



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 2017

No. 15

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 30, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX 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, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

RESTORE VISA IMMIGRATION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, as we stand in the House Chamber today, over 4,000 U.S. military personnel are bringing the fight to ISIL terrorists in Iraq. Navy and Air Force pilots, Special Forces, and advisers are working hand in hand with Iraqis and Kurds to eject ISIL from Mosul, the city they declared 3 years ago as the capital of their caliphate.

Great progress has been made. Supported by thousands of U.S. air strikes, the eastern half of the city has been reclaimed by the forces of the civilized world and efforts are underway to finish the job in western Mosul.

Madam Speaker, none of this could have been done without the help of brave Iraqi interpreters who are essential to communicating all of the pieces of these operations.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am proud that from 2008 to 2016, we passed and re-passed a special immigration visa program to open the door of immigration to the U.S. for these interpreters as a safe haven, and also as a reward for putting their lives at risk and making sure that our troops can communicate safely and effectively in their operations.

Incredibly, on Friday, with one stroke of the pen, President Trump slammed the door shut on that program because he canceled all visa programs from Iraq.

If anyone could imagine a more demoralizing way to undercut the anti-ISIL alliance at such a critical time, Friday's order won the prize; and we are hearing from military commanders who are over there in Iraq talking about the blowback that is coming from our allies that were literally underway in real operations in real time.

We, in Congress, need to stop this order for the sake of our standing in the world as a beacon of hope and freedom and, if for nothing else, to support our troops and their allies in harm's way.

SUPPORT OF SHORT-TERM PROGRAM BANNING IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, the rhetoric coming from my

colleagues across the aisle and the liberal media regarding President Trump's executive order to strengthen American's immigration policy is harmful to our country and is placing law enforcement professionals at risk due to incited protests.

The fact is that President Trump is protecting America by strengthening our vetting procedures. The details of his order clearly state that the allowed level of immigrants from the affected foreign nations is essentially the average rate of the 15 years before President Obama's dangerous expansion of the program in 2016.

President Trump's executive order has simply restored sanity to America's immigration policy. It was President Obama who, against all reasonable consideration, put the American citizenry at risk in 2016 by his massive expansion of immigration from nations that are known to produce radical Islamic terrorists. Thank God that President Trump has upheld his oath to protect American lives.

This order puts a temporary pause on immigration from seven countries: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Sudan, Libya, Yemen, and Somalia. The governments in these countries are either hostile to the United States, or presently in great turmoil.

As a professional law enforcement officer for the last 13 years, I paid very close attention to the insane policies that put American citizens and American police at risk. I have watched carefully and prayerfully as terror attack after terror attack has shed American blood on American soil, and I have been privy to many jihadist plots that were stopped because of the dedicated courage and skilled law enforcement investigators; the same cops that have been for years maligned, attacked, and murdered across our Nation by Americans incited to violence by dangerously irresponsible rhetoric from the left.

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.

H705

It is clear to me that the status quo immigration policy will not control the threat, and I am thankful that President Trump is using his office to reverse the madness that preceded him.

America's war against terror should never invoke partisan revolt. We, as members of the people's House, must recognize that the American people are not willing to accept radical Islamic terror within our borders—from immigrants or anyone else—as a fact of American life.

President Trump's executive order for a short-term ban on entry from countries that are known to foster jihadists, combined with a systematic review of our immigration and vetting procedures is both necessary and reasonable.

Madam Speaker, the time for weakness has passed. Now is the time for strength and courage. Now is the time to reform our border control and immigration policies.

President Trump's order is not a betrayal of American values. His actions inspire hope to the millions of Americans who have watched our Nation decline over the past decade, watched helplessly, as radical Islamic horror has gripped the world and, unbelievably, been allowed into our own Nation with wanton disregard.

Now is the time for America to embrace its rightful place as leader of the free world. The President's executive order to strengthen our immigration policies are reflective of the timeless wisdom of peace through strength. It protects the American citizenry, preserves American values, reassures America's allies, and ensures America's future.

STAND UP AGAINST EXECUTIVE ORDER ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, this Sunday I was out on the road amongst my constituents when at about midday, I started to get panicked emails from the doctors of Yale New Haven Hospital because one of their own, Tarek Alasil, an ophthalmologist of Syrian dissent, an ophthalmologist who has made his home here in the United States, who has U.S. citizen children, who has his family in New Haven, had been detained in the Caribbean in the Bahamas.

He had been in the Caribbean doing cataract surgery for people who might otherwise not have access to the surgery that might allow them to see again; stepping forward, as all that we think is best about a country that was founded and strengthened by immigrants abroad, doing God's work as an ambassador—informal, though, he may have been—that America is a good and decent place.

But he was detained and sat there in the Bahamas detained by the customs and border patrol, wondering if he

would ever see his family again, wondering if he might ever become the United States citizen that he hoped to be, wondering if he was going to get sent back to his native city of Aleppo, which now is a smoking ruin.

Of course, we hear story after story like that. The worst I heard was an elderly lady in her eighties, Hamidyah Al Saeedi. Hamidyah Al Saeedi has a son who is a sergeant in the 82nd Airborne. She hadn't seen Sergeant Al Saeedi for 5 years, and she was on her way to the United States to see her son, a sergeant in the United States Army, for the first time in 5 years.

She spent 33 hours in detention; some of those hours handcuffed—this mother of an 82nd Airborne soldier—because of the actions of Donald Trump.

She thought she was going to be deported. She was told she would be deported. Thank God she wasn't, this mother of an 82nd Airborne soldier.

Madam Speaker, I serve on the Intelligence Committee and have for some 4 years. I know a little something about national security, and the executive order signed by President Trump on Saturday is not only about national security, it is profoundly dangerous to the security of this country because it gives our enemies a logic to say the United States is bigoted; it is anti-Muslim; and it does not stand for its principles.

What is this executive order?

It is a travesty. It is dangerous security theater. It is a knife in the heart of the values that founded this country. What it is most assuredly not is a mechanism to keep us safer.

It opens with a preamble on 9/11—a devastating day for all of us. Yet, not one of the countries that produced the 9/11 hijackers is on the list of countries affected by this order.

How do you explain that?

All over the world right now radical Muslims are saying: We told you so.

And we are hearing this from our generals. We are hearing this from our national security experts; not one of whom has stood up and said that this is a good idea which will keep us safer.

It comes at a huge cost to our country. The costs to our values that we are a decent country are incalculable and we will be bearing them for a long time.

We are the Congress of the United States. We are the House of Representatives. We are the people's House. Article I of the Constitution—now is the time to stand up against this madness. I plead with my Republican colleagues: Now is the time to stand up for national security, for safety, and for the values enshrined by the Constitution to which we all pledged an oath.

I understand I am a Democrat, so maybe I don't have that much credibility with my Republican colleagues. Let me quote to you what Eliot Cohen, noted conservative, national security strategist, former State Department official said: "Either you stand up for your principles and for what you know

is decent behavior, or you go down, if not now, then years from now, as a coward or opportunist. Your reputation will never recover, nor should it."

History is staring us in the face right now. It doesn't happen very often, but it is staring us in the face right now. And when history stares you in the face, that is not a gaze that wavers. It stays for generations. And how you respond to that gaze and how you behave will be the stuff of the stories of your children and your grandchildren.

So now is the time for the Congress of the United States to stand up to the bigotry, to the national security theater, to the destruction of our values, with legislation that reverses this travesty of a decision that we saw this weekend.

SURVIVOR TINA FRUNDT—FIGHTS THE HUMAN TRAFFICKERS AND RESCUES VICTIMS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, she was a 14-year-old girl when she was forced into sex trafficking. Her name is Tina Frundt.

Like so many other trafficking victims, she was lured away from the safety of her home—a home nearby to this United States Capitol—and she was lured away by a man she thought she knew, and she trusted him.

He sweet-talked her and promised her a perfect life somewhere far away. He was a smooth-talking, slick con artist, tempting her with gifts and affection just to get her into the slave trade.

Her blissful, happy, and trusting world view all came crashing down when she found herself in a dark motel room surrounded by unfamiliar men in an unfamiliar city.

The trafficker forced her to have sex with the men for money. When she refused to have sex, the men just raped her. They stole her dignity, her self-respect, and her happy spirit.

□ 1215

Tina had become a slave on the marketplace of sex trafficking. These disgusting predators used the innocence of children to force them into the horrific life of sex trafficking. Most cannot imagine the depths of the suffering and abuse Tina suffered during the next year. She was forced to have sex with over 18 men a day. When she fell short of the mandatory \$500 daily quota, she was beaten and beaten and humiliated. Her life consisted of cigarette burns, broken arms, broken fingers, and intimidation. Tina was arrested, treated as a delinquent, and was shuttled from one jailhouse to another.

Tina and other victims of human trafficking are victims of crime—they are not criminals; they are not juvenile prostitutes. Under the law, juveniles cannot commit the crime of prostitution. These victims do not belong in the criminal justice system. It is the

vile traffickers and buyers who belong behind bars. In fact, we built jails and prisons for these deviants.

Stories like Tina's are common in our Nation. Sex trafficking just does not happen in foreign countries. As co-chair of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, along with my friend JIM COSTA and coauthor of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, along with CAROLYN MALONEY, it seems to me that, in America, human trafficking victims need to be identified, rescued, and not abandoned.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act does three things: it prosecutes the traffickers—the slave traders—and it locks them up. It prosecutes the buyers in that it punishes them like the traffickers; it rescues the victims and treats them as victims, not as criminals; finally, it establishes a fund that is paid by the traffickers and the buyers to help treat and restore victims with long-term care.

Let those crooks pay for the system they have created, and let them pay the rent on the courthouse. America cannot let young girls be bought and sold on the streets of our Nation. These predators are everywhere. They are not old men in trench coats but are young, good-looking guys who are well versed in their vile trade. Their next victim could be anybody's daughter or wife.

