that site, but they may have been in Las Vegas for work or otherwise. It will be on the minds of Americans for a long time.

Just this past Monday, I stood with Sheriff Acevedo, my chief of police, my sheriff, my constable; mothers who have lost loved ones and children; and a woman who had been abused and her significant other carried around a heavy weapon to scare her, threaten her, and abuse her.

Why we can't have gun safety regulation, I don't know, but I believe after Sandy Hook and after Pulse nightclub, we must pass real gun safety legislation. We must ban assault weapons, ban the bump stocks. We must have universal background checks.

Madam Speaker, it is a shame that we cannot save lives. We need gun safety now, not money in your pockets.

□ 1615

#### OVERCOMING PROBLEMS WITH THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I want to commend President Trump's decision this week with executive orders to do some of the work we have been unable to do so far in the House and the Senate, helping people overcome the problems with the ACA, the Affordable Care Act.

One of the measures he put forth was association health plans to allow employers' employees to form health plans that suit them—indeed, to asso-

ciate with their type of business, their type of industry on a small scale in their neighborhoods. It makes perfect sense, if you want to give people more choices.

Also, short-term, limited-duration health insurance plans, which allow people to have, if they are in between jobs, instead of limiting it to just 3 months, perhaps just a little longer. In the interim, while they are in between jobs, they have choices that they could afford with the elements in the plan they would like.

Finally, health reimbursement arrangements, which make it where employees—if they want to provide benefits to their—employers to their employees, that they can reimburse for more issues in their plan, such as helping them pay for their premiums, if that is how the employee wishes to have that.

Flexibility is what we need; choices are what we need; and then Congress needs to be able to accomplish something in the Senate so we can bring it back and give this to the American people.

#### RESPONSE TO THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, before my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus and I begin our discussion about the response to the Republican tax plan, I wish to take a moment to express our sympathy for the people of northern California who are facing devastating and destructive wildfires.

I represent a Silicon Valley district where hundreds of our neighbors to our north and south remain missing. Tens of thousands are suffering at this very moment from the destruction of more than 150,000 acres and counting, as well as an increasing number of family homes and businesses. It seems that our Nation has been struck by one national tragedy after another. Our prayers are with the California residents, and I know that everyone in this body is committed to their relief.

I also, on a personal note, want to recognize Liz Bartolomeo, who has been my communications director and worked very hard with the Congressional Progressive Caucus. She is going on to work for Democracy Alliance. I

wish her very well in her next steps, and I thank her for her service to our office and to the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The purpose of this hour is to discuss the Republican economic plan, and I have distinguished colleagues of mine who will be joining us. I just want to, at the outset, articulate the basic difference in philosophy.

The President and the Republicans believe that to grow our economy, to create jobs, the way to achieve that is by giving tax cuts to corporations, giving tax cuts to the investors in stock, giving tax cuts to the executives who already get large compensation packages; and that if we do that, if we cut corporate tax rates at a time where corporations are making record profits, if we give more tax breaks to those who are investing in our stock market, if we give more tax breaks to those who get dividend checks, then somehow, magically, people making 30 grand or 40 grand will see their wages go up, that somehow we are going to get many more jobs in places across this country.

And the question is why would we believe that? Why would we think the trickle-down economics, which has failed time and again, is going to help? Does someone really believe, in my district, who is a construction worker or a nurse or a teacher, that lowering the corporate tax rate is going to do anything to put more money in their pocket, that it is going to do anything for a nurse who is struggling to get an apartment and pay rent to be able to afford that rent, or that it is going to do anything for people in Youngstown, Ohio, to be able to send their kids to school or get vocational training or get a college education?

The difference is very simple. Our belief is, if you want to raise wages—if you want to give more pay to average Americans, just go raise wages. Provide the tax credit to those making under \$75,000. For one-third of the cost of the Republican tax plan, which is geared towards corporations and the investor class, we could give every single American, who is making under \$75,000, a 20 percent pay raise. I believe that is bottom-up economics, and that is actually what is going to grow the economy.

It is not a matter of just the economics. It is a matter of common sense. Think about it. Who do you think is going to create more jobs in the United States? Someone worth 5 million bucks who gets tax money back and is going to invest in stocks? Or is that money going to create jobs in the United States? Or could that money be spent anywhere in the world, sheltered anywhere in the world? As opposed to if you give that money to someone making \$50,000, \$60,000, they are going to spend that money in their local community; they are going to buy more groceries; they are going to buy more things for their house; they are going to get more education; that money is

going to go into the local economy, and it is going to actually create jobs. That is what is going to grow the economy. That is our only shot of getting 3 percent economic growth if we invest in actual workers, the people doing the work.

By the way, they haven't gotten a raise for the past 40 years. Since 1979, wages in this country have stagnated, and we heard the same thing: just cut the taxes on the top and the wages will go up. But the wages haven't gone up.

Guess who promised to help, finally, those forgotten Americans? Guess who promised to help them? President Donald Trump. That was his whole campaign: The stock market is doing great, but you are being left behind. The coasts are doing great, but you have been left behind. And I am going to come to the White House and I am not going to give the keys to the Wall Street bankers. I am going to actually worry about raising wages.

His biggest disappointment as President is that he went back on the promise that he made to ordinary Americans, and we know that he can do it if he wants to. All he has to do is tell his Wall Street advisers: No, no more tax breaks for Wall Street. I want the tax credits going to Main Street, and I can do that at a third of the cost of the plan that you are selling to me and the American people.

This is the debate in this country, supply-side economics that believes the greatness of America is with the investor class and the CEO class and the elite class, or bottom-up economics that our party and the Progressive Caucus is putting forward that believes the greatness in America is with the people who actually do the work, who work 40, 50 hours, who go on the assembly lines and work in factories, who work overnight as nurses taking care of folks, who are doing the education as teachers.

Who do we believe is really contributing to the economy? Who do we believe is really driving America's economic growth? The Democrats believe it is ordinary workers across this country, that that is the greatness that drives the American economy, and the Republican tax plan believes it is the investor class.

It is a very clear difference, and our commitment is not just one towards fairness but also one about investing in people who are going to create jobs and create innovation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my distinguished colleague, who is not just a constitutional law professor and a leading thinker on issues of jurisprudence but has also been a leader with the Congressional Progressive Caucus in helping us craft an economic policy that is really for ordinary Americans and not for just the very wealthy.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA for his leadership in putting this together.

Madam Speaker, I want to invoke a great Republican member of this body

who went on to become President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, who spoke of "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

The tax plan that has been presented to us by the GOP in the 21st century is government of the 1 percent, by the 1 percent, and for the 1 percent. It was written by a billionaire Cabinet of a billionaire President for the richest 1 percent of taxpayers in the country.

The same policy experts whose healthcare plan was to throw 30 million Americans off their health insurance and reduce women's access to complete reproductive services now have a tax plan to sell America. But read the fine print first. In fact, you don't even need to read the fine print. You just have to look at the headlines.

Under this plan, 80 percent of the total tax cut will end up going to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans who earn more than \$900,000 a year. Let me repeat that: 80 percent of the money that will be saved in this tax cut will go to Americans earning \$900,000 a year. That is astounding.

In the meantime, tens of millions of middle class families making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year will pay higher taxes than they were paying before. And check this out. The very wealthiest sliver of Americans, those who make at least \$5 million a year, and, on average, \$16 million a year, would get an average tax cut of over \$1 million. That is a \$1 million tax cut for millionaires.

The slogan for this plan should be: The Trump tax cut, because the rich just aren't rich enough and everybody else is doing just fine.

Madam Speaker, if you know anyone who makes \$16 million a year, please ask them to write me and tell me what they are going to do with their extra \$1 million. Maybe they will send it to a Swiss bank account or to the Bahamas; maybe they will run for Congress; maybe they will invest it in Australia where a lot of the super-rich are apparently now buying property in order to have a getaway plan from the escalating crises of climate change in North America.

□ 1630

So the billionaires make out like bandits.

What about the rest of us? How much will this plan cost us?

Well, the bipartisan Committee for Responsible Federal Budget's initial analysis shows that the GOP plan would add \$2.2 trillion to deficits over the next decade. This is the result of cutting taxes for the wealthy by a staggering \$5.8 trillion and then adding new tax revenue of only \$3.6 trillion, so we are going to be adding \$2.2 trillion in deficits.

What about the deficit hawks?

They are an endangered species, as Congresswoman PELOSI says now. Actually, they have mutated into a completely new species. We don't have deficit hawks anymore. We have deficit

ostriches. They are willing to squawk and strut and kick dust like hawks when there is a Democrat in the White House, but when a budget-busting, deficit-ballooning, debt-deepening Republican occupies the White House and proposes inflating the deficit and the debt to unprecedented levels with the most breathtaking fiscal recklessness anyone has ever seen, they become deficit chicken hawks and transmogrify into deficit doves, and then finally turn into fast scurrying deficit ostriches and run away from everything they have been saying for years about the necessity to reduce the deficit, they simply bury their heads deep in the sand and let the debt and the deficits climb up all around them.

Speaker PAUL RYAN, when he was campaigning with Mitt Romney, said the national debt is threatening jobs today, it is threatening our prosperity today. Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, while calling for changes to Social Security and Medicare in 2013, told supporters only one thing can save this country, and that is to get a handle on the deficit and debt issue. Well, that was then, this is now, as they say. Now the GOP leaders are twisting arms to vote for a tax plan that will blow up the deficit and drive our children and our grandchildren's generations deeply into debt.

What happened to all of the fine speeches we heard about how we owe it to our kids not to engage in deficit spending? What happened to all the magnificent oratory about how the national debt is a moral crisis?

Can any of the Members of Congress, who built their careers on the principle of deficit reduction and ending the debt, explain why it is responsible today to add more than \$2 trillion to our national deficit?

We await an answer, Madam Speaker.

Why are they doing this to America? Why are they proposing it? Who wins with this assault on the common good?

Well, let's see. Donald Trump and his family certainly do. The only President who ever bragged that he would be able to make money by running for President is showing what a good job he is actually doing at achieving his objective.