No human being should ever have to endure what Tina and other trafficking victims like her have gone through. Tina was able to escape her slave trader, and she has become a survivor. Tina, along with many other survivors, has found a way to turn her darkness of hell into a light for good.

Recently, I was honored to tour Courtney's House, which is a shelter right here in Washington, D.C., that Tina founded to rescue and support trafficking victims. She actively uses her personal experience to connect with those girls and give them support, nourishment, hope—things that they need. Since 2008, Courtney's House has helped over 500 victims escape the bonds of sex slavery and become survivors.

In this Human Trafficking Awareness Month, I wish to commend Tina's leadership and zeal in helping other victims become survivors. Tina is inspiring courageous. Victims and survivors should know that we as a society stand with them and by them; and let the law put the traffickers and buyers in jail.

Madam Speaker, justice demands such.

And that is just the way it is.

THIS IS NOT WHO WE ARE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, this is not who we are. The executive order that the President is executing does not reflect our American values. It is not consistent with a clear statement in our Constitution that we do not dis-

criminate on the basis of national origin, that we do not discriminate on the basis of religion. Read the executive order. It does those precise things.

But there are other foundational documents that contradict what the President is executing. Matthew 25: "I was a stranger, and you invited me in. . . ." This policy is morally bankrupt. It is an attempt to pander to narrow voices to which this President promised a Muslim ban. He went to Rudy Giuliani and asked how to do a Muslim ban, and this is what they came up with.

Make no mistake. This is not who we are. Not only is it morally wrong—against everything we have been taught about who we are as a country—but this administration has been dangerously incompetent in how it is even implementing this misguided policy—secretive. I saw a White House spokesman this morning admit that they kept this secret from the very people who are going to be asked to implement this wrong-headed policy. It is morally wrong, and it is being administered in a dangerously incompetent way.

Most importantly, this policy will not make us safe. This unconstitutional executive order will make us less safe. What is the message we are trying to send—that we are an intolerant Nation? that, if you happen to have different beliefs, you are not welcome here? People who are literally being handcuffed are people who have a legal right to be in the United States of America.

We cannot normalize this. We cannot accept this as simply a difference of opinion over how to secure our borders. It makes us less secure to send a message to the world that we are this narrow and—yes—bigoted Nation. We are not that. Even for many of those people who supported this President, this is not what they voted for. I ask my colleagues to, for God's sake, speak up.

Join the faith leaders who are speaking up against this terrible, unconstitutional policy. Join the business leaders who are saying this is wrong. Join your own Republican colleagues—many in an increasing number—who are having the courage to stand up against the President of their own party and say "no." This is not who we are. This does not reflect who we are. This is morally wrong. This is constitutionally wrong, and this is dangerous.

History will judge where people who sit in this House stood on this day on this question.

Stand with your fellow Americans. Stand with the Constitution. Stand with those who are willing to speak up and speak truth to power and say this is wrong, that this is not America. This must end now. Add your voice to that chorus. Be on the right side of history.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of this assembly as they set upon the important work that faces them. Help them to make wise decisions in a good manner and to carry their responsibilities steadily with high hopes for a better future for our great Nation.

May the desire to act speedily to implement promises made while campaigning not prevent the careful consideration of all possible outcomes in the governing process. Send Your spirit of wisdom and discernment upon them in their work.

May Your blessing, O God, be with all of our leaders this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BARRAGÁN 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.

THE SHAME ACT SHAMES TRAFFICKERS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, those dastardly deviants that are in the slave trade of human sex trafficking try to dehumanize their victim. Victims sometimes lose their self-worth and dignity of existence.

Last Congress, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, led by CAROLYN MALONEY and me, was enacted to go after traffickers and buyers to rescue victims. Now it is time to expose

the identity of convicted traffickers and sellers of human beings. That is why Mrs. MALONEY and I have introduced the Shame Act.

The Shame Act allows Federal judges to publicly publish the names and photographs of convicted traffickers and buyers. Shaming works. I successfully used it as a judge in Texas. Dubbed "poetic justice" by the media, I learned the last thing criminals want are their faces and crimes exposed to the public.

It is time to let traffickers and buyers know they cannot hide their evil and the darkness. Put their photographs on billboards. Shame them. Shame them for their slave trade.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the names of the organizations that support the Shame Act.

1. Polaris.
2. The International Organization for Victim Assistance.
3. Shared Hope.
4. The National Organization for Victim Assistance.
5. The Texas Centers for Child Advocacy.
6. The Texas Court Appointed Special Advocates.
7. Stop Child Predators.
8. The Family Focused Treatment Association.

BAN ON REFUGEES

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because of what we saw happening this weekend.

President Trump's executive order is unconstitutional, un-American, and unlawful. I myself went to Los Angeles International Airport on Saturday night, and what I saw was shocking to me. I saw Fatema coming in from an airline—a legal, permanent resident in this country, who came with her 1-year-old son who is an American citizen—being detained with the threat of being deported and pressured to sign to give up her right to be a legal permanent resident.

I was fighting to get to her, to make sure she had legal counsel, to make sure that she had that opportunity, and I was unsuccessful. Despite me and another Member being there, the Customs and Border Protection wouldn't even talk to us. They wouldn't give us a briefing. They merely hung up on us.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. This provision is discriminatory based on religion and nationality. This did not only affect a small number of travelers; this affected families; this affected lawyers and volunteers who came out in the masses. I hope the President will see.

I will work to ensure the Federal Government obeys the Constitution, respects our history as a nation of immigrants, and does not unlawfully target anyone because of their national origin or faith.

RECOGNIZING THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE WORK OF SCOTT CHESTER GRAVES

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank a longtime member of my staff, Scott Graves, for his 12 years of service on Capitol Hill. Scott has worked in numerous capacities, starting as an agriculture legislative assistant and then as a legislative director, then as my chief of staff, and, most recently, as staff director at the House Committee on Agriculture. He is a well-respected and accomplished leader; and though he is moving on, I know he will continue to accomplish great things for American agriculture.

Scott has been my right-hand man for many years, helping me navigate the complexities of the 2008 and 2014 farm bills, serving as an adviser when I chaired the House Committee on Ethics, and keeping the wheels running in both my personal office and the Agriculture Committee. Although much of his work was done behind the scenes, my colleagues and I knew we could always count on Scott to get results.

Beyond his many professional attributes, I will certainly miss his wit and humor. I am very proud of him, and I wish Scott, Haley, Bronte, and a unit to be named this summer the very best. I want to thank him for his loyalty and dedication to public service, and I wish him Godspeed in the next chapter of his life.

OPEN YOUR HEARTS TO THE REST OF THE WORLD

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, this is my first 1-minute in 20 years—first one—and I am here today to basically call out my colleagues who remained silent this weekend as Lady Liberty shed tears.

It is not about extreme vetting. No one has concerns about punching it up a little bit. This weekend we took people from around this world who are legally, legally, legally coming to our country, many of whom have been through every single vetting we can give them. We embarrassed ourselves and them in what we did this weekend.

Where is the terror threat from a 5-year-old child?

Where is the terror threat from a professor coming to MIT or a research scientist coming in?

There is none. Not one of the seven countries mentioned provided one single terrorist.

And for those people who say, I am here just to protect our country, I have been in Boston all of my life. The largest numbers of people came out from

New York City and Boston. It was our people who lost their lives, yet we remain humanistic and openhearted.

Open your hearts to the rest of the world.

NEW ADMINISTRATION IS COMMITTED TO MILITARY READINESS

(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, on Friday, President Donald Trump took lifesaving action to begin the much-needed process of rebuilding our military.

For the past 5 years, the failed policy of defense sequestration has forced our military to endure extreme reductions, dangerously affecting equipment, personnel, and training readiness. Under the order, Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis will review all aspects of military readiness.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness, with four sons who have served overseas, I especially appreciate President Trump's commitment to rebuilding the military. It is critical for American families to ensure that our troops have the resources and training to accomplish their missions.

This order is a positive first step, and I look forward to working alongside President Donald Trump, Vice President MIKE PENCE, Speaker PAUL RYAN, and Chairman MAC THORBERRY as we ensure our troops have the resources they need to promote peace through strength.

God bless our troops.

We will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Thank you, President Donald Trump, for vetting refugees to protect American families.

HONORING FRED KOREMATSU DAY

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Fred Korematsu Day. I could hardly imagine a more relevant time to celebrate his fight for freedom and equality.

When the United States incarcerated 115,000 Japanese Americans during World War II, including my parents and grandparents, Fred Korematsu resisted Executive Order 9066 and courageously stood up for the oppressed when few others would.

History often forces us to ask ourselves: How would we have acted if we lived in that moment? Through the President's recent executive order, we no longer have to wonder.

How you react to the Muslim ban today is how you would have reacted to the imprisonment of my grandparents and parents 75 years ago. If you are silent today, you would have been silent

then. If you are complicit today, you would have been complicit then.

This great institution is facing an enormous test of our commitment to liberty and justice for all. Let our children and grandchildren look back and see that we passed that test.

LIMIT NASA'S CLIMATE AGENDA

(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, NASA has given us a good reason to limit the amount of funds the agency gets for climate change.

They recently claimed that a landslide in Alaska, fires in Yellowstone National Park in 1988, and a drought in California were all due to climate change. But extreme weather events actually had been declining over the last few decades at the same time that carbon emissions have been increasing.

That NASA has played so fast and loose with the facts with the clear intent to mislead the American people shows why they can't be trusted with hard-earned taxpayers' dollars.

Cervantes wrote in *Don Quixote* that "one swallow doesn't make a summer." Well, one weather event doesn't presage climate change disaster. Ignore the media's exaggerations, the alarmists' predictions, and scientists trying to scare men, women, and small children.

As for NASA, let's get them out of hyping climate change and back to exploring space.

RECOGNIZING KARLA-SUE MARRIOTT

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Karla-Sue Marriott, associate professor of chemistry and forensic science at Savannah State University.

Dr. Marriott has made groundbreaking chemical discoveries to help millions of people with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and ALS. Dr. Marriott began her work at Savannah State in 2006, after completing a postdoctoral fellowship at Clemson University.

In 2010, while at Savannah State, she applied for a grant with the National Institutes of Health, which allowed her to research dopamine and sigma receptors in the brain. It was through this research that Dr. Marriott discovered the chemical compound called benzofuran.

Benzofuran has the ability to target and activate signal receptors in the brain, while leaving other central nervous system receptors alone. This has the potential to reduce the impact of various neurological diseases.

However, Dr. Marriott's work is not done. She will continue her research to

discover the full potential of her compound and the benefits it can provide.

I am proud to recognize Dr. Marriott today, and I am thankful for the work she is doing at Savannah State University.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DESIGNATING A MOUNTAIN IN THE JOHN MUIR WILDERNESS AS SKY POINT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 381) to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as "Sky Point".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 381

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Staff Sergeant Sky Mote, USMC, grew up in El Dorado, California.

(2) Staff Sergeant Mote graduated from Union Mine High School.

(3) Upon graduation, Staff Sergeant Mote promptly enlisted in the Marine Corps.

(4) Staff Sergeant Mote spent 9 years serving his country in the United States Marine Corps, including a deployment to Iraq and two deployments to Afghanistan.

(5) By his decisive actions, heroic initiative, and resolute dedication to duty, Staff Sergeant Mote gave his life to protect fellow Marines on August 10, 2012, by gallantly rushing into action during an attack by a rogue Afghan policeman inside the base perimeter in Helmand province.

(6) Staff Sergeant Mote was awarded the Navy Cross, a Purple Heart, the Navy-Marine Corps Commendation Medal, a Navy-Marine Corps Achievement Medal, 2 Combat Action Ribbons and 3 Good Conduct Medals.

(7) The Congress of the United States, in acknowledgment of this debt that cannot be

repaid, honors Staff Sergeant Mote for his ultimate sacrifice and recognizes his service to his country, faithfully executed to his last, full measure of devotion.

(8) A presently unnamed peak in the center of Humphrey Basin holds special meaning to the friends and family of Sky Mote, as their annual hunting trips set up camp beneath this point; under the stars, the memories made beneath this rounded peak will be cherished forever.

SEC. 2. SKY POINT.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest in California, located at 37°15'16.10091"N 118°43'39.54102"W, shall be known and designated as "Sky Point".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the mountain described in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to "Sky Point".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would name a peak in the Sierra Nevada Mountains after Marine Staff Sergeant Sky Mote as a small token of the gratitude of our Nation, and as a permanent reminder that, as Shakespeare put it: "This story should the good man teach his son."

On August 12, 2012, Sergeant Mote was at his post in the tactical operations center of the 1st Marine Special Operations Battalion in Helmand province. On that day, a so-called Afghan police officer opened fire on the Marines who had come there to help that country.

When the attack broke out, Sergeant Mote was in an adjoining room. He could have easily escaped to safety. According to the Navy citation: "He instead grabbed his M4 rifle and entered the operations room, courageously exposing himself to a hail of gunfire in order to protect his fellow Marines. In his final act of bravery, he boldly engaged the gunman, now less than 5 meters in front of him, until falling mortally wounded."

According to the citation, it was Mote's actions that stopped the attack, and it was his heroism for which he received the Navy's second highest decoration: the Navy Cross.

The irony is that Sky Mote was indifferent to the medals he was awarded during his life: the Navy and Marine

Corps Commendation Medal, the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, two Combat Action Ribbons, and three Good Conduct Medals that he earned during his 9 years of exemplary service to his Nation.

His father, Russell, recalled that “He never cared about medals. He never showed them to us.” He said: “Once, I found one in his laundry.” But his father also said that although his son was indifferent to medals, he was intentionally and intensely proud of his EOD badge, designating his service as an explosive ordnance disposal technician.

To the EOD technicians, bombs are not something to be avoided but something to be sought out and disarmed. On one such day, Mote diffused two IEDs, crawled through a heavily seeded minefield to save the life of his team member who had been severely wounded by a third, and then directed the evacuation of his unit. On that day, Sergeant Mote had earned a Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with a V for valor.

We come today to the Hall of the House of Representatives to try to honor a hero who didn’t care much about medals.

We do so not for him. Lincoln was right long ago that it is far beyond our poor powers to add or detract from the honor of his deeds and the example of his life.

I think we do so in part to acknowledge an irredeemable debt that our country owes to an eternally grieving family. We need to remember there are Gold Star families among us who spend their Memorial Days not at barbecues and beach parties but in solemn ceremonies and quiet vigils around honored graves. We honor their loved ones in hopes that in some small way we can fortify them against the loss that they bear every day of their lives.

But, mainly, I think we do it for ourselves, that we might draw inspiration from his courage and instruction from his willingness to sacrifice all to protect the vision of liberty enshrined in the founding of our Nation.

In consultation with his family, we have identified a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest overlooking where Sky Mote and his family often camped and hiked. This bill proposes that it forever more be known as Sky Point as a token of our Nation’s respect of his heroism, its appreciation of his sacrifice, its sympathy for his family, and of its solemn pledge that succeeding generations of his countrymen will never forget him.

This legislation first passed the House by voice vote in the 114th Congress, and I urge the passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, wow, just listening to my good friend from California explain and give us a description of what happened in the life of this American hero,

Sergeant Sky Mote, I am truly touched by the many other stories that I have heard from families of our men and women in uniform, our veterans in service of our country.

And as we have just heard, this bill designates a mountain peak in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest in California as “Sky Point” in recognition of a fallen Marine Corps Staff Sergeant Sky Mote.

Sky served our country honorably as a U.S. marine for 9 years. He had a tour of duty in Iraq and two in Afghanistan.

By designating that mountain as “Sky Point,” it will honor his memory and ensure his selfless sacrifice for his country and fellow marines is not forgotten.

We passed this legislation last Congress by voice vote, and I urge that we do the same again today.

I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California, for introducing this bill today.

As I have no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind and good words and urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 381.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS ECONOMIC EXPANSION ACT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 339) to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 339

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Northern Mariana Islands Economic Expansion Act”.

SEC. 2. COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS: TRANSITIONAL WORKERS.

Section 6 of Public Law 94-241 (48 U.S.C. 1806) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(6), by striking “\$150” and inserting “\$200”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting “, except a permit for construction occupations (as that term is defined by the Department of Labor as Standard Occupational Classification Group 47-0000 or any successor provision) shall only be issued to extend a permit first issued before October 1, 2015.”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end of the third sentence and inserting “, except that

for fiscal year 2017 the number of permits issued shall not exceed 15,000.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House has before it H.R. 339, sponsored by Congressman SABLAN of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The House passed an identical bill this past December just before the conclusion of the 114th Congress. However, that bill was unable to pass the Senate and make it to the President’s desk for signature before the end of that Congress, and so I am here today to once again urge the bill’s passage through the House and on to the Senate.

The Northern Mariana Islands are benefiting by new investment and growth of consumer spending, particularly in tourism. Their economic growth rate is almost twice that of the rest of our country.

To meet this growth, the Commonwealth has to maintain a workforce to match it. Currently, the Northern Marianas is phasing out the use of foreign workers by slowly reducing the total number of CW-1 permits issued by the Department of Homeland Security. Economic growth is dynamic, but bureaucracy is not. If the CW-1 permits are phased out too quickly, the islands may suffer a growth-stopping shortage of labor. This bill would provide flexibility to the Commonwealth in order to protect its newfound economic prosperity in three critical ways:

First, it would fund ongoing vocational education curricula and program development to assure a skilled domestic workforce funded from an increase in CW-1 fees from \$150 to \$200.

Second, it would limit the CW-1 permits for construction occupation to those issued prior to October 1 of 2015.

And third, it would temporarily increase the number of CW-1 permits during this transition period.

Mr. Speaker, these changes will continue to accommodate the economic growth in the Northern Marianas, while assuring a trained domestic workforce for the future.

I would urge adoption of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman ROB BISHOP for allowing my bill to come to the floor again.

We passed the same bill in the House on December 6, but the Senate adjourned 3 days later without acting, and the problem has not gone away.

The economy of the Northern Mariana Islands grew 3.5 percent last year, the fourth straight year of growth for my district.

This strong economic expansion is good news for the people I represent. We desperately want this growth to continue because our economy is still smaller than it was in 2000.

The Northern Mariana Islands Economic Expansion Act addresses that problem and is broadly supported back home.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from Governor Ralph DeLeon Guerrero Torres of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; from the Commonwealth's Strategic Economic Development Council; the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation; the Hotel Association of the Northern Mariana Islands; and from the Saipan Chamber of Commerce.

CNMI STRATEGIC ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL,
December 1, 2016.

Hon. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLAN: The CNMI Strategic Economic Development Committee is in strong support of H.R. 6401, critical legislation that will provide short-term relief from the labor shortage threatening the growth of the Northern Marianas economy.

The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis indicates the Commonwealth economy grew for the fourth consecutive year, a recent high of 3.5 percent. This is attributable to increased private investment and tourism now threatened by the lack of available qualified workers on the island.

The modest one-year increase in Commonwealth-Only Transitional Workers (CW) proposed under H.R. 6401, will provide the business community with the necessary human resources to continue to operate and propel an expanding economy.

It is imperative that we do not stymie our plan for fixture economic growth, now beginning to come to fruition, with a labor shortage in critical areas.

The bill also provides additional funds for the job training/education programs proven effective at expanding the pool of qualified and skilled U.S. workers in the CNMI.

The CNMI Strategic Economic Development Council fully supports H.R. 6401 and appreciates all of your efforts in addressing the labor crisis in the Northern Marianas.

Very truly yours,
ALEXANDER A. SABLAN,
Sub Committee Chairman,
Labor & CW Task Force, CNMI Strategic Economic Development Committee.

SAIPAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
December 2, 2016.

Hon. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLAN: The Saipan Chamber of Commerce is in strong support of H.R. 6401, critical legislation that will pro-

vide short-term relief from the labor shortage threatening the growth of the Northern Marianas economy.