A New York Times analysis shows that Trump and his family could save more than \$1 billion under this plan. That is right, the President and his family could save more than \$1 billion under the tax proposal that has been sent to us in Congress. Of course, it is impossible to know precisely how much would be saved because President Trump, despite his campaign promise to release his tax returns, if elected, still refuses to release his tax returns, which constitutes not only a radical breach of faith with the people, but a radical break from past practices of other Presidents for the last half century, who have opened up their tax records for the rest of us to see.

But let's see what we can do based on information we know. This proposal



would eliminate the estate tax, which would generate massive tax savings for President Trump and his family. If his assets, reportedly valued at \$2.86 billion, were transferred after his death under today's rules, his estate would be taxed at around the 40 percent level, still leaving his heirs with more than \$1 billion.

Repealing the Federal estate tax, which they propose to do, would save his family \$1.1 billion, at least, in estate tax costs.

Why would we do this?

The Founders of our country were passionately opposed to hereditary wealth, just like they were passionately opposed to hereditary government. They thought it was dangerous to have the intergenerational transmission of wealth and great fortunes like that. They said that it would cause idleness and irresponsibility in the heirs to great wealth, and they would be able to convert their wealth not just into bigger estates, bigger land purchases, bigger houses, but actually in the public offices. They had a very profound democratic critique of that kind of intergenerational wealth inequality, because, at a certain point, you have bought enough houses, you have bought enough jets, and now you want a governorship, you want the Presidency, you want a Senate seat. In a democracy, we need to have much reduced levels of inequality that are being proposed under this idea of abolishing the estate tax.

They also are proposing to abolish the alternative minimum tax, which is the only reason that President Trump paid any taxes in the one year over the last two decades that we know he paid taxes in, in 2005. Remember, somebody mysteriously leaked information about that year to the Rachel Maddow show, and it turned out that the President paid taxes because of the alternative minimum tax which says that you can't push a good joke too far, you can only use all of your deductions and allowances, and so on, up to a certain point. If you are at a certain place, in terms of your wealth, you have got to pay something.

Well, The New York Times now estimates that the GOP tax plan to repeal the alternative minimum tax would save the President at least \$31.3 million. He would not have had to pay in that one year that we know where he paid taxes, and we don't know about the rest because he has refused to release it.

And let's just look at one more provision, which would change the treatment of pass-through business income. According to The New York Times, President Trump could save as much as \$6.2 million on business income and \$9.8 million on income from real estate and other kinds of partnerships under changes to the taxation of pass-through income.

Now, look, Madam Speaker, nobody likes paying taxes, nobody loves it, especially when we know that there are

billions of dollars being wasted, for example, at the Department of Defense in boondoggles, fraud, and abuse taking place, according to a hearing that we had just this session in the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. So people don't love the experience.

But just as Oliver Wendell Holmes said, that he didn't mind paying his taxes because he understood that they were the price of civilization. It is what we all put in, in order to have roads and highways and airports and schools and universities. That is what it means to be a citizen. People don't mind, as long as there is a basic sense in the public that everybody is participating and we are not getting ripped off.

And I am terrified that if they succeed in barreling this plan through Congress, that it is going to spread more cynicism and more disenchantment and more negativity about the tax system and about the government, and we can't afford it. Because of the escalating crises of climate change, which are all around us, our people are suffering. We have millions of people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands tonight who have no access to power, no access to electricity or clean water. We have people in Florida and Texas and Mississippi and Louisiana who are still recovering from the last hurricanes. We have Californians, many of whom have died already, who are struggling against the forest fires out of control.

Now is a point when we need a tax system that brings our people together, that says that wealthier people can pay more because they are wealthy, but everybody is going to pay their share, and we are all going to participate together. That is the tax system we should be looking for, a tax system where we get rid of all of the special interest inflected deductions and allowances and loopholes and rip-offs that are built into the system, where it is simplified.

In the European countries, you can pay your taxes in about 10 or 15 minutes, and you don't have to go to the multibillion-dollar tax preparation industry, or go find a law firm to do it. We can simplify our taxes if we decide to get rid of all of the special interest loopholes. And wealthy people can pay more because they get more out of being part of this society, and they use more of the infrastructure of the country, instead of paying less than everybody else, instead of trying to rip off the system by paying nothing.

Madam Speaker, now is the time when we need the wisest and most principled leadership to get us through the accumulating crises of the time. This tax plan is totally irresponsible. I hope that it will be withdrawn and we can work together across the aisle on a bipartisan plan that will represent the best values of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative RASKIN for his thoughtful points and comments on the President's tax policy.

I have a few other points before we conclude. The President has said that we can't afford foreign aid given our deficits, but the President thinks that the average American doesn't know math. Mr. President, the average American can do math.

The deficit is \$20 trillion. Our foreign aid every year is no more than \$30 billion to \$40 billion. Your proposal would increase the deficit between \$200 billion to \$500 billion. So this red herring that somehow foreign aid is responsible for the deficit is just false.

What is responsible for the deficit is the massive tax cuts that you are proposing that would add, according to conservative economists, between \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion more to our deficit, and it is all to finance the corporate interests, all to finance the investor class.

We have, on the Democratic side, on the progressive side, proposed an alternative, and that alternative is based on the view that we need to encourage job creation and raise wages for mainstream America, that we need to invest in the people actually doing the work. It is based on the thinking of people who used to be Republicans and people like Jack Kemp, who said: Let us invest in areas that don't have jobs and economic growth and have heavy investment for training on the technologies of the future. That used to be the thinking on the other side of the aisle. We used to have differences, but there used to be creativity and a sense of what is actually going to invest in people to grow the economy.

And now, under this President, it is just a mantra of tax cuts for the very wealthy, tax cuts for the people who need it least, tax cuts for corporations, no sense of actually investing in new industries, investing in the training and skills of the 21st century, investing in bringing capital to places that need them. I hope and believe that as people in good faith will look at the two contrasting proposals, one that says tax cuts for corporations, the other that says let's invest in American workers, let's invest in American communities, that they will conclude that the way to actually raise wages, the way to actually create jobs, the way to actually grow our economy is by bottom-up economics by investing in the American workers and in those Americans who are part of the middle class.

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

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

□ 1645

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it has been an interesting number of days here this week. We continue to have hearings and fight for good legislation, and we continue to hear from people back home that we simply must at least work on our promises to repeal ObamaCare and bring their health insurance into a realm that is affordable.

They realize they were lied to. They will never get the insurance they liked back. They would like to try to get their doctors back.

One of the interesting things about the design of the devious architect of ObamaCare is the guy who bragged later: Yeah, we knew you couldn't keep your insurance, you couldn't keep your doctor, but we had to say that to sell it.

They actually incentivized the handful of remaining insurance companies not to put the best cancer healthcare providers in their network. ObamaCare actually incentivizes insurance companies not putting the best heart healthcare providers or, in fact, any chronic, expensive disease that the insurance companies, because of the design of ObamaCare—and I think it was intentional—basically were penalized if they put the very best cancer treaters, heart treaters in their network. So there actually are indications that insurance companies, they could see what the administration was encouraging them to do.

For example, I had read that MD Anderson was not in those networks as a cancer provider. Some would argue it is the best cancer treatment facility. That certainly can be debated. I think it still comes down to the effort to get to the point where government is completely in charge of every American's healthcare.

ObamaCare was a good start, but obviously if you design a system so that the insurance companies, they just get down to a handful of monopolies and they are having record years, and that same bill even allows those insurance companies to get what are called bailouts after they have had record profits, well, most people are going to end up hating the insurance companies. And we have seen that.

What would happen, of course, is eventually people get so outraged with premiums going up, whether it is 10 percent or 70 percent—I have heard of it being doubled, being tripled since the last 7 years. I have heard all kinds of horror stories from people in east Texas. Around other places I have visited, it is the same thing happening. They can't afford their policy, yet they can't afford to pay an extra tax for not having a policy that the government says they have to have; and yet if they pay for their policy, the deductible is so high, they are still not going to get any benefit out of it.

So it is easy to see, when you start looking at the way in which

ObamaCare was created, the rules in place for it, the day would come when people got so outraged at how expensive their health insurance was that they would scream: Look, I just can't stand it anymore. I never wanted the government to be in charge of my personal life, but anything's got to be better than the current system. Just let the government take it over.

Then, there you are, government controlling everybody's body, everybody's personal life.

Of course, we have got this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau out there created during the Obama years by the Democrats. We were not helpful in that. We thought, sure, we want to help people who are being taken advantage of by unscrupulous lenders, but we don't need a Bureau to monitor everybody's debit and credit card transactions. There were those who argued: Yeah, but this way, they can monitor and they can tell if somebody's being taken advantage of.

There was a time, as a felony judge in Texas, that, if someone wanted your bank records, under the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution, we are supposed to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizures, and that includes anyone's bank records. So people would come to me as a judge, they would have affidavits, and they hoped that would prove under oath probable cause that a crime had been committed and that this person committed it, and if so, I could sign the warrant that allowed them to go get bank records.

We used to care about the Fourth Amendment. I know my friends across the aisle, our Democratic friends, they cared greatly, because I have heard over and over in Judiciary Committee arguments about the protections against unreasonable searches, and yet they set up a Bureau that violates that, says: Just give us all your information.

Well, sure, if somebody is being taken advantage of by an unscrupulous lender, then the remedy is they go complain to the appropriate government law enforcement or the SEC, whoever it is, and then they come to a judge like I was, get the warrant, get the records, and then make the determination if there is probable cause. We just lost so much of our privacy.

Several years ago, we said, well, since ObamaCare is going to allow the mass gathering of people's medical records and our Democratic friends set up this consumer protection racket here in Washington, we could conceivably have a day—and if we don't do something about ObamaCare and the CFPB, then it is closer than I imagined—when you get your mail, Madam Speaker, and you see: Oh, I have got a letter from the government here. And you open it, and it says: We noticed, when you were at Brookshire's grocery store the other day, that you bought a pound of bacon; and we also noticed, from your healthcare records, that your cholesterol rate is at this certain

level, and so, therefore, since we control your healthcare now and we monitor your debit and credit purchases, here is the deal: you are either going to join a health club and start working out once a week and stop buying bacon, or we are going to have to raise the amount you pay in each month.

I mean, this is where it goes when you have the Orwellian Big Brother that was advanced more through ObamaCare than anything that has ever occurred in U.S. history. It has got to be repealed.

I want to applaud and thank President Trump for taking steps today through executive order. He shouldn't have had to do that. I am very, very grateful he did. God bless him for doing it. But we should have already taken care of that stuff. That is our job.

What do we do here in the House? It was contentious. The first bill was a disaster, but we got it to where it actually was going to bring premiums down for the middle class in America. It was going to make their premiums cheaper. It was going to make their deductibles lower. Then we had people in the Senate who got elected on the promise of repealing ObamaCare that voted "no." We still have to do something.

I loved seeing the President's interview with our good friend, Sean Hannity, last night. I love this about President Trump. I think it is why he got elected. When Sean asked him about, basically, is this over, he gets this smile and says: No. We are not giving up, not giving up.

The truth is we cannot give up. People are counting on us. They don't know what to do.

There are small-business employers like the one in Tyler who told me that a few years ago he was paying \$50,000 for his employees' health insurance. He has the same number of employees, and this year it is \$153,000, and he is going to have to start letting people go or drop their insurance. It just cannot continue. People are already taking losses. It can't continue.

Well, with the proper President in place, and here in Congress we have taken some steps to ameliorate some of the damage to jobs in America, things seem to be turning around some. But we actually have to keep our promise, and I think we do that by putting a lot more heat on the Senate as the House body, House Republicans. We have got to put pressure on the Senate. Like the President said, this fight cannot be over.

Normally, I have been told since my freshman term, you can't do big things in an election year. But I am beginning to wonder, if America makes it clear to the Republicans in the Senate that you either will keep your promise on ObamaCare, you will keep your promise on tax reform or you will not be back in the Senate, then I think we could buck tradition in this place.

The idea was that we were told back in 2006, in January: Okay. Well, we didn't keep any of our promises last

year as the Republican majority, but now, you veterans know we are into an even-numbered year. That means it is an election year, so we can't do any of those big things, because everybody knows you just can't do big things in an election year or you might lose.

Well, it would have been a lot better if we had already done those things, if we had repealed ObamaCare and put a system in place that was affordable, that gave people the healthcare they needed and with actual insurance and encouraged, instead of spending \$700, \$800, \$900, sending it to the insurance company, how about putting \$700, \$800 in your own medical health savings account you control, debit-card coded where it can only be spent on healthcare, whether it is crutches, medicine, doctor visits, hospital stays, whatever, and you could have a high deductible. We could have a day where \$700 goes to your account, \$200 goes for catastrophic coverage. That is the kind of thing that we should have been pushing for and gone to, but, instead, we are pouring that money into health insurance companies.

Just in case, Madam Speaker, there are those who are already wondering, "Maybe we should just let the government take over everything; that has got to be better." I heard on the news again today another horror story. Just when you thought the VA was being cleaned up, here comes another horror story.

Some doctor at the VA was allowed to do 80-some-odd surgeries that were unnecessary, inappropriate, or terribly done, even surgeries not even needed at all, on the wrong person, but it had been covered up for some time. Well, when the government is in charge of your healthcare, you can't expect any more than the lowest common denominator in the government.

I am very, very grateful we do have some good doctors, some good nurses in the VA, but I have also talked to good doctors and nurses in the VA who are so frustrated with such an albatross of a system.

□ 1700

Why not just let people—if you want to go to the VA clinic, here is your card, you go.

We thought we were doing a good thing, and I think it was a step in the right direction when we were going to allow veterans to go to a civilian clinic, hospital, healthcare provider if there was not one within a minimum number of miles. I believe it was 40, but I have heard horror stories about how people have been jerked around and not been allowed to utilize the program as it was designed. Here, again, we come back to what you get when the government is in charge. We have got to do that.

Stuart Varney was asking today again about tax reform. We promised it. We have got to deliver on that. These rumors I hear emanating from people at the Senate side of this build-

ing that: Yeah, well, the House can do the reform. They did their ObamaCare repeal and we didn't pass that, so maybe we won't do their tax reform package like we are working on.

It takes a lot of work to pass a major reform like we did on ObamaCare. It takes even more work, perhaps, to do a significant tax reform package where it becomes simplified, people pay less tax, the economy explodes. You would think it would be a no-brainer, but apparently there are too many people up here with no brains and it is not getting done. We do have to do that. We promised we would. We have got to do it for the sake of the economy that will make people's lives so much better.

But in the meantime, if we are going to be an effective Congress, we have got to make sure that we maintain proper systems in place that we can do our business without inappropriate outside influence, whether it is coming from Russia or Pakistan. Wherever it is coming from, we need to know and we need to protect ourselves.

That is why this Taxed Enough Already Caucus meeting we had, we invited people in the tradition of my friend Tim Huelskamp, the former chair of that caucus from Kansas. Just a great guy, a great American. It was great to talk to him recently. Tim started with this caucus having representatives of outside groups with important information we should share coming in and having Members of Congress come in and share information, figure out how we can help get the Nation's business done.

We have been concerned about articles we continue to read, especially by Luke Rosiak of The Daily Caller. No one has done more investigation on the issue of the Awan family cohorts that were working here on Capitol Hill for House Members. They happened to be Democratic House Members. I think the same thing could happen where one Republican could say, "Oh, these folks are great," and before you know it, you have dozens of people having the same IT computer workers working part time. People are allowed to do that, hire somebody part time so it doesn't overwhelm your budget. Others can hire them part time, but under no circumstances can anybody working on the Hill make more than around \$160,000.

We found out this week from the lead investigator, oh, not law enforcement, oh, no. FBI, apparently they are not getting anything done, and I will explain why in a moment. But as he has gone around and investigated and asked witnesses questions that have direct information about what is going on, Luke Rosiak would also ask: Has anyone from the FBI talked to you, or has any law enforcement talked to you?

He said 80 percent of the time the answer is no. No one from the FBI has talked to me. No one from any law enforcement has talked to me. Staggering.

I hear rumors that there are people from the FBI telling the Department of Justice: Yeah, we have looked into it. There is nothing there.

Yeah, just the way the FBI looked into the notice from Russia that the Tsarnaev older brother had been radicalized.

What do they do?

I know because I have asked Director Mueller after he had run off thousands of years of our best experienced FBI agents, done more damage to the FBI than anybody since Hoover. He has got plenty of young aggressive people without enough experience to call him out when he was making mistakes, as he made many.

They send out an FBI agent to talk to the older Tsarnaev after the second notice from Russian agents that this guy has been radicalized. He is going to be a threat. But because Director Mueller—now Special Counsel Mueller, who is hiring lawyers and investigators right and left—built up a beautiful, comfortable nest for himself, that same Mueller, as Director of the FBI, had the FBI training materials on radical Islamists purged of anything that might offend radical Islamists.

Yes, he was more concerned about the little lunches and dinners he had with CAIR—or the Council of American-Islamic Relations—than he was about people being killed in Boston, because if he had, he would have made sure that the Tsarnaev brothers were properly investigated after they got two heads-up.

If they had bothered to look, they would have seen where the older Tsarnaev went and would have known he went to a hotbed of radicalism. They would have known to investigate: What has he been reading? What scriptures from the Koran has he been reading? What has he talked about? Is he doing more memorization? What is his appearance looking like now? Who is he hanging out with?

But no. Because he was too concerned about what he called the outreach program to Islamic Americans, he didn't want to offend anybody. He was more worried about offending somebody than saving the lives and limbs of Bostonians.

He created a massive problem at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and now we are turning special counsel over to this man?

We heard from Mr. Comey himself that he talked to Mueller even before his testimony before Congress. We heard from he himself that he leaked information that was clearly FBI information that should not have been leaked.

So there is a question of did he commit a crime, or did he just commit a breach of FBI ethics? What action should be taken?

Oh, no. We have got FBI Director Mueller on the case, and if you go back and look at the Washingtonian back in 2013, they did a big expose on how wonderful Mr. Comey was; and they point

out in there that, gee, basically if the whole world were on fire, Comey knew there would be one person that would still be standing with him there to protect him, Mr. Mueller; the same guy that is protecting him instead of investigating the leaks that have come from the FBI that appear to have gone through the exact same person through whom he leaked what he admitted. But, no, we have got Mueller, the same man who is going to be there through thick and thin to protect Comey; he is the one investigating.

If Jeff Sessions as Attorney General cannot investigate Mr. Comey and his violations, potential breaches of the law, then we need another special counsel, and it sure ain't going to come from Mr. Rosenstein, that is for sure.

We need a special counsel. I think the Attorney General could do it, but I am not sure the extent to which he has recused himself. But this has to be investigated. Unfortunately, because of the damage done to the FBI, I still have questions arise on things they investigate because I know the damage that Mueller did to their training materials, to their ability. As one of our intelligence agents explained, we have blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemies.

But don't worry, the guy that was the biggest blinder is now the special counsel growing his little bureaucracy. And I am sure, knowing how vengeful he is, when he hears what I have had to say, then he probably will open an investigation on me. That is just how vengeful this man has been.

But the truth is the truth. He damaged the FBI, running off thousands of years of experienced people. He purged the training materials that would have—and Michele Bachmann and I went through these, and another Congressman from Georgia went through some, and there were some things, sure; cartoon stuff, sure; take them out, fine. But there were some things in there very clearly that every FBI agent needs to know to help them spot a radical Islamist, and Mueller blinded them of the opportunity to do that.

I will never forget, at one of our hearings, after it was so clear that he was more concerned about offending CAIR than he was of protecting Boston, and he was so defensive, I said: You didn't even go to the mosque where Tsarnaev went to see if he had been radicalized.

After fumbling around, I finally got him to tell me how he thought that was wrong, and he said: We did go to the mosque.

And I didn't hear it at first. Unfortunately, I didn't hear it until I had it played on the video.

He said: We did go to that mosque in our outreach program.

Oh, the outreach program. Yeah, you didn't go to investigate Tsarnaev to find out if he had been radicalized by asking questions in the mosque where he worshipped to find out if he was now acting like a radical. And there are

clear indications. That is why we don't have to worry about most Muslims, but you sure need to know what you are looking for.

For those that want to call people like me an Islamophobe, well, it is another lie. But there are plenty of lies around Washington. I have got enough Muslim friends in the Middle East and Afghanistan and other countries. They know they don't want radicals. I am so proud of the President of Egypt, el-Sisi, a man who would stand before imams and tell them: We have got to get our religion back from the radicals.