The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis indicates the Commonwealth economy grew for the fourth consecutive year, a recent high of 3.5 percent. This is attributable to increased private investment and tourism now threatened by the lack of available qualified workers on the island.

The modest one-year increase in Commonwealth-Only Transitional Workers (CW) proposed under H.R. 6401, will provide the business community with the necessary human resources to continue to operate and propel an expanding economy. It will also provide additional critical funds for job training and education programs that are steadily expanding the pool of qualified and skilled U.S. workers on Saipan.

The Saipan Chamber of Commerce fully supports H.R. 6401 and appreciates all of your efforts in addressing the labor crisis in the Northern Marianas.

Very truly yours,
VELMA M. PALACIOS,
President of the Board,
Saipan Chamber of Commerce.

HOTEL ASSOCIATION OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,
December 2, 2016.

Hon. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLAN: The Hotel Association of the Northern Mariana Islands is in strong support of H.R. 6401, critical legislation that will provide short-term relief from the labor shortage threatening the growing hospitality industry in the Northern Marianas.

Due in large part to increased private investment and tourism the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis recently announced that the Commonwealth economy grew for the fourth consecutive year.

However, our hotel and resort properties are in critical need of labor, particularly those with skills and experience in the hospitality industry, culinary arts and property maintenance. The inability of employers to renew or hire new Commonwealth-Only Transitional Workers (CW) threatens their continued operations and chills future investment in our islands.

The modest one-year increase in CWs, proposed under H.R. 6401, will allow the hospitality industry to continue to provide first-class service to our tourists.

The Hotel Association of the Northern Mariana Islands fully supports H.R. 6401 and appreciates all of your efforts in addressing the labor crisis in the Northern Marianas.

Very truly yours,
GLORIA CAVANAGH,
Chairman, Hotel Association of the Northern Mariana Islands.

COMMONWEALTH HEALTHCARE CORPORATION, COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,
December 2, 2016.

Hon. GREGORIO "KILILI" CAMACHO SABLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLAN: Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation (CHCC) is in strong support of H.R. 6401.

This critical legislation would provide an increase in the FY 2017 limit on Commonwealth-Only Transitional Workers (CW) and allow the CHCC to petition for renewal of 39 essential healthcare workers impacted when the CW cap was reached just two weeks into the Fiscal Year.

Our Commonwealth Health Center (CHC) is the only hospital in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, providing inpatient and outpatient acute, chronic, and emergency health care services to the people of the CNMI. We also maintain community health centers on the populated islands of Saipan, Tinian, and Rota.

Our ability to continue to provide these essential on-island health care services, and maintain quality patient care and safety as well as maintain overall public health, depends on being able to maintain current staffing levels and specialized expertise.

Without an increase to the CW cap this year, CHC stands to lose the services and experience of 34 staff nurses, two infection control nurses, a clinical laboratory scientist and specialists in mammography and ultrasonography.

For the foregoing reasons, we are in full support H.R. 6401 and are grateful for your work in addressing this critical health care issue.

Sincerely,
ESTHER L. MUNA,
Chief Executive Officer.

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,
December 4, 2016.

Hon. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLAN: I write to support H.R. 6401, critical legislation that will provide short-term relief from the labor shortage facing the Commonwealth that threatens our growing economy and public health.

The latest report from Bureau of Economic Analysis indicates the Commonwealth economy grew for the fourth consecutive year. A growing economy needs a qualified workforce. And while there are now more U.S. workers than foreign workers in the Northern Marianas for the first time in decades, there are still not enough to meet the labor demand. The temporary increase in the number of Commonwealth-Only Transitional (CW) workers provided in your bill will particularly help small businesses retain the workers needed to maintain operations.

Most importantly, the Commonwealth's only hospital, stand to lose critical staff including 34 staff nurses, two infection control nurses, a clinical laboratory scientist and specialists in mammography, ultrasonography without the relief provided in H.R. 6401.

Building a qualified U.S. workforce in the Northern Marianas is a priority for my administration. The CW worker fee increase in the legislation will provide additional funding for efforts to recruit, educate, and train these workers and establish a permanent pool of workers to fill local jobs.

H.R. 6401 is critical to continued economic growth in the Northern Marianas. The bill has my full support.

Sincerely,
RALPH DLG TORRES,
Governor.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank again Chairman ROB BISHOP of the Natural Resources Committee for his understanding and support. I also thank Chairman DON YOUNG who held a hearing on this issue last September and agreed that action was needed.

I appreciate the support of Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA and our new Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs Subcommittee Ranking Member NORMA TORRES.

Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, and to the

majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, and to my friend Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California who agreed to bring H.R. 339 to the floor today.

I ask for support of H.R. 339.

Having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House to finish the work that it began in December by passing this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 339.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT ONTARIO STUDY ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 46) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 46

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fort Ontario Study Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) From 1755 until 1814, Fort Ontario and three previous fortifications built on the site of the Fort in Oswego, New York, on the shore of Lake Ontario were used as military installations during the French and Indian War, the Revolutionary War, and the War of 1812.

(2) The original fort, erected by the British in 1755, was destroyed by French forces in 1756. The fort was rebuilt and subsequently destroyed during both the American Revolution and the War of 1812. The star-shaped fort was constructed on the site of the original fortifications in the 1840s, with improvements made from 1863 through 1872.

(3) The United States Armed Forces began expanding Fort Ontario in the early 20th century and by 1941, approximately 125 buildings stood at the fort.

(4) On June 9, 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that Fort Ontario would serve as the Nation's only Emergency Refugee Camp during World War II. From August of 1944 until February 1946, nearly 1,000 refugees were sheltered at Fort Ontario.

(5) Fort Ontario was conveyed from the Federal Government to the State of New York in 1946; it was used to house World War II veterans and their families and then converted to a State historic site in 1953.

(6) A post cemetery containing the graves of 77 officers, soldiers, women, and children who served at Fort Ontario in war and peace is situated on the grounds of the fort.

(7) In 1970, Fort Ontario was placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

SEC. 3. FORT ONTARIO SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Sec-

retary") shall conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in Oswego, New York.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the site;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the lands by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations or any other interested individuals;

(5) determine the effect of the designation of the site as a unit of the National Park System on existing commercial and recreational uses and the effect on State and local governments to manage those activities;

(6) identify any authorities, including condemnation, that may compel or allow the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal land if the site is designated a unit of the National Park System; and

(7) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives.

(c) APPLICABLE LAW.—The study authorized under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the findings of the study; and
(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Congressman JOHN KATKO of New York brings us H.R. 46, which authorizes the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in Oswego, New York, to evaluate the site's national significance and determine the suitability of its designation as a unit of the National Park system.

□ 1645

Fort Ontario was first established in 1755 to defend Americans during the

French and Indian Wars. You might say it was the first time our Nation has dealt with organized terrorism. It played a role in the American Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 and served our country as a hospital, training facility, and a refugee center in the First and Second World Wars.

In 1946, after nearly 200 years of active military use, Fort Ontario was transferred to the State of New York, which has operated and maintained it ever since. The House passed a nearly identical version of this legislation in the 114th Congress.

I urge adoption of the measure.

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

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

This bill authorizes the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in Oswego, New York. Fort Ontario was a military installation used during the French and Indian Wars, which was later used to house refugees fleeing the Nazi Holocaust during World War II.

Many Americans remember our Nation's role in World War II through events like the Invasion of Normandy or the Battle of Iwo Jima, closer to my district, which have been re-imagined in film and memorialized in stone, but the story of Fort Ontario is an equally important component of our historical legacy. Providing physical refuge from persecution says as much about our national character as the bravery and sacrifice of the millions of Americans who were deployed overseas.

The site has been managed as a New York State historic site since 1949 and has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 1970. The study authorized by this bill will look into the best available options for the continued preservation and management of Fort Ontario, including the possibility of turning it into a unit of the National Park System.

Fort Ontario has had many uses throughout our Nation's history, and it has had a particularly relevant place in the story of Jewish Americans. As we work to ensure that our public lands tell the story of all Americans, Fort Ontario and its unique story could be a fitting addition.

This bill passed the House last September but was, unfortunately, not acted upon by the Senate.

I would like to thank Representative KATKO, the sponsor of this bill, for his continued efforts to ensure the Nation knows about the story of Fort Ontario.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), the author of this measure.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank both gentlemen for their kind words about this truly unique historical fort in my district.

Fort Ontario stood on the shores of Lake Ontario for over 260 years and now stands as a testament to the great history of central New York and the important role the region has played in our Nation's history. The Fort has been involved in nearly every major American war, from the French and Indian Wars to World War II.

From 1944 to 1946, Fort Ontario served as our Nation's only emergency refugee camp, providing shelter to over 980 refugees during World War II. In recognition of the Fort's use as a refugee shelter, primarily for Jewish people fleeing Hitler's Europe, the site also hosts the Safe Haven Holocaust Refugee Shelter Museum. It is a truly unique fort in our country.

Following World War II, the fort was transferred to the State of New York to house war veterans and their families until 1953. This unparalleled history would make Fort Ontario a unique asset to our National Park System.

I am honored to have introduced this legislation, which takes the first steps toward ensuring Fort Ontario receives the national recognition it richly deserves. The Fort Ontario Study Act would commission a special resource study of Fort Ontario to evaluate the site's national significance and determine the suitability of its designation as a part of the National Park System.

Fort Ontario, now a national historic site in New York and listed on the National Register of Historic Places, draws residents of New York, visitors across the Nation, and, indeed, across the globe to experience the rich history of the fort and the Safe Haven Holocaust Refugee Shelter Museum. Designating the fort as a national park will not only preserve the unique history of the site, but also have the potential to grow tourism and strengthen our economy.

I am proud to be a champion of this effort, and I credit this success to the countless individuals and organizations in Oswego, New York, and throughout the 24th District who have spent years working to preserve the history of Fort Ontario. These groups and individuals include the Friends of Fort Ontario, Paul Lear with New York State Parks, the Board of the Safe Haven Holocaust Refugee Shelter Museum, and the many volunteers that give so much of their time to this cause.

Reflecting the importance of the fort to the entire region, I introduced this bill with Congresswoman TENNEY and Congresswoman SLAUGHTER. I would like to thank them both for their support, as well as Chairman BISHOP for working toward moving this legislation forward.

I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 46, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to take quick action on this important legislation.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption and support of the bill.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this is an important part of American his-

tory. It belongs in the National Park System. I urge adoption of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 46.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUNGENESS CRAB FISHERY MANAGEMENT SUNSET PROVISION REMOVAL

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 374) to remove the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105-384, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 374

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

SECTION 1. DUNGENESS CRAB FISHERY MANAGEMENT.

Section 203 of the Act entitled "An Act to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Republic of Poland, and for other purposes", approved November 13, 1998 (Public Law 105-384; 16 U.S.C. 1856 note), is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (i); and
- (2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House has before it H.R. 374, sponsored by our colleague, Congresswoman JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER of Washington.

This bipartisan, consensus-based legislation would permanently reauthorize the successful management of the Dungeness crab fisheries of Washington, Oregon, and California by these respective States. They have been doing so since 1980, and doing it well.

This permanent reauthorization is broadly supported by commercial and recreational fishing organizations. It is

an example of the maxim: "If it ain't broke, don't try and fix it."

I might add that these three States manage these fisheries in both Federal and State waters, and the management is funded by the participating States—a relief to the Federal Treasury.

In the last Congress, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that an identical bill would save up to \$1 million in discretionary Federal spending since State management would continue under this act. This bill is a win for the American taxpayer, a win for the seafood consumer, and a win for the three States involved.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

H.R. 374 would reward the States of California, Oregon, and Washington for their long legacy of successful cooperative management of the West Coast Dungeness crab fishery in Federal waters. These States have, with oversight from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, managed this fishery sustainably, and this bill would make that management arrangement permanent.

The specifics of the Dungeness crab fishery, including robust stock assessments, accurate catch reporting, and little conflict between commercial and recreational crabbers, make regional management a good choice. This is basically the opposite of a fishery like Gulf of Mexico red snapper, where there is a lack of cooperation among States and fishing sectors.

I agree with the goals of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to stand with me in support.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. BEUTLER), the author of this legislation.

Ms. BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the West Coast Dungeness crab fishery agreement.

This successful, two-decades-old tri-state Dungeness crab management agreement expired on September 30, 2016. This bill simply extends the working management authority between Washington, Oregon, and California and makes this arrangement permanent. A similar measure passed the House last year with flying colors.

For approximately two decades, these States have successfully overseen one of the most valuable fisheries in the Pacific Northwest. In 2014, fishermen delivered 53 million pounds of crab to market, totaling \$170 million. This economic activity helps support more than 60,000 jobs related to the seafood industry in Washington alone.

How has it maintained its success? The fishery has been managed in a sustainable, science-based way, and, importantly, it doesn't cost taxpayers a

dime. If we do not renew this agreement, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, says its management of this fishery will cost taxpayers \$1.15 million per year.

Simply put, this bill maintains local control of a crucial resource and ensures sustainability of the Dungeness crab fishery, all while saving taxpayer dollars. This bill is the kind of commonsense policy that those folks I represent at home in southwest Washington expect to see out of Washington, D.C.

I want to thank Chairman BISHOP and the House Natural Resources staff for bringing this bill to the floor. Passage of this bipartisan bill gives fishermen and coastal communities on the West Coast peace of mind.

I urge the House to vote “yes” on this bill and to ensure a bright, sustainable economic future for coastal crab-dependent communities like Ilwaco, Washington, and many others on the West Coast.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the sponsor and the cosponsors of this bill, Congressman DEFAZIO, Congressman KILMER, Congressman HUFFMAN, and many others that are supporting this legislation.

This is important in that it promotes regional management. Today, this pertains to the Dungeness crab, a species that is largely native to the West Coast. In this case, what this legislation does is provide for regional management. It provides for an opportunity for the States of Washington, Oregon, and California to manage this species.

The States are closer to the ground. They have closer, more intimate relationships with their fishers, and they can ensure that what is being done is in the best interests of those folks, the best interests of the public that they are closer to, and the best interests of the recreational and commercial fishers that fish this species.

I think it is fantastic. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think this exact model should be expanded. I think this exact model should be replicated not just in Washington, Oregon, and California; it should be replicated elsewhere, similar to how it is replicated for the Atlantic striped bass on the East Coast and the salmon in Alaska. This should be replicated to allow for States to be able to work together for regional management strategies to manage the species and to allow for more intimate, better public input to make sure that you have the appropriate balance between recreational and commercial fishers.

I, again, want to commend the sponsor of this bill, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and all the cosponsors. This is exactly

what we need to be doing. We need to be expanding upon this model around the coastal States of this country.

I urge adoption of this bill, I urge aggressive passage of this bill, and I urge the Senate to pass it as well.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 374, and I have no further speakers.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 374.

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. MCCLINTOCK. 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.

□ 1700

OCMULGEE MOUNDS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY REVISION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 538) to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 538

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park Boundary Revision Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Ocmulgee National Monument Proposed Boundary Adjustment, numbered 363/125996”, and dated January 2016.

(2) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term “Historical Park” means the Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park in the State of Georgia, as redesignated in section 3.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. OCMULGEE MOUNDS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—Ocmulgee National Monument, established pursuant to the Act of June 14, 1934 (48 Stat. 958), shall be known and designated as “Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to “Ocmulgee National Monument”, other than in this Act, shall be deemed to be a reference to “Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park”.

SEC. 4. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Historical Park is revised to include approxi-

mately 2,100 acres, as generally depicted on the map.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 5. LAND ACQUISITION; NO BUFFER ZONES.

(a) LAND ACQUISITION.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire land and interests in land within the boundaries of the Historical Park by donation or exchange only (and in the case of an exchange, no payment may be made by the Secretary to any landowner). The Secretary may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land within the boundaries of the Historical Park. No private property or non-Federal public property shall be included within the boundaries of the newly expanded portion of the Historical Park under section 4(a) without the written consent of the owner of such property.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—Nothing in this Act, the establishment of the Historical Park, or the management of the Historical Park shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of the Historical Park. That an activity or use can be seen or heard from within the Historical Park shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside the Historical Park.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary shall administer any land acquired under section 5 as part of the Historical Park in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

SEC. 7. OCMULGEE RIVER CORRIDOR SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the Ocmulgee River corridor between the cities of Macon, Georgia, and Hawkinsville, Georgia, to determine—

(1) the national significance of the study area;

(2) the suitability and feasibility of adding lands in the study area to the National Park System; and

(3) the methods and means for the protection and interpretation of the study area by the National Park Service, other Federal, State, local government entities, affiliated federally recognized Indian tribes, or private or nonprofit organizations.

(b) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall conduct the study authorized by this Act in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code.

(c) RESULTS OF STUDY.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate—

(1) the results of the study; and

(2) any findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Ocmulgee Mounds are among the oldest archaeological sites in our country. The earthworks date back before 1000 A.D., and the site has evidence of human habitation dating back to the ice age, some 17,000 years ago. Between the 10th and 12th centuries A.D., the site was occupied by a sophisticated society that we know as the Macon Plateau culture, which built earthen mounds up to 55 feet in height, representing a distinct political and cultural society.

It is believed that Hernando de Soto recorded the site as the chiefdom of Ichisi in 1540. Just before the American Revolution, naturalist William Bartram marveled at "the wonderful remains of the power and grandeur of the ancients in this part of America."

H.R. 538, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), would redesignate the Ocmulgee National Monument in Georgia as the Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park and adjust the boundary of the historical park to include approximately 2,100 new acres to be acquired by donation or exchange only.

Additionally, the bill directs the Department of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the feasibility of adding the Ocmulgee River corridor to the National Park System. The study will also examine the national significance of the site as well as the best methods and means for ensuring protection and interpretation of this area.

The bill was passed by voice vote in the House in the 114th Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage today.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 538, the Ocmulgee Mounds National Historic Park Boundary Revision Act of 2017.

First, I thank the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) for yielding. And I thank the coauthor of the legislation, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), my friend and colleague. He has been a tireless advocate on behalf of this legislation, and we would not be here today without his help and his advice.

I also thank Chairman ROB BISHOP and Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA from the full Committee on Natural Resources for their work in bringing this bill to the floor so early in the 115th Congress.

In the 114th Congress, Chairman McCLINTOCK and Ranking Member TSONGAS of the Subcommittee on Fed-

eral Lands were very helpful as well, and I commend them and their staffs, especially Terry Camp and Brandon Bragato, for their efforts.

This legislation was approved last March by the full House of Representatives by voice vote. The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources also approved a companion bill, but it was not considered by the full Senate prior to the adjournment of the 114th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, historic sites in the United States that have evidence of continuous human habitation from so long ago when the first nomadic people came to North America to hunt ice age mammals and again to settle the Macon Plateau. It is what makes the Ocmulgee National Monument so unique. On its 702 acres, one can find archaeological evidence from these first nomads, the mound builders of the Mississippian Period, British traders of the late 17th century, as well as the Civil War period.

Our bipartisan legislation consists of three parts. First, it will expand the boundaries from approximately 702 acres to over 2,800 acres, providing protection to additional archaeological resources, linking two currently non-contiguous areas and improving the site's connection to the city of Macon, Georgia. Most of the land will be donated from nonprofit associations and government agencies. Property will also be acquired only from willing donors or willing sellers, subject to the availability of funding.

Second, the bill would change the name from Ocmulgee National Monument to Ocmulgee Mounds National Historic Park, which would increase name recognition and draw additional visitors.

Finally, H.R. 538 would authorize a resources study to explore the possibility of expanding the park even further and include additional opportunities for hunting, camping, fishing, and other recreational activities.