That is a courageous great man. We owe him a lot of help.

So what do we have here on Capitol Hill?

We had guys that apparently never had a background search. And as we found out from the investigator for The Daily Caller, there were actually three or more months of the year when Imran Awan would be in Pakistan doing his job, supposedly making sure Capitol Hill computers were secured. We find out that there was suspicion when they saw this Imran Awan clan. His wife got involved. As we heard, when they would get up to the maximum amount one person could make on Capitol Hill, they would add another family member, and then they would get up to \$160,000; add another family member, get them up; add another family member. And apparently all of these people didn't work.

□ 1715

The people that had a lot of experience working at McDonalds probably didn't have that much experience on computers, but he was still making \$160,000 or so a year and, we find out—I had no idea, just this week found out—they were able to gain \$6 million to \$7 million from the House of Representatives' budget.

And we find out, gee, one of them, had gotten \$100,000 from an individual with known ties to Hezbollah, and we don't know for what reason, but clearly never came to Capitol Hill. He was put on the payroll of the U.S. House of Representatives, the guy that was owed \$100,000 with ties to Hezbollah, and made over \$200,000 or so before he was taken off the payroll.

That is a good way to pay back a loan, isn't it?

So we had Imran Awan; Hina Alvi, his wife; Abid Awan; Jamal Awan; Rao Abbas; and possibly a couple of others we found out—just incredible that this kind of thing could happen.

But the suspicion grew when he was supposed to be working on the computer system of Congressman, now attorney general in California, Becerra. No indication Becerra knew anything was wrong, but people here on the Hill watching this saw there have been 5,700 accesses to his computer system and 5,400, at least, were not from people who should have been getting into his computer system.

Then we find out, actually, he downloaded other Members of Con-

gress' servers completely onto Becerra's server, and, actually, he had 2 terabytes of information that he said was for their child's homework—a little child's homework taking 2 terabytes.

But we also know, apparently, from what came out this week, he was downloading dozens of Members' computers onto one server so that anybody he wanted to could access any of that information.

Now, there is no indication that classified information was revealed through the access to all these computer systems by people who were not hired by that Member of Congress. But we also know—I mean, General Petraeus, I read somewhere that it was actually a calendar that he gave to the lady who was to do a book, that he was having an affair with, that had some stuff that was considered classified.

Well, on every Member's computer system, you get their calendar, you get all their email, you get all their appointments, things that are going on in the office, you get reactions to people who come in over different bills, you get reaction to different things that have been learned in the intelligence community. There are all kinds of things that people would pay a lot of money for.

Then we find out, you had a bankruptcy in the Awan history, you had domestic violence in the history, and now we find out this week, newly reported, that his wife is now upset. We can maybe get some answers now that she is upset because, now, she has found out that not only was he being corrupt to the banks here in the United States and on Capitol Hill, but he also, without his wife's knowledge, married another lady. So that may help bring his first wife around to giving us more information about just how bad things got.

But the report was, this week, investigators with the IG's office here on Capitol Hill have been quietly tracking the five IT workers—that is, the Awan group—their digital footprints for months. They were alarmed by what they saw.

The employees, the Awans, appeared to be accessing congressional servers without authorization, an indication that they "could be reading and/or removing information," according to the documents distributed at the previously unreported private briefings.

So I know that there are people who have reported here on Capitol Hill, well, it is being looked into, but there is no evidence of crime. Really?

Because we have also learned that there may have been hundreds of vouchers filed falsely for, say, an \$800 iPad. But if you say that it is under \$500, then it doesn't go in the inventory, and it is easier to steal and sell, for example, hypothetically, in Pakistan, where there are reports that he sent technological systems and sold them to make extra money.

We know that he was not truthful and honest in his financial disclosures.

That can be a crime. But just one voucher where you claim something only cost \$490 and the server system cost \$310 when you know that item actually cost \$800 and should go into the inventory, that could be a crime. It appears that happened countless times, but we need to be trying to count anyway.

We know that there were many pieces of computer equipment found at his home after FBI agents said his wife appeared to be fleeing, to not come back, even though she had a trip back. We don't know what representations have been made to get her to come back, but we know that the tenants who leased the house where they fled from had been threatened by Imran Awan's lawyer for allowing law enforcement to have access to that computer equipment that was there at his house. Hard drives appeared to be destroyed so they could not be properly investigated.

We got a report that one of the group appeared to be home most of the time and was not here in Washington, D.C. But what a great gig, when you can make \$160,000 a year for servicing computer equipment. And it appears all of these five, six, seven people in this group didn't have competence to do computer or IT work, yet they were sure making a good living doing it.

But for those who continue to say "we just don't think there is much there," all that should tell you is the report by Luke Rosiak, of all the witnesses to this whole sordid matter, only about 20 percent of them have ever been interviewed by FBI or law enforcement. It tells you somebody around here in this town, this Hill, somebody does not want to get to the bottom of this. If law enforcement wants to get to the bottom of this, they will get to the bottom of it.

Kind of like Benghazi, if we really wanted to get to the bottom of it, we would do like Judicial Watch and be relentless till we got to the bottom of it. We haven't gotten there yet.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that needs to be investigated, a lot that needs to be done. We need—somebody, sounds like, needs to be investigating Mr. Mueller, but certainly needs to be investigating the various leaks that appear to have come from Mr. Comey through the same sources as the one he admitted. That has got to be investigated. And Mueller can't do it and, apparently, the current Attorney General can't. We have got to have somebody appointed to get to the bottom of what was happening at the DOJ during last year when an election was going on.

We need to have an investigation to thoroughly get into this matter of having a U.N.—our representative to the U.N. is unmasking American information. We were assured that kind of thing would not happen if we would just reauthorize that program: Oh, no, no. If there are Americans who happen to be incidentally picked up by the

monitors, the wiretap, by listening in on conversations, look, if there is an American, we mask the name. You can't just get that. You are protected. It is minimized.

Well, we find out that wasn't true, that anybody that wants to go skipping and looking into any political opponents can do that if you are corrupt enough. And if you are corrupt enough and you have corrupted other people, then it won't be investigated.

Maybe there are things other people around here don't want found out, but it is time we cleaned up the mess that has been left here, we clean up the wiretapping capability. It is coming up for reauthorization here. It has got to be done before the end of December, and I still need a lot of answers before I could even consider doing that.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we have got to help the American people by keeping our promises.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN PAKISTAN AND SINDH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for yielding me 30 minutes, more than enough time to deliver three separate speeches that I have prepared for presentation. The first two are informed, or two of these speeches are informed. The first and the third are informed by my 20 years of experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the second speech I will deliver is informed by 40 years as a CPA in the world of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking member on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee and the founder of the Sindh Caucus. In those two roles, I have focused on human rights and the rule of law in Pakistan, and particularly in its perhaps largest province, Sindh, comprising most of southern Pakistan.

We have dedicated ourselves in the Sindh Caucus to efforts to preserve the culture and the language of the Sindh people, and particularly their dedication to religious tolerance. Unfortunately, the human rights picture in Pakistan and in Sindh are not good.

I would like to say a few words about the disappearance of Punhal Sario, the leader of the Voice for Missing Persons of Sindh movement, and about the very serious problem of disappearances in Sindh in southern Pakistan.

Just this past summer, Punhal Sario led a march between Sindh's two major cities, Hyderabad to Karachi, demanding accountability for Sindh activists who have been abducted by Pakistani security forces or simply disappeared.

Where is Punhal now? It appears that he, too, has fallen victim to the very serious forces that he marched against.

□ 1730

Punhal's case is hardly an isolated one. The Human Rights Commission of Pakistan reported that over 700 people disappeared, were kidnapped, and never heard of again in Pakistan in the year 2016 alone.

In the past year, the United Nations Human Rights Committee, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and the State Department's own Report on Human Rights have all noted serious concerns about extrajudicial and targeted killings and disappearances in Pakistan and, particularly, in Sindh.

Elements of the government or military see an opportunity to simply make their opponents disappear. Here are a few particulars. In 2016, Amnesty International reported that the Pakistani security forces had, and these are their words, "committed human rights violations with almost total impunity."

While Human Rights Watch observed that, "law enforcement and security agencies remained unaccountable for human rights violations."

The State Department itself noted in Pakistan, "the most serious human rights problems were extrajudicial and targeted killings disappearances, torture, the lack of the rule of law."

Two years ago, in 2015, Sindh leader Dr. Anwar Laghari was brutally murdered in Pakistan. Days before his death, he had sent a memorandum to President Barack Obama about human rights violations by the Pakistani military and its ISI, the Inter-Services Intelligence, agency, an important part of the Pakistani military.

I attended a memorial service for Dr. Laghari here in Washington and have come to know of his work for human rights for the Sindh people of southern Pakistan. The Pakistani Government has not been responsive to numerous inquiries into the reason for Dr. Laghari's death and for why his perpetrators have not been brought to justice.

Two months ago, on August 18, I sent a letter to the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs and the U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan expressing strong concerns about human rights violations of the Pakistani Government in Sindh. Six of my House colleagues—three Democrats and three Republicans—joined me in that effort.

There are other human rights concerns in Pakistan that I should also bring to the attention of this House. The people of Sindh face religious extremist attacks. ISIS, for example, claimed responsibility for an attack on a Sufi shrine in Sindh that killed 80 people. Yet the government has not acted to protect religious minorities and, in general, has not acted to protect the people of Sindh from Islamic extremism.

In addition, in Sindh, there are forced conversions of Sindh girls belonging to minority communities.

While the numbers are unclear, reports suggest that every year perhaps 1,000 girls and young women in Pakistan, including many in Sindh, are forcibly converted upon a marriage, not of their choice, to Muslim men. The Pakistani Government has not done enough to stop this practice, and reform measures have been circumvented and not enforced.

Human rights abuses of this type cannot go unanswered. Activists disappear under suspicious circumstances. It is our obligation to speak out and demand accountability. These disappearances and other violations of human rights should be a major topic of conversation in all bilateral discussions between our government and the government in Islamabad.

#### TAX PROPOSAL DELETES DEDUCTIONS

Mr. SHERMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker I would like to move on to a second speech, one dealing with the tax proposal of the Trump administration.

The provisions I would like to focus on chiefly are those involving taking away the deductions, the itemized deductions that so many Americans take to reduce their tax liability.