The legislation enjoys widespread local support, including Macon mayor Robert Reichert, the Macon Chamber of Commerce, the Macon-Bibb Visitors Bureau, the Macon-Bibb Commission, the Macon-Bibb Economic Development Commission, the Ocmulgee National Park and Preserve Initiative, and the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes: Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Muscogee (Creek), and Seminole.

In short, I believe that H.R. 538 will strengthen the current Ocmulgee National Monument and bolster the economy and cultural life of Georgia and beyond. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), the cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. BISHOP). I know he has had a busy week, as I have, with his district being affected by the storms. I certainly want to take a second to thank America for their prayers and their support. It has been overwhelming. A tremendous number of churches have opened their doors, and there are volunteers out there helping people. I thank all who have participated.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 538, the Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park Boundary Revision Act of 2017. I am happy this legislation is being considered before the full House in this Congress. I am hopeful we can reach an agreement with the Senate to pass this legislation and have it signed into law.

For years, there has been a great effort to bring about increased recognition of the enhanced cultural preservation of the Ocmulgee National Monument. The Ocmulgee National Monument was originally authorized by Congress in 1934 to protect the Old Ocmulgee Fields, which includes a network of very well preserved Indian mounds of great historical importance. The history of the fields can be traced back to Native Americans who first came to the site during the Paleo-Indian period to hunt ice age mammals.

The park is unique in that it vividly displays the story of many stages of prehistoric cultural development, including the Mound Builder period and highlights the important role of agriculture in the region.

I am proud to represent this area of middle Georgia along with Congressman SANFORD BISHOP. Our offices have worked together, along with many regional community partners, to advance this goal.

By expanding the current Ocmulgee National Monument area from 700 acres to just over 2,000 acres and redesignating the area as a national historical park, the legislation will provide significant economic, educational, and cultural benefits to middle Georgia. Additionally, H.R. 538 will authorize a resources study for future further expansions and include increased opportunities for hunting, fishing, camping, and other recreational activities.

The expansion of the Ocmulgee National Monument area provides for critical preservation of additional archaeological locations throughout the Old Ocmulgee Fields. Because of its significant historical and archaeological importance, the future Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park must be preserved. The expanded park also will generate additional tourism in middle Georgia while educating visitors on the fascinating history of the many civilizations that have thrived in the region. It should be noted that the property in the proposed expansion area would be acquired only from willing donors or sellers, using private funds, and that no Federal dollars will be used to achieve the expansion.

I want to take this time to thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA as well as all members of the House Committee on Natural Resources for their work to bring this legislation to the floor today.

I want to close by noting that this legislation is a true example of what can be achieved when a local community, State leaders, and the Federal Government collaborate toward a worthy goal.

The Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park Boundary Revision Act was created from the ground up with many letters of support from the Macon-Bibb area and well over 3,000 comments from individuals and community groups in support of the expansion. Without this collaboration at every level, none of this would be possible.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 538, the Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park Boundary Revision Act of 2017.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge all of my colleagues for the adoption of H.R. 538.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 538, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. 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.

KENNESAW MOUNTAIN NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 558) to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 558

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park Boundary Adjustment Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park was authorized as a unit of the National Park System on June 26, 1935. Prior to 1935, parts of the park had been acquired

and protected by Civil War veterans and the War Department.

(2) Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park protects Kennesaw Mountain and Kolb's Farm, which are battle sites along the route of General Sherman's 1864 campaign to take Atlanta.

(3) Most of the park protects Confederate positions and strategy. The Wallis House is one of the few original structures remaining from the Battle of Kennesaw Mountain associated with Union positions and strategy.

(4) The Wallis House is strategically located next to a Union signal station at Harriston Hill.

SEC. 3. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT; LAND ACQUISITION; ADMINISTRATION.

(a) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park is modified to include the approximately 8 acres identified as “Wallis House and Harriston Hill”, and generally depicted on the map titled “Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 325/80,020, and dated February 2010.

(b) MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) LAND ACQUISITION.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, from willing owners only, land or interests in land described in subsection (a) by donation or exchange.

(d) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LANDS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall administer land and interests in land acquired under this section as part of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(e) WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER.—No non-Federal property may be included in the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park without the written consent of the owner. This provision shall apply only to those portions of the Park added under subsection (a).

(f) NO USE OF CONDEMNATION.—The Secretary of the Interior may not acquire by condemnation any land or interests in land under this Act or for the purposes of this Act.

(g) NO BUFFER ZONE CREATED.—Nothing in this Act, the establishment of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, or the management plan for the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of the Park. That activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate or determine the conduct or management of activities or uses outside the Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 558, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), expands the boundary of the Kennesaw National Battlefield Park by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 8 acres of land by donation or exchange only. The expanded area includes the historic Wallis House and Harriston Hill.

The Wallis House is one of the few remaining structures associated with the Kennesaw Mountain Civil War battle, while Harriston Hill was strategically significant as the Union signal station.

The Battle of Kennesaw Mountain in June of 1864 was critical to the Union campaign to split the Confederacy, and although it was a tactical victory for the Confederates, it opened the way for the Union's strategic victory of taking Atlanta. The sacrifices of more than 3,000 Union troops on Kennesaw Mountain made possible Sherman's famous telegram to Lincoln 3 months later that “Atlanta is ours and fairly won.”

These battlefields remind succeeding generations of Americans of the price paid by so many for the preservation of our Constitution and the liberty it protects and the enormous responsibility that each of us has to maintain and defend that same Constitution today. Nearly identical legislation passed the House by voice vote in the 114th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill adjusts the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park in Georgia to include two historically significant structures, the Wallis House and Kolb's Farm, and to assist in the preservation of the story of the Atlanta campaign. Additionally, the bill authorizes the National Park Service to acquire by donation approximately 8 acres that will be added to the Kennesaw National Battlefield Park.

The Civil War was a significant event in the history of this country and remains relevant as we grapple with the civil rights discussions today. The preservation of these sites reinforces Congress' dedication to equality and enables the National Park Service to interpret and tell our national story.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for continuing to support the preservation of the history of this great country.

This bill passed the House last Congress by voice vote, and I encourage its swift adoption today.

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

□ 1715

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 558, a bill that

will add valuable historic property to the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, located right in the heart of Georgia's 11th Congressional District.

Our Nation has long recognized the importance of restoring historic sites, especially those battlefields where Americans fought and died for freedom. Places such as Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, where significant battles of America's Civil War took place, allow us to look back in time to get a glimpse of the events that shaped our Nation. It is extremely important that we understand our history; otherwise, we will be destined to repeat the mistakes of our past.

This bill, which passed the House unanimously last Congress, welcomes our next generation to engage in the eye-opening stories of our past. A recent study of American history education revealed that only 23 percent of college seniors could identify James Madison as the father of our Constitution; however, 98 percent of college graduates knew that Snoop Dogg was a rapper.

Mr. Speaker, it is now more important than ever to ensure that the generations following us have access to these historic sites and the educational opportunities they provide or we risk losing touch with our history. My bill simply allows Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to acquire two pieces of property, through donation, that will add to the historic and educational value of this historic battlefield.

One of the properties this bill will preserve is a home that was built in 1853 by Mr. Josiah Wallis. Mr. Wallis built this home for his family, but it was eventually used as a hospital by the Confederate Army during the Civil War. In 1864, the Wallis House fell into the hands of General William Sherman of the Union Army during his campaign to take Atlanta.

The house served as Sherman's headquarters during the Battle of Kolb's Farm, which was a resounding victory for the Union Army, but the victory was not without cost. When the smoke cleared, over 350 Union soldiers and over 1,000 Confederate soldiers lay dead.

Five days later, Union General Oliver Howard used the Wallis House as his headquarters and communications center during the Battle of Kennesaw Mountain, one of the bloodiest 1-day battles of the entire war. This was also the last major battle before Atlanta fell to Union forces.

While the assault by General Sherman was a tactical failure costing the lives of over 3,000 of his men, the battle also inflicted heavy losses on the Confederates. Having lost another 1,000 men, the Confederate Army could not stop General Sherman on his march to Atlanta.

Adjacent to the Wallis House is 8 acres of land known as Harriston Hill. This property offers a sweeping view of

the valley leading to the Confederate line on top of Kennesaw Mountain and was used by the Union as signaling positions during the battle. This location is essential for park visitors to understand the strategic positions taken by the Union and Confederate flag Armies during the battle.

In addition to being critical sites in Civil War history, the Wallis House and Harriston Hill are two of the few original locations remaining from the Battle of Kennesaw Mountain associated with the Union Army. Most of the park's current attractions correspond with Confederate history, and these additions will prove to be major historical acquisitions that will enhance the value of the park and provide insight into the Union's side of the story.

In 2002, the Cobb County Government purchased the Wallis House and Harriston Hill to prevent the house from being demolished. Since then, the county has been seeking to transfer the property to the park. My bill simply modifies the boundary of Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the house and the hill and authorizes the park to acquire the property by donation.

Along with the Cobb County Government, this land transfer is supported by the National Park Service, Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, and several park volunteer organizations and historical societies in my district.

This legislation is an essential step toward preserving our Nation's heritage and a valuable part of Civil War history. The Wallis House and Harriston Hill will provide tremendous educational and historical value to Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, and it is my hope that the park will quickly acquire this property and restore it to its original condition for visitors to enjoy for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 558.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CALL UP H.R. 724, STATUE OF LIBERTY VALUES ACT OF 2017

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up and consider H.R. 724, the Statue of Liberty Values Act of 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

DELAWARE WATER GAP NATIONAL RECREATION AREA IMPROVE- MENT ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 560) to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 560

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

SECTION 1. VEHICULAR ACCESS AND FEES.

Section 4 of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act (Public Law 109-156) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4. USE OF CERTAIN ROADS WITHIN THE RECREATION AREA.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, Highway 209, a federally owned road within the boundaries of the Recreation Area, shall be closed to all commercial vehicles.