Now, these deductions are eliminated on the theory that, oh, they just go to the wealthy, and, for those purposes, they define the wealthy as the wealthiest 30 percent or so of the American people—say a family with an income of \$100,000 or \$150,000. We are told that is the same thing as increasing taxes on the top one-tenth of 1 percent, say a family with an income of \$1 million or \$2 million a year.

There is a difference in the ability to pay of those two typical families, typifying their income brackets. The fact is, that taxing hardworking families with incomes of \$100,000 or \$150,000, in order to provide reduced tax rates for those with incomes of \$1 million or \$2 million, makes our tax system more regressive. You cannot put the entire top 30 percent in one category for these income calculations.

That is why, and that is only one reason why, I oppose the elimination of the home mortgage deduction. Another reason that I oppose it is elimination of the home mortgage deduction and reduction for local property taxes will probably decrease the value of homes by 20 percent, is the best estimate I have seen.

Well, if you lose 20 percent of the value of your home, you may very well lose all of the equity in your home. How is that going to affect the economy? How is that going to affect the ability of homeowners to go and spend money in their communities and support the economy of their communities?

What does it do to the Federal budget when we are responsible through Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac for underwriting home mortgages? We know that if you wipe out the equity of many homeowners in their homes, this can lead to defaults and cost the Federal Government perhaps more than we give

up by having a home mortgage deduction.

Another element to keep in mind is that the entire idea of an income tax is that we tax people based on their ability to pay. If you are in a State with high income taxes, high property taxes, that diminishes your ability to pay. If you make a certain salary and money is taken out by your State government before you ever see it, your ability to pay is only on that net paycheck.

It is simply wrong to take away the deduction for State and local taxes. But make no mistake about it, the purpose of removing that deduction is not just to hurt the top 30, or 40 percent, or 50 percent of the American people who itemize their deductions, it is designed to punish those who are dependent on State and local government.

All the conservative theorists say: If we can just eliminate the deduction for State and local taxes, we will cut the size of State and local governments. We will create a political atmosphere in which they slash money for local schools, slash money for local health programs for the poor, slash money for police.

Who will be hurt from those cuts? Not just the top 30 percent or 50 percent, but everyone in America, most particularly, the poor.

Finally, I want to focus on the medical deduction. They take away the medical deduction in this program, this proposal of the Trump administration. Now, keep in mind that we already have severe limits on deducting medical expenses. You can deduct medical expenses only if they exceed 10 percent of your family's income. So medical expenses are itemized and deducted only by those families including someone with very significant health costs.

Now, we have worked hard in this House to make sure that people have health insurance. But even with health insurance, there are copays; there are deductibles. These can be absorbed in a family budget where no one has a particular strong medical need. But what if there is some member of the family who needs experimental treatments that are not covered, therapies that are not covered?

Under the present system, at least they get to deduct these extraordinary—not the first 10 percent of AGI, of adjusted gross income—but when they start spending out-of-pocket costs in excess of 10 percent income, they can take a tax deduction—a tax deduction taken away in the Trump tax proposal.

I speak not just as someone who spent a lot of time as a tax expert who headed the second largest tax agency in the country, but as the father of a child with special needs. What does this tax proposal mean for such a family? Well, first, there is a cut in Federal revenue under this proposal of between \$150 billion and \$200 billion a year. Deficit hawks will demand that these revenue cuts be matched by cuts to Federal spending.

What does that do to the \$13 billion the Federal Government dedicates to the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, also known as special education? And what do these cuts in our Federal expenditures mean to the \$293 million that are spent by the National Institutes of Health on research designed to prevent and treat autism and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, ADHD?

So the first impact on a family with special needs is a slashing of the money the Federal Government spends for special education and medical research. But second, I talked about those out-of-pocket medical expenses. Parents with special-needs children know that health insurance pays only a portion of what is needed, or perhaps none of what is needed, for behavioral therapy, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, developmental pediatricians, neuropsychological services, et cetera.

Medical insurance will pay nothing toward anything branded an experimental treatment, and, of course, medical insurance does not cover special schools required to meet the needs of some special-needs children.

Under current law, a special school designed to meet those with a physical or mental handicap are considered medical expenses. All of these tax deductions are taken away from a family whose ability to pay is diminished by the costs of providing these therapies to a special-needs child.

In addition, right now, the tax law provides a personal exemption of \$4,050 for each dependent child. The Trump administration proposal takes that away. It does say, in some vague language, that there will be a child tax credit to compensate parents who are losing the personal exemption. But this credit will be limited to children 16 years of age and younger.

So what about parents supporting children in their teenage years, and older? Remember, some special-needs children will need parental support for a lifetime. Those parents lose the exemption and are ineligible for this credit available only to parents of younger children.

But perhaps parents of children with special needs should support the Trump tax program. While it will tremendously increase their taxes, while it will cut Federal expenditures on special education and on health research and medical research, parents of children with special needs can take solace in knowing that this plan will reduce taxes for the Trump family by over \$1 billion in estate taxes and by tens of millions of dollars in income tax.

Perhaps we should tell parents of special-needs children that they should stop worrying so much about their children and start worrying about Donald Trump's children. If they did, they would support the Trump tax proposal.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR CONTROL DEAL

Mr. SHERMAN. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the issue of



Iran and the nuclear deal, nuclear control deal that we signed with Iran.

First, a little background. In 1997, I said at the Foreign Affairs Committee that Iran and its nuclear program were the number one threat to American national security.

□ 1745

For the last 20 years, I have supported every effort to impose sanctions on the Iranian regime. When the Iran nuclear deal was finalized and published, I was the first of either party to come to this floor and say that Congress should not vote to endorse that deal.

But the question before us now is: Should we renounce the deal?

Now, it would be one thing if Iran decides that we are so tough on them on other issues that they choose to renounce the deal, but that is not the issue before us today. The issue before us today is whether America should renounce the deal, and the resounding and clear answer is that is not something we should do at this time.

Now, I will give you an example. Let's say you bought a flawed automobile. In some jurisdictions, you take back the automobile and you get back your money. But what opponents—what some are proposing now is that we renounce the deal. Imagine you are in a jurisdiction where you have to take back the car and the dealer keeps your money, too. Taking back the car doesn't look like such a good idea anymore.

Now, like a flawed automobile, the Iran nuclear deal is liable to not be working next decade. But that doesn't mean you take back the car and the dealer keeps the money.

What happens if we renounce the deal?

Iran keeps the money. We unfroze very roughly \$100 billion of their money. If we renounce the deal, they keep the money. We delivered over \$1 billion in currency on big pallets. If we renounce the deal, Iran keeps the money. If we renounce the deal, Iran is liberated from all of the restrictions that it agreed to on its nuclear program.

I opposed the deal because the restrictions on Iran's nuclear program in the deal were temporary. I believe we need to extend and enforce those limitations on their nuclear program. If you listen to the Prime Minister of Israel, Bibi Netanyahu, he has identified the fact that we have not been able to extend and make permanent the limitations on Iran's nuclear program as the chief flaw in the deal and the chief thing to correct to turn it into a better deal.

But if we renounce the deal, we don't extend and enforce the limitations on Iran's nuclear program, we end and eliminate immediately the restrictions on Iran's nuclear program. I cannot think of a worse result.

Now, there are two mechanisms that we could use as a nation to renounce

the deal, give Iran all the benefits, and liberate them from all their obligations. The first of these is on our mind now because it could be triggered on October 15. That is the day on which the President could, in effect, decertify this deal under the Iran Nuclear Review Act. I hope that, if he does that, the press will not overplay it, because a decertification does nothing more than focus Congress' attention on whether we want to reinstitute the exact sanctions that were waived as part of the nuclear deal. A decertification does nothing more than focus our attention and, over in the Senate, provide for a reinstitution of the old sanctions.

Now, I don't think that Congress would be stupid enough to do that because, as I have explained, if we renounce the deal, Iran keeps the benefits and is liberated from its obligations.

But the President should not decertify the deal and focus the world's attention on whether America will stand with the deal at this time.

The second way that America could renounce the deal will occur next January because the basic element of the deal—the basic thing Iran got from the United States—was an agreement that the President would, every 4 months to 6 months, it depends on the exact statute, waive particular identified sanctions. As it happens, the existing waivers all expire in the middle of next January. If the President were to fail to issue those waivers, that would be an American renunciation of the deal. So it does not meet our national security objectives to renounce the deal.

What meets our national security objectives is to impose tough sanctions on Iran, draft those sanctions carefully, and explain them to the world not as a renunciation of the deal, but as appropriate sanctions given Iran's non-nuclear, outside-the-deal, wrongful behavior.

Now, the question is: Can we have sanctions on Iran and continue to force them to abide by the deal?

The answer is clearly yes.

In July of 2015, Secretary Kerry came before our committee, and I raised this very issue: If we adopt the deal, can we impose sanctions on the Central Bank of Iran to deter terrorism? Or would that violate this agreement?

I specifically asked: Are Congress and the United States free under the agreement to adopt new sanctions legislation that will remain in force as long as Iran holds American hostages or supports the murderous Assad regime?

Secretary Kerry's answers were clear. He stated: We are free to adopt additional sanctions as long as they are not a phony excuse for just taking the whole pot of past ones and putting them back.

So we can and should impose new sanctions on Iran to the extent justified by Iran's behavior outside the area of nuclear research and uranium enrichment. Look at that as an oppor-

tunity because you could make a list of every sanction any one of us here on this floor has thought of. And add in the creativity of the United States Senate and make a list of every sanction we could impose, I assure you that those sanctions and more are justified by the non-nuclear evil committed by the regime in Tehran.

Iran is more responsible than Russia for the hundreds of thousands of deaths in Syria. The lifeline of Assad's murderous regime is a lifeline to the aid, money, weapons, thugs, and training that Iran has provided—hundreds of thousands of deaths, an immoral responsibility of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Turn to Yemen, where tens of thousands of people have died because of Iran. Look at worldwide terrorism, and Iran is the number one state sponsor of terrorism year after year, according to our State Department. Look at the treatment by Iran of its own people, the murders by the state of anyone they identify as being part of the LGBT community, the murders by the state of women—it is usually women—accused of adultery.