“(b) EXCEPTION FOR LOCAL BUSINESS USE.—Until September 30, 2021, subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the use of commercial vehicles that have four or fewer axles and are—

“(1) owned and operated by a business physically located in—

“(A) the Recreation Area; or

“(B) one or more adjacent municipalities; or

“(2) necessary to provide services to businesses or persons located in—

“(A) the Recreation Area; or

“(B) one of more adjacent municipalities.

“(c) FEE.—The Secretary shall establish a fee and permit program for the use by commercial vehicles of Highway 209 under subsection (b). The program shall include an annual fee not to exceed \$200 per vehicle. All fees received under the program shall be set aside in a special account and be available, without further appropriation, to the Secretary for the administration and enforcement of the program, including registering vehicles, issuing permits and vehicle identification stickers, and personnel costs.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—The following vehicles may use Highway 209 and shall not be subject to a fee or permit requirement under subsection (c):

“(1) Local school buses.

“(2) Fire, ambulance, and other safety and emergency vehicles.

“(3) Commercial vehicles using Federal Road Route 209, from—

“(A) Milford to the Delaware River Bridge leading to U.S. Route 206 in New Jersey; and

“(B) mile 0 of Federal Road Route 209 to Pennsylvania State Route 2001.”

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act (Public Law 109-156) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section) the following:

“(1) ADJACENT MUNICIPALITIES.—The term ‘adjacent municipalities’ means Delaware Township, Dingman Township, Lehman Township, Matamoras Borough, Middle Smithfield Township, Milford Borough, Milford Township, Smithfield Township and Westfall Township, in Pennsylvania.”.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 702 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 560, introduced by Congressman TOM MARINO, amends the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to allow a highway through the national recreation area to continue to be used by small commercial vehicles that serve the local communities adjoining this federally designated land. It is entirely in keeping with one of our principal objectives for Federal land use policy: to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to the communities impacted by the Federal lands.

In 1981, a portion of highway 209 was transferred from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the National Park Service. Two years later, Congress closed the National Park Service segment of highway 209 to commercial traffic except for commercial vehicular operations serving businesses or persons located in or contiguous to the boundaries of the recreation area. Congress also authorized the Park Service to collect and retain fees from commercial use of the road. A 10-year transition period was established to accommodate impacts on the surrounding communities until alternative trucking routes could be built. Congress later passed two additional extensions of the commercial vehicle permitting authority through September 30, 2015.

As the third extension permitting commercial vehicle use of highway 209 neared expiration, local elected officials requested that Congress enact legislation to permit access for smaller class commercial vehicles for businesses physically located in towns ad-

acent to highway 209. H.R. 560 provides for such an extension, establishes up a fee structure, and exempts certain vehicles from the fee, thus protecting residents of these communities from additional disruption and inconvenience.

Congressman MARINO should be commended for his efforts to resolve this vexing issue for his constituents.

A nearly identical version of this legislation passed the House by voice vote in the 114th Congress. I urge adoption of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill, H.R. 560, amends the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to extend a waiver for certain commercial traffic on U.S. Route 209, a federally owned highway that runs through the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

When Congress decided to restrict commercial traffic on the portion of the highway that runs through the recreation area, the law included an exemption for certain vehicles that belong to nearby businesses and municipal governments. This bill provides a 5-year extension of that exemption in order to facilitate continued access for local residents.

The National Park Service, which manages the area, supports the bill; and it passed the House, as my colleague from California mentioned, last year by voice vote. I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the author of the measure.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 560, my bill to reauthorize limited commercial vehicle traffic along Route 209 through the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Tomorrow marks 16 months during which uncertainty has reigned over this 21-mile stretch of road running through my district.

Over 30 years ago, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania transferred Route 209, then a State road, to the National Park Service. As commercial vehicle traffic is banned on roads within our national parks, it would ultimately be restricted on this stretch of Route 209. But at that time, a 10-year exemption was made to support the local freight transport industry and because acceptable alternative routes were unavailable.

After multiple extensions, the most recent commercial vehicle authorization expired at the end of September 2015. To address the problem, county and township officials from the surrounding areas met with the National Park Service and my staff to negotiate a new plan. They recognized a continuing need to allow some commercial vehicles access and settled on the care-

fully crafted language we are considering today.

The work to produce this extension acknowledges the continued need of the employers, businesses, and homeowners in Pike and Monroe Counties. Unfortunately, although the House passed identical language in the 114th Congress and the Senate moved it to the floor, this important legislation failed to become law. The resulting uncertainty created hardship for families and businesses in the communities neighboring the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

The lack of access to this stretch of road has cast a cloud on a wide range of local businesses from heating fuel and package delivery to plumbers and electricians. Homeowners cannot access the services they need and countless jobs are in jeopardy. This is a critical piece of legislation for my constituents. We must pass it today and urge the Senate to act just as quickly.

I want to thank Chairman BISHOP and Federal Lands Subcommittee Chairman MCCLINTOCK, and I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their support and work with my staff to bring this bill to the floor as quickly as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, Mr. MARINO, for his leadership and his effort in the introduction and efforts towards the hopeful passage of H.R. 560. I want to also thank my good friend from California for this afternoon's wonderful time managing these six bills.

I urge the passage of H.R. 560.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I would just add that this and all the bills we heard today authored by both Republicans and Democrats, which passed this House in the last session, unanimously, were all stalled in the Senate. I would only express the hope that the Senate, this year, will act on these measures and do its duty as the coequal branch of the legislative department of this government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 560.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 30, 2017, at 4:18 p.m.:

Appointments:
Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.
Washington's Farewell Address.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1730

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

NANCY PELOSI,
DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
January 30, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 4(a) of House Resolution 5, 115th Congress, I am writing to reappoint the following member to the House Democracy Partnership:

The Honorable David Price of North Carolina, Ranking Member.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO
BRITISH-AMERICAN INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. CICILLINE, Rhode Island

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE
NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia
Ms. FRANKEL, Florida

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND
COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003,

and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:
Mr. HASTINGS, Florida
Mr. COHEN, Tennessee

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO
THE JAPAN-UNITED STATES
FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2903, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission:
Mr. TAKANO, California

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.J. RES. 38, DISAPPROVING A
RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DE-
PARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 70) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 38) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.J. RES. 41, PROVIDING FOR
CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL
OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION, AND PROVIDING
FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J.
RES. 40, PROVIDING FOR CON-
GRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A
RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SO-
CIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRA-
TION

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-7) on the resolution (H. Res. 71) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Dis-

closure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers", and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 374, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 538, by the yeas and nays.

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

DUNGENESS CRAB FISHERY MAN-
AGEMENT SUNSET PROVISION
REMOVAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 374) to remove the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105-384, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—388

Abraham	Bost	Cheney
Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline
Aderholt	F.	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	Brady (PA)	Clay
Allen	Brady (TX)	Clyburn
Amash	Brat	Coffman
Amodei	Bridenstine	Cohen
Arrington	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Bacon	Brown (MD)	Collins (NY)
Banks (IN)	Brownley (CA)	Comer
Barletta	Buchanan	Comstock
Barr	Buck	Conaway
Barragán	Bucshon	Connolly
Barton	Budd	Conyers
Bass	Burgess	Cook
Beatty	Bustos	Cooper
Bera	Byrne	Correa
Bergman	Calvert	Costello (PA)
Beyer	Capuano	Courtney
Biggs	Carbajal	Cramer
Billirakis	Cárdenas	Crawford
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Crist
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Crowley
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Cuellar
Black	Cartwright	Culberson
Blum	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Blunt	Chabot	Davidson
Bonamici	Chaffetz	Davis, Danny