The evil that comes from the Islamic Republic far exceeds the ability of this House to identify sanction points. That is why the proper policy for the United States is to impose the maximum sanctions and to explain to the world that this is not a phony renunciation of the nuclear deal, but it is the appropriate response to Iran's actions that are outside of the nuclear deal.

If we do that, we will have substantial support from Europe, Asia, and elsewhere first for demanding that Iran continue to be subject to all the nuclear limitations and inspections that they agreed to under the deal and which continue to be enforced well in the next decade.

What we shall do next decade, well, I will come back here and give another speech next decade. But at least many years deep in the next decade, this deal provides us with valuable limitations and valuable inspections of the Iran nuclear program, and Europe will insist that those be adhered to.

Second, Europe may join us in the sanctions when we sanction Iran for its actions in Syria, its actions to its own people, its actions in Yemen. One more I should add, and that is Iran's violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions by testing and developing missiles and exporting weapons.

So if we stick with the deal and we sanction Iran, they may choose—if those sanctions are as effective as I think they can be—to walk away from the deal. But if they do, we will have the whole world with us enforcing sanctions against Iran.

Now, there is one part of the policy I put forward that may not meet the psychological needs of the President of the United States, for he has shown an uncontrollable personal need to pour disgusting liquids on anything associated with President Obama. Maybe it

meets his psychological needs to say he is renouncing the nuclear deal. But the fact is we don't have to renounce the nuclear deal and liberate Iran from its obligations in order to impose the toughest imaginable sanctions on this regime that is doing so much evil.

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

#### THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me just note I believe that our President is doing a terrific job. I think that the last Presidents of the United States have left us an incredibly dangerous situation, and this President is trying to deal with it with strength and purpose, and, yes, being a forceful leader.

For example, during the Clinton administration, we provided \$4 billion to \$5 billion to North Korea, the same way the last administration tried to provide funds for Iran.

What do we have now?

A crisis with possible nuclear weapons and missiles in North Korea. That is called kicking the can down the road. They sure kicked it down to us, and now the people want to kick the can down the road with the Iranians. No, let's not do that again and leave future generations to face the music that we left them.

Our President wants to make sure that Iran does not become a nuclear power as long as it is controlled by radical, fanatic mullahs who don't even represent their own people. In fact, if Iran was more peaceful and actually more democratic, then we wouldn't have to worry about that because they wouldn't want to have a wasteful program of nuclear weapons.

Those are the type of issues we face today. We face a lot of uncertainties at home and abroad, and it behooves us to look for explanations for the shifts in power, the dangers, and the influence that are taking place in the world today.

Europe, along with the United States, for five decades, seemed to be the center of world order and progress. NATO, the European Union, and the common market all seemed to be the epitome of sophisticated and proper governance needed to offset humankind's destructive and combative inclinations. World Wars I and II had undercut, if not destroyed, the expansion of classical liberalism that was in the process of retiring royalist and imperialist domination of the world, which, of course, is where the world was at the turn and the beginning of the 20th century as classical liberalism began to replace imperialism and monarchy.

Yes, the two World Wars that we experienced were traumas that still im-

pact our lives. The Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I was the last gasp of European colonialism.

□ 1800

Maps drawn at that international gathering brought on World War II. Some of those other lines that they drew on that map plague us to this day.

Those national borders mandated by the Versailles Treaty made the world temporarily tranquil. Maybe we just heard about that a few moments ago, how we have got to overcome the tragedy right now, like we did in Korea, by not having confrontations with those people who were engaged in hostile activity.

Yes, the Treaty of Versailles gave the world temporary tranquility, but doomed following generations to instability and conflict. Such future challenges were left to the League of Nations. When that failed, the baton was passed to the United Nations.

Humanity, obviously, hoped that global government, in one form or the other, would solve everything. The EU, the common market, NATO, and other multinational bureaucracies would demonstrate how nation-states can cooperate and achieve a collective peace, freedom, and prosperity.

Well, just as things changed dramatically after the 19th century turned into the 20th century, and it became a different world, so, too, is our world changing. We must make sure that we have turned from the 20th century into the 21st.

The 20th century was dominated by the wars and by the defeat of the Soviet Union. Yet we are plagued with conflicts and upheavals that can be traced back to border and sovereign decisions made long ago by people who are now dead, not only from the 20th century, but, as I said, from the end of World War I.

Many of the confrontations between various nationalities that we face today could be solved and the greatest threats of violence, insurrection, and war itself could be defused if our world would again recognize the right of self-determination.

It seems to have been forgotten that the United States was not only founded on the principles of liberty and independence, but also of the right of people to demand their rights, and, yes, that right of independence. They had a right to declare their independence.

This was the revolutionary idea that people have a right to select their government. This was the revolutionary idea that gave our Founding Fathers and Mothers the moral high ground to free themselves from the British Empire. Without this, they probably would not have won, if it were just a battle between powermongers.

No. This was what the fundamental beliefs were: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but also the right of people to declare themselves free and independent to create a country based on shared beliefs and shared ideals and values.

This is what we hope—those shared values and beliefs in liberty and justice—are the things that unite us today. That is what united had our Founding Fathers and Mothers and that is what made us a nation. After all, we don't have one race or one religion or one ethnic group to identify us as being Americans and create that unity.

But that said, there are many other countries of the world whose nationalism and patriotism are based on the fact that they have an identity with other people that share their cultural and racial identities. This is what unites them as a people. They are ethnically the same, they are culturally the same, and they have the same type of national and racial roots in their past.

Yes, this is what most countries are like. That is what defines a nationality. Recognizing that people of similar values and culture do not want to live in the subjugation of others has been ignored and/or rejected by the powers that be throughout the world.

So we live in a world where this idea of just recognizing that people want to be like people with similar people. For example, you have differences between Catholics and Protestants in many areas of the world.

Yes, they like to have people who maybe speak their same language and have the same culture, enjoy the same music. There is nothing wrong with people identifying others as being part of their national family. We should promote that as a positive, rather than as a negative. We should encourage people to work together.

There are many, for example, Jewish charities, which is wonderful that Jewish people now, because they have gone through a certain amount of oppression throughout the world, take care of each other in Jewish charities. We have that. We have Catholic schools and different things.

Yes, it is meant because people do share certain values that they can work together on. That is a good thing. However, the idea that people like that might want to be in their own country, which is what our Founding Fathers said, because it was only shared values, it wasn't specific that we wanted freedom of religion for all people.

Well, today the world is threatened by people who want to be independent of domination of others who don't share their same values and their nationality. The reason why it is being rejected is basically by the power brokers throughout the world because it threatens those in power with losing authority over people who don't want to live under their domination.

That is what self-determination is all about: letting people decide their own fate. If a majority of people in an area want to be independent of a country, that is what they should be, according to our Declaration of Independence. And this is something that brings a

more peaceful world, rather than trying to have subjugation of one people by another.

There has been a major cause of conflict in the world today when people don't recognize that, yes, there are others who feel that they are being oppressed by being forced under the jurisdiction of a particular government. They would like to have their own independence.

This, of course, has been especially true where people, since the end of the Cold War, have started looking at their own self-identification. When the right of self-determination is recognized, disputes are usually settled peacefully, as happened when, for example, after the fall of communism, the Czechs and the Slovaks, who had one country before, under the Treaty of Versailles, Czechoslovakia became the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. Well, that is fine. It is a good thing that they were able to separate. Now they can be friends.

But when they were one country, if the Czechs and Slovaks felt like they were being oppressed, they weren't satisfied. It was a good thing to permit them right off the bat: If you don't want to be part of the country with us, yes, you can be a separate country. Otherwise, there would have been turmoil at one level or another.

We also saw a peaceful solution in countries like Slovenia. Yugoslavia was breaking up, Tito was dead, the Cold War was over, and guess what. Slovenia and a bunch of other republics within Yugoslavia wanted to be independent, and they were able to do it.

Well, perhaps they were able to do it because the Serbs had already launched attacks on the Croatians and the Kosovars and other people in Yugoslavia that now was splitting apart because these people wanted to be independent and free, but the Serbs attacked them.

They didn't attack Slovenia, because I think by that time they realized that they could not succeed going to war with all of these various groups. Had the Kosovars and the Croatians been free to go and separate and become independent countries—as Croatia is today, and as the Kosovars would like to be, and as we are trying to help them to be—that would have been better for Serbia. It would have been better for everybody. There would have probably been by now an agreement for some kind of free trade zone.

Instead, when the Serbs used force to keep those people under its jurisdiction, we had violence throughout the Balkans that has lasted for several decades. That is a tragedy. We should be working today in the Balkans.

Let me just note that the Serbs today are an example of people who are reaching out, for example, to the Kosovars and others to try to find peaceful solutions and trying to come to some agreements that will make peace more likely.

But, again, if you would have had people who were under their thumb,

nobody would be talking to them because they would be afraid of them. No. People who treat other people as equals and have rights as people in the world, they are more likely to reach understandings that are of mutual cooperation that will bring peace to the world.

I am not trying to say you have to submit yourself to some other group of people. The former Soviet Union, Ukraine, and other of the so-called Soviet republics were actually permitted at the end of the Cold War to, basically, peacefully establish their own independence. I know it is not as simple as that, but it happened in a peaceful way in which thousands of lives were not lost trying to force groups of people who do not want to be under Moscow's control.

Those people, whether Ukraine or elsewhere in the Baltics or the Balkans, had the right—and also in Central Asia—and people were permitted to have, basically, an independent government free from being only suppressed by Moscow and have to follow its orders.

That happened relatively peacefully. Had that not happened, there probably would be conflict throughout that part of the world today. There certainly would have been, as communism faltered in Russia itself.

So it took a lot of prodding for us to make sure that the Russians in the Soviet Union, in Moscow, understood that they could not keep people under their thumb. It was the Cold War.

Thank God, we ended the Cold War peacefully, because that was the great gift that Ronald Reagan gave to us. I am very proud to have served with Ronald Reagan for 7 years in the White House as a senior speechwriter to the President for 7½ years, as well as being a Special Assistant to the President and very involved with his efforts to try to move peace in the world. A lot of it was peace by recognizing people's right to independence.

Look back, for example—Ronald Reagan was an Irish American—at the needless violence that the British perpetrated and what happened in Ireland because the British insisted that the Irish be kept under British rule for so long, when it was clear that the Irish people wanted to be independent of Great Britain.

Look at what happened, in contrast, in Singapore and Malaysia, where the British just peacefully permitted those countries that were basically under the domination—they were part of Great Britain and the British Empire—to leave and establish their independence peacefully. Then Malaysia and Singapore separated from Great Britain, and then separated from each other, peacefully.

But in any one of these cases, if somebody demanded that these people stay in this particular status within this particular government, there would have been a lot more violence.

When self-determination is respected, peace is more likely. When a people are

subjugated to the orders of a government in a country they don't want to be part of, violence is more likely.

How easy is that?

Special interests and power elites throughout the world are not so inclined to this obvious reason.

Why?

Because it is not in their interest to let people just go when they have them right there under their control.

So let's look at a few examples where self-determination has manifest itself in conflict.

Today, one of the greatest conflict areas of the world is the Middle East. Again, many of the conflicts that we have seen, if not a majority, can be traced right back to the Treaty of Versailles, right back to World War I, and the decisions of colonialists and imperialists and royalists to draw borders in the Middle East, just as they did in Africa and elsewhere, which made no sense.

Yes, we ended up separating whole nations. For example, one nation of people that we are aware of today are the Kurds. The Kurds were separated into various countries in the Treaty of Versailles by these British and French colonialists.

And we are supposed to just abide by their decision of what the borders should be today, 100 years later?

No, I don't think so.

□ 1815

The Kurds, of course, were not living just subjugating themselves to what they had been dictated. No, the Kurds have been our greatest ally in the fight against radical Islamic terrorism, and what they are doing today and what they just voted on recently was they had a vote to determine if their people wanted self-determination and wanted to be an independent country from Iraq.

Yes, that was a good thing, and we should recognize that. They won overwhelmingly, and we should look at the map of—we should say a map of the Middle East needs to be changed so you can have a Kurdistan that flows all the way from Turkey and Iraq and Iran and Syria. There are more, for example, Kurds in Iran than there are in Iraq. In Turkey, there are more Kurds, and, of course, in Syria.

This should be a modern country. Why are we letting this turmoil go on when our greatest allies are looking for their own self-determination and these other countries are becoming or are already our enemies? Yes, it will behoove the United States to support the independence of Kurdistan and all the Kurds. We should support in bringing together these Kurdish people as a nation, because that is what they are. They are a nation without a state. Let them have their country.

There has been so much bloodshed in trying to repress the Kurds from the Iranians, from the mullah regime, but also the Shah before him. The Kurds were oppressed by Saddam Hussein,

and right now, what we have is a repression of people even in Iran where the mullah regime is oppressing not only the rest of its people, not only the other people who make up Iran, but the Kurds, in particular.

Look at what is going on with the Baloch, for example. Now, a small group—there are groups of people. There is an area in Iran where the vast majority of people are of the Baloch extraction. They would like their independence. They deserve their right to self-determination, and they are not suffering from the oppression of Iran.

By the way, if we are going to try to deal with Iran, let's not ratchet up our military and threaten to attack them that way. Let's ratchet up our support for people like the Kurds and the Baloch and the Azaris and other people who live in Iran who don't like the oppression of the mullahs, and we can even be supportive of the Persian people who hate the mullah regime.

These are not our enemies in Iran. It is the mullah regime, the fanatics that would drop a bomb on us and not even think twice because they think they are doing God's work. They are the enemy. So we need to be supporting, for example, the Baloch, when I talk about in Iran. The Baloch are also persecuted, mainly persecuted by the Pakistanis who have them under their thumb, and they murder people constantly. They pick these young people up and they murder them, and then they drop their bodies in little villages just to show people what is going to happen to them if they try to resist Pakistani authority.

This is the history of Pakistan. Right now they are doing it to the Baloch, to the Sindhis, to the Singhs, you name it. You have got just a group of people—except for, of course, the Punjabis and then others, the Pashtuns who control that Government in Pakistan.

Well, remember what happened before. We have seen it before. When the people of Bangladesh wanted to be a little independent of the Pakistani Government, have some way to, you know, control their own lives and control their own government, they were brutally repressed by the Pakistani Government, and that is what led to, basically, the uprising of the people in Bangladesh when they freed themselves.

Remember, that same type of oppression is continuing not only on the Baloch, but, for example, the populations that came over from India, after India and Pakistan split. A lot of them went to Karachi. Those people in Karachi now, there are people who want to have Karachi—it is like a Singapore of that part of the world, an independent. That is what they want to do because they have a right of self-determination.

They don't want to be subjugated by this corrupt, militaristic, proterrorist Government in Pakistan. We should be siding with people like that who want their independence and believe in these same values that we believe in.

Another example of that, of course, is what we see in Spain today. Today, of course, now there are groups of people who live in Catalonia. Catalonia is a province with a long history in Spain. People identify themselves as Catalonians. Yes, Spanish, but also Catalonians. They should have a right to vote on whether or not they want to remain part of Spain, whether or not they give up their sovereignty to a central government in Madrid or do they want to have a government of Catalonia that they can have their own government, and yes, their own sovereignty.

Well, the Spanish overreaction to the efforts of the Catalonians just to have a poll—basically it was a vote on independence, but it was—you know, basically it had to be recognized for it to have effect. But instead of letting them do this and just saying, "Well, it has no legal effect," instead, the Spanish Government came down with brute force and conducted violence, as you would think violence coming from terrorists would exert on a group of people in Spain. It was their own government that was exercising violence and force and intimidation against the people of Catalonia.

Now, of course, the people of Catalonia are united because they know the brutality and subjugation of what is going on with Madrid.

Now, the British knew how to do it. Unlike Madrid and Spain, the British permitted their people in Scotland to have a vote, and that was a wonderful thing. The Scots had their vote, there was no interference, and if they didn't want to be part of Great Britain, they didn't have to be, and that was a wonderful example to the world of how you should do this.

Now, the Scots decided to stay part of England, part of Great Britain. That is fine, but they had their chance. The people in Spain weren't given that chance. No, instead their government came down and beat them up when they tried to go to the polls. And let's say also, the British seemed also to be demonstrating, they believe, in self-determination.

They are exiting—they are taking the Brexit issue of whether or not you should have Britain as part of the EU and the common market. That vote that they allowed their people to decide, it wasn't decided by an elite. The Brexit vote let all the people of Britain decide whether or not they were going to be basically part of a subjugated people in Europe or whether they were going to be an independent force and a nation, which is their history as a people of Great Britain.

I am proud that they permitted Scotland to vote, and I am also proud that they voted not to subjugate themselves to the EU and to the common market, et cetera.

We need to make sure that we stay true to our principles and have a vision about what this world will be. If you are just looking at things of what we

can do every day, Ronald Reagan succeeded because he had a vision of a peaceful world based on those individual rights and those concepts of freedom and democracy that were at the heart of the American experience, but also an America that encompassed people from all over the world.

Reagan had a vision, and it wasn't to get into a war with the Soviet Union and destroy communism. Reagan's vision was let's have—yes, we have to have strength in our military in order to defeat this enemy of Soviet communism, because it was threatening the world peace. It was taking over countries and overthrowing governments and replacing them with atheist dictatorships. Reagan knew we had to stop that.

Just like today, our primary enemy today is no longer the Soviet Union because Reagan helped eliminate the Soviet Union, the communist threat. The threat today is radical Islamic terrorists who will murder our people and are murdering people all over the world and murdering people in their own countries in order to terrorize them into submission.

Well, the bottom line is, Ronald Reagan's vision succeeded with Russia because, at that time, it was the Soviet Union, and now we have a Russia that we have so much more potential.

Now, there are a lot of flaws. There are a lot of flaws in the Russian Government, and there are things that we have to make sure that we are taking care of and standing firm on, but, by and large, we have to understand that they, today, are being attacked and murdered by radical Islamic terrorists as well. They know that, and they know the dangers that we face because they face a common danger.

We need to work to build a new alliance because what is happening is, Islam is making such inroads into the stupidity of our western European allies that the western Europe that we know—here again, time is going on, 19th century into the 20th century. Now we are in the 21st century. The 21st century will see that Europe becomes a whole different place than what it has been for the last 150 or 200 years.

There will be Islamic countries in Europe, and they will be, then, either part of or they will not fight against a radical Islamic terrorist threat that today threatens the peace of the world just as the Soviet Union did that 10 years, or I should say, 10 decades ago.

So with that, we need a vision, and one vision that we should have is, number one, a vision of self-determination that we all agree on.

Number two, let's make sure that we ally ourselves in a positive way with people who are not going to be weakened by the onslaught of Islam. I would suggest that America will be a more peaceful place and our country will be more secure and the world will be more peaceful and secure if we establish a new relationship in which we are

watching out for each other with four countries. The United States, of course; the other one is India, and I will soon be going to India. In fact, I will be going to India tomorrow. And number three, Japan; and number four, Russia.

Now, there is some work that needs to be done to make a coalition like that real, but a coalition of those countries working together, not mandated that we have to do this and we have to subjugate ourselves to decisions of what the four say, but, instead, seeking out cooperation with those countries where there is mutual benefit to do, we can make this a better world. We can secure our prosperity and secure the peace of our own country and the security of our own country.

So with a vision and with a recognition of fundamental things like the right of self-determination and the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that our Founding Fathers talked about, and limited government where they said government only derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, let us champion these values and these ideals.

Let us have a vision for the future, as Ronald Reagan did, and we can make this a more peaceful world as we side with people all over the world who want to control their own destiny by having their own nation rather than being subjected to someone else.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1595. An act to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary; and to the Committee on 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.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 16, 2017, at 10 a.m.

#### 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. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3669. A bill to improve and streamline security procedures related to general aviation and commercial charter air carrier utilizing risk-based security standards, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3017. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 9, 2017.

#### 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. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to establish cybersecurity supervision and examination of large consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4029. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make reasonable adjustments to earnings data for graduates of cosmetology gainful employment programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 4030. A bill to amend the Department of Education Organization Act to codify into law the "Revised Sexual Harassment Guidance: Harassment of Students by School Employees, Other Students, or Third Parties", issued January 19, 2001, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; the Dear Colleague letter issued April 4, 2011, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; and the "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence" issued April 29, 2014, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4031. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress annual reports on beneficiary travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4032. A bill to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 4033. A bill to reauthorize the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 4034. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue to the Pat Harrison Waterway District a long-term special use permit to develop approximately 8,307 acres of National Forest System land within the Bienville National Forests in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4035. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal certain loan guarantee programs of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Appropriations, 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. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4036. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a defense to prosecution for fraud and related activity in connection with computers for persons defending against unauthorized intrusions into their computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the non-applicability of non-Department of Veterans Affairs covenants not to compete to the appointment of certain Veterans Health Administration personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4038. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reassert article I authorities over the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4039. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY,

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4040. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. DENT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4041. A bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 4042. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 4043. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HECK, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 4044. A bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 4045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for shareholder ownership and passive income rules of the personal holding company tax provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4046. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of a military department to make certifications regarding the feasibility of using existing space in property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense prior to entering into certain agreements to acquire or lease real property for the use of such military de-

partment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4047. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4048. A bill to require institutions of higher education to provide students with statistical employment information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 4049. A bill to establish a grant program to ensure that students in high-need schools have equal access to a quality education delivered by an effective, diverse workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4050. A bill to support research, development, and other activities to develop innovative vehicle technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4051. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a bollard installation grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BASS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HIMES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 4052. A bill to prohibit the transfer or possession of large capacity ammunition

feeding devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 4053. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require an independent audit of the cybersecurity practices of certain consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 4054. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to submit an annual report on sources of funds used to finance the non-Federal share of expenditures under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4055. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain information when denying claims for traumatic injury protection under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4056. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other laws to return primary responsibility for disaster relief to the States, to establish a private corporation to insure States against risks and costs of disasters otherwise borne by the States, and to provide for reimbursable Federal assistance to States for activities in response to disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, 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. KING of New York (for himself and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4057. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. COMER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOHO, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 4058. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide for the establishment of a trust for the benefit of all unpaid cash sellers of livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 4059. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that physicians of the Department of Veterans Affairs fulfill the ethical duty to report to State licensing authorities impaired, incompetent, and unethical health care activities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 4060. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit and to provide for equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LUTTKEMEYER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BARR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MESSER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. KIND, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HILL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RENACCI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. TIBERI, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 4061. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 4062. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to establish a constituent-driven program to provide a digital information platform capable of efficiently integrating coastal data with decision-support tools, training, and best practices and to support collection of priority coastal geospatial data to inform and improve local, State, regional, and Federal capacities to manage the coastal region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4063. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to maintain a database of information on electricity outages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4064. A bill to impose restrictions on the sale of binary explosives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4065. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish grants to reduce the incidence of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4066. A bill to establish a program to accurately document vehicles that were significant in the history of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4067. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. ROSS, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4068. A bill to make necessary changes to the competitive need limitations provision of the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4069. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to clarify the treatment of authentic Alaska Native articles of handicraft containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. BACON, and Mr. PANNETTA):

H.J. Res. 118. A joint resolution authorizing the use of United States Armed Forces against al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, and any associated persons engaged in hostilities against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 2266; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 569. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 570. A resolution affirming the historical connection of the Jewish people to the ancient and sacred city of Jerusalem and condemning efforts at the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to deny Judaism's millennia-old historical, religious, and cultural ties to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. TAKANO):

H. Res. 571. A resolution recognizing Filipino American History Month and celebrating the history and culture of Filipino Americans and their immense contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H. Res. 572. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Red Ribbon Week during the period of October 23 through October 31, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H. Res. 573. A resolution calling on the President to work toward equitable, constructive, stable, and durable Armenian-Turkish relations based upon the two countries' common interests and the United States' significant security interests in the region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4028.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper

for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 4032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 4033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 4035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 4036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 4037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 4038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:  
H.R. 4042.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUM:  
H.R. 4043.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 US Constitution

By Mr. SCALISE:  
H.R. 4044.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:  
"The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

By Mr. BARR:  
H.R. 4045.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:  
H.R. 4046.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:  
H.R. 4047.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:  
H.R. 4048.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:  
H.R. 4049.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Art. 1, Sec. 8 "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mrs. DINGELL:  
H.R. 4050.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I Section VIII

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:  
H.R. 4051.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or  
Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:  
H.R. 4052.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18  
By Mr. FORTENBERRY:  
H.R. 4053.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:  
H.R. 4054.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. KILDEE:  
H.R. 4055.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KIND:  
H.R. 4056.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. KING of New York:  
H.R. 4057.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MARSHALL:  
H.R. 4058.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the understanding and interpretation of the Commerce Clause, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation in accordance with Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:  
H.R. 4059.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:  
H.R. 4060.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:  
H.R. 4061.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following :

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have the Power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:  
H.R. 4062.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Sec. 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. SOTO:  
H.R. 4063.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:  
H.R. 4064.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:  
H.R. 4065.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. WALBERG:  
H.R. 4066.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution  
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution  
By Mrs. WALORSKI:  
H.R. 4067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, specifically Clause 3 regarding regulating commerce with foreign nations  
By Mrs. WALORSKI:  
H.R. 4068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, specifically Clause 3 regarding regulating commerce with foreign nations  
By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:  
H.R. 4069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 "To make all Laws, which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into the Execution the forgoing Powers, and for all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. COFFMAN:  
H.J. Res. 118.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution of the United States

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. GABBARD, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 121: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 149: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 173: Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 233: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 246: Ms. CHENEY, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.  
H.R. 299: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 331: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 391: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.  
H.R. 392: Mr. CUELLAR.  
H.R. 449: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 451: Mr. ROKITA.  
H.R. 495: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.  
H.R. 502: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 535: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 564: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. COOK.  
H.R. 620: Mr. TURNER and Mr. BARR.  
H.R. 638: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. BARRAGAN.  
H.R. 733: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 747: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.  
H.R. 778: Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
H.R. 821: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 826: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 846: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
H.R. 870: Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 878: Mr. GOSAR.  
H.R. 959: Mr. GALLEGRO.  
H.R. 960: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.  
H.R. 1017: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 1046: Mr. POCAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

- H.R. 1078: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H.R. 1098: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 1116: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
- H.R. 1148: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 1164: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 1298: Ms. STEFANIK and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 1311: Mr. COMER.
- H.R. 1360: Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 1374: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
- H.R. 1380: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 1406: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 1421: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 1437: Ms. LEE.
- H.R. 1475: Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 1478: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 1562: Mr. PANETTA.
- H.R. 1612: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 1617: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 1626: Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1651: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 1661: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 1676: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1710: Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 1731: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
- H.R. 1739: Mr. WALZ and Mr. CRIST.
- H.R. 1783: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 1796: Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 1810: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 1825: Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 1828: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. REED.
- H.R. 1832: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 1841: Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 1849: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
- H.R. 1864: Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 1865: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H.R. 1898: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 1953: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1957: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 2024: Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 2069: Mr. KHANNA.
- H.R. 2079: Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 2092: Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 2133: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MITCHELL.
- H.R. 2148: Mr. EMMER.
- H.R. 2151: Mr. CRIST and Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 2232: Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. COOK.
- H.R. 2234: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 2293: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 2306: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
- H.R. 2319: Mr. BARR and Mr. EMMER.
- H.R. 2340: Mrs. LOVE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
- H.R. 2401: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 2403: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
- H.R. 2404: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 2405: Mr. FASO.
- H.R. 2431: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 2501: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 2584: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. COOK.
- H.R. 2587: Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 2599: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 2628: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. HECK.
- H.R. 2641: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 2670: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 2686: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 2687: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 2723: Mr. BARTON.
- H.R. 2740: Mr. PANETTA.
- H.R. 2748: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H.R. 2790: Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 2797: Mr. WOODALL and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2806: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 2821: Mr. BLUM.
- H.R. 2826: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 2839: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 2840: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 2859: Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 2871: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 2881: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 2885: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
- H.R. 2899: Mr. STIVERS and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
- H.R. 2902: Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 2909: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
- H.R. 2920: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 2926: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 2972: Mrs. TORRES.
- H.R. 2973: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
- H.R. 2987: Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 2999: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 3010: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3030: Mr. QUTGLY.
- H.R. 3034: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 3042: Mr. SMUCKER.
- H.R. 3111: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 3117: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 3120: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. ADERHOLT.
- H.R. 3148: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 3263: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 3272: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
- H.R. 3274: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 3312: Mr. WALKER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. EMMER.
- H.R. 3325: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 3327: Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 3329: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 3331: Mrs. TORRES and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 3347: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 3419: Mr. HARRIS.
- H.R. 3478: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 3489: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HECK, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 3513: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 3515: Mrs. WALORSKI.
- H.R. 3516: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 3534: Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 3545: Mr. EVANS and Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 3548: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 3572: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 3591: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 3635: Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 3687: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
- H.R. 3711: Mr. BABIN and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 3717: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BACON.
- H.R. 3721: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
- H.R. 3730: Ms. TITUS and Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 3738: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 3748: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 3759: Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RENACCI.
- H.R. 3767: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 3770: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. BASS, Mr. DENT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
- H.R. 3773: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 3774: Mr. BUCSHON.
- H.R. 3792: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3793: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 3796: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 3798: Mr. COLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. SMITH of H.R. 3806: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 3827: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 3832: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 3849: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 3855: Mr. COFFMAN.
- H.R. 3857: Mr. HULTGREN and Ms. TENNEY.
- H.R. 3858: Mr. GOMEZ.
- H.R. 3859: Mr. GOMEZ.
- H.R. 3861: Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 3862: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 3864: Ms. SINEMA and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
- H.R. 3869: Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 3897: Mr. OLSON, Mr. REED, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GALLEGOS.
- H.R. 3898: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 3906: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 3929: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 3931: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 3941: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 3947: Mr. CLAY and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 3966: Mrs. HANDEL.
- H.R. 3976: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DUFFY, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
- H.R. 3979: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 3980: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 4012: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. CHABOT.
- H.R. 4013: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
- H. J. Res. 6: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
- H. Con. Res. 72: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. JEFFRIES.
- H. Con. Res. 81: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H. Res. 142: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 274: Mr. POCAN and Mr. REICHERT.

H. Res. 401: Mr. LANCE and Mr. PANETTA.

H. Res. 428: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 443: Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 495: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H. Res. 521: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H. Res. 528: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 556: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 557: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 560: Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Res. 564: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. MASSIE.

H. Res. 566: Mr. GRIJALVA.