Davis, Rodney	Kildee	Reed	Womack	Yoder	Young (IA)	Blum	Foster	Love
DeGette	Kilmer	Reichert	Woodall	Yoho	Zeldin	Blumenauer	Fox	Lowenthal
Delaney	Kind	Rice (NY)	Yarmuth	Young (AK)		Blunt Rochester	Frankel (FL)	Lowey
DeLauro	King (IA)	Rice (SC)				Bonamici	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
DelBene	King (NY)	Richmond				Bost	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Denham	Knight	Roby	Blackburn	Hoyer	Pelosi	Boyle, Brendan	Fudge	Lujan Grisham,
Dent	Kuster (NH)	Roe (TN)	Butterfield	Huizenga	Pocan	F.	Gabbard	M.
DeSantis	Kustoff (TN)	Rogers (AL)	Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Price, Tom (GA)	Brady (PA)	Gaetz	Lujan, Ben Ray
DeSaulnier	Labrador	Rogers (KY)	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Brady (TX)	Gallagher	Lynch
Deutch	LaHood	Rohrabacher	Cleaver	Johnson (LA)	Renacci	Bridenstine	Garamendi	MacArthur
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rokita	Costa	Kinzinger	Rush	Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Maloney,
Dingell	Lamborn	Rooney, Francis	Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan (OH)	Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Carolyn B.
Doggett	Lance	Rooney, Thomas	DeFazio	Langevin	Sewell (AL)	Brown (MD)	Gohmert	Maloney, Sean
Donovan	Larsen (WA)	J.	Demings	Lawson (FL)	Slaughter	Brownley (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Marino
Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen	DesJarlais	Marchant	Tiberi	Buchanan	Goodlatte	Marshall
F.	Latta	Rosen	Ellison	Meeks	Titus	Buck	Gosar	Mast
Duffy	Lawrence	Roskam	Callego	Meng	Tonko	Bucshon	Gottheimer	Matsui
Duncan (SC)	Lee	Ross	Green, Al	Mulvaney	Velázquez	Budd	Gowdy	McCarthy
Duncan (TN)	Levin	Rothfus	Grijalva	Nadler	Zinke	Burgess	Granger	McCaul
Dunn	Lewis (GA)	Rouzer	Gutiérrez	Napolitano		Butterfield	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Emmer	Lewis (MN)	Roybal-Allard				Byrne	Graves (LA)	McCollum
Engel	Lieu, Ted	Royce (CA)				Calvert	Graves (MO)	McEachin
Eshoo	Lipinski	Ruiz				Capuano	Green, Gene	McGovern
Espallat	LoBiondo	Ruppersberger				Carbajal	Griffith	McHenry
Esty	Loebsack	Russell				Cárdenas	Grothman	McKinley
Evans	Lofgren	Rutherford				Carson (IN)	Guthrie	McMorris
Farenthold	Long	Sánchez				Carter (GA)	Hanabusa	Rodgers
Faso	Loudermilk	Sanford				Carter (TX)	Harper	McNerney
Ferguson	Love	Sarbanes				Cartwright	Harris	McSally
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Scalise				Castor (FL)	Hartzler	Meadows
Fleischmann	Lowey	Schakowsky				Castro (TX)	Hastings	Meehan
Flores	Lucas	Schiff				Chabot	Heck	Meeks
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Schneider				Chaffetz	Hensarling	Mitchell
Foster	Lujan Grisham,	Schrader				Cheney	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Fox	M.	Schweikert				Chu, Judy	Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)
Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)				Cicilline	Higgins (LA)	Moore
Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Scott, Austin				Clarke (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Moulton
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Scott, David				Clay	Hill	Mullin
Fudge	Maloney,	Sensenbrenner				Cleaver	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Gabbard	Carolyn B.	Serrano				Clyburn	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Gaetz	Maloney, Sean	Sessions				Coffman	Hollingsworth	Nadler
Gallagher	Marino	Shea-Porter				Cohen	Hoyer	Napolitano
Garamendi	Marshall	Sherman				Cole	Hudson	Neal
Garrett	Massie	Shimkus				Collins (GA)	Huffman	Newhouse
Gibbs	Mast	Shuster				Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Noem
Gohmert	Matsui	Simpson				Comer	Hunter	Nolan
Gonzalez (TX)	McCarthy	Sinema				Comstock	Hurd	Norcross
Goodlatte	McCaul	Sires				Conaway	Issa	Nunes
Gosar	McClintock	Smith (MO)				Connolly	Jackson Lee	O'Halleran
Gottheimer	McColum	Smith (NE)				Conyers	Jayapal	O'Rourke
Gowdy	McEachin	Smith (NJ)				Cook	Jeffries	Olson
Granger	McGovern	Smith (TX)				Cooper	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Smith (WA)				Correa	Jenkins (WV)	Pallone
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Smucker				Costello (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Palmer
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Soto				Courtney	Johnson (OH)	Panetta
Green, Gene	Rodgers	Speier				Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell
Griffith	McNerney	Stefanik				Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
Grothman	McSally	Stewart				Crist	Jordan	Payne
Guthrie	Meadows	Stivers				Crowley	Joyce (OH)	Pearce
Hanabusa	Meehan	Suozzi				Cuellar	Kaptur	Pelosi
Harper	Messer	Swalwell (CA)				Culberson	Katko	Perlmutter
Harris	Mitchell	Takano				Cummings	Keating	Perry
Hartzler	Moolenaar	Taylor				Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Peters
Hastings	Mooney (WV)	Tenney				Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Peterson
Heck	Moore	Thompson (CA)				Davis (CA)	Kelly (PA)	Pingree
Hensarling	Moulton	Thompson (MS)				Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Pittenger
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Thompson (PA)				Davis, Rodney	Khanna	Poe (TX)
Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (FL)	Thornberry				DeGette	Kihuen	Poliquin
Higgins (LA)	Murphy (PA)	Tipton				Delaney	Kildee	Polis
Higgins (NY)	Neal	Torres				DeLauro	Kilmer	Posey
Hill	Newhouse	Trott				DelBene	Kind	Price (NC)
Himes	Noem	Tsongas				Demings	King (IA)	Raskin
Holding	Nolan	Turner				Denham	King (NY)	Ratcliffe
Hollingsworth	Norcross	Upton				Dent	Knight	Reed
Hudson	Nunes	Valadao				DeSantis	Krishnamoorthi	Reichert
Huffman	O'Halleran	Vargas				DeSaulnier	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
Hultgren	O'Rourke	Veasey				Deutch	Kustoff (TN)	Rice (SC)
Hunter	Olson	Vela				Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Richmond
Hurd	Palazzo	Visclosky				Dingell	LaHood	Roby
Issa	Pallone	Wagner				Doggett	LaMalfa	Roe (TN)
Jayapal	Palmer	Walberg				Donovan	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Jeffries	Panetta	Walden				Doyle, Michael	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Jenkins (KS)	Pascrell	Walker				F.	Langevin	Rohrabacher
Jenkins (WV)	Paulsen	Walorski				Duffy	Larsen (WA)	Rokita
Johnson (OH)	Payne	Walters, Mimi				Duncan (SC)	Larson (CT)	Rooney, Francis
Johnson, E. B.	Pearce	Walz				Dunn	Latta	Rooney, Thomas
Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter	Wasserman				Emmer	Lawrence	J.
Jones	Perry	Schultz				Engel	Lawson (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Jordan	Peters	Waters, Maxine				Eshoo	Lee	Rosen
Joyce (OH)	Peterson	Watson Coleman				Espallat	Levin	Roskam
Kaptur	Pingree	Weber (TX)				Esty	Lewis (GA)	Ross
Katko	Pittenger	Webster (FL)				Evans	Lewis (MN)	Rothfus
Keating	Poe (TX)	Welch				Farenthold	Lieu, Ted	Rouzer
Kelly (IL)	Poliquin	Wenstrup				Faso	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Kelly (MS)	Polis	Westerman				Ferguson	LoBiondo	Royce (CA)
Kelly (PA)	Posey	Williams				Fitzpatrick	Loebsack	Ruiz
Kennedy	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)				Fleischmann	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Khanna	Raskin	Wilson (SC)				Flores	Long	Russell
Kihuen	Ratcliffe	Wittman				Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Rutherford

NOT VOTING—44

□ 1850

Messrs. ENGEL, DOGGETT, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 66.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 66.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 66.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 66, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 66.

OCMULGEE MOUNDS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY REVISION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 538) to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 8, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—396

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

Sánchez	Speier	Walden
Sarbanes	Stefanik	Walker
Scalise	Stewart	Walorski
Schakowsky	Stivers	Walters, Mimi
Schiff	Suozi	Walz
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Wasserman
Schrader	Takano	Schultz
Schweikert	Taylor	Waters, Maxine
Scott (VA)	Tenney	Watson Coleman
Scott, Austin	Thompson (CA)	Weber (TX)
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Webster (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (PA)	Welch
Serrano	Thornberry	Wenstrup
Sessions	Tipton	Westerman
Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Williams
Shea-Porter	Torres	Wilson (FL)
Sherman	Trott	Wilson (SC)
Shimkus	Tsongas	Wittman
Shuster	Turner	Womack
Simpson	Upton	Woodall
Sinema	Valadao	Yarmuth
Sires	Vargas	Yoder
Smith (MO)	Veasey	Yoho
Smith (NJ)	Vela	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Young (IA)
Smith (WA)	Viscosky	Zeldin
Smucker	Wagner	
Soto	Walberg	

□ 1900

OBJECTING TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S EXECUTIVE ORDER SUSPENDING VISAS AND THE U.S. REFUGEE ADMISSIONS PROGRAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the administration's recent executive order suspending the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program and visas from certain countries in the Middle East and east Africa. Protecting our national security, of course, must always be our number one priority.

This executive order, however, Mr. Speaker, does not focus on the precise challenges that we face. We can keep our homeland safe by immediately implementing more thorough screening procedures rather than pursuing this broad brush approach.

Although this measure is temporary and some individuals will continue to be admitted on a case-by-case basis, Congress needs to work to ensure that this order does not apply to U.S. residents, does not apply to those who have already been issued a visa, or does not apply to those who have already been granted refugee status.

I urge the administration to work with Congress and Federal agencies to find a measured plan that protects our national security, honors our existing commitments, and follows the letter and spirit of the law.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ON REFUGEES

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we live in the greatest country on Earth, and I am proud to say so. But I have to say that last week's executive order by President Trump on refugee resettlement is shaking that faith.

How can we hold ourselves as a beacon of hope when we turn away tens of thousands of the most desperate and vulnerable of our men, women, and children of this planet? How can we be the light of the world when our policies are driven by darkness and fear?

I am going to keep that light alive. I am going to fight to keep it that way because that is what we are, that is what we represent. I am going to fight because I still believe that we are that shining city on the hill. And I am going to fight for my State of Rhode Island, which was founded on the principle of free religious practice, not fear of the other. I am going to fight against injustice with my amazing constituents who joined together for the second weekend in a row of rallying at our State House to keep that light alive.

Mr. Speaker, we are a strong country, but we are strong because of our

values and our principles embodied in our Constitution. Let's continue to build that shining city on the hill for the world. I am going to continue this fight, and I hope my colleagues will, too.

ACCESS TO INPATIENT REHABILITATION THERAPY

(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, before coming to Congress, I worked as a certified therapeutic recreation specialist and rehab services manager. There is no greater joy in the health profession than to see your patient make progress after a debilitating disease or disability.

I rise today to speak about how we can allow more patients the ability to live full and healthy lives through therapy. Last week, with Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina, I reintroduced the Access to Inpatient Rehabilitation Therapy Act. This bill would allow physicians to prescribe what they consider to be most medically necessary treatments for Medicare beneficiaries within the comprehensive inpatient rehab setting.

In 2010, Medicare narrowed its coverage options and limited therapeutic services to just physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, and orthotics and prosthetics. Meaning that if a doctor thought that a patient would be served by recreational therapy, it is currently not an option covered by Medicare. Well, that is wrong. Medicare coverage should support a patient's recovery plan as directed by their physician. Such therapies are intended to help those who have suffered a life-altering injury recover their functions and transition back to living a full life.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan commonsense bill.

EXECUTIVE ORDER AGAINST LEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to President Trump's executive order against legal immigration.

I was sworn to uphold the Constitution and I was elected to grow our economy and help unify our country.

Unfortunately, this order is an assault on the Constitution, it harms the economy by harming working families, and it divides the country.

On Saturday night, I went to O'Hare International Airport to help American, legal permanent residents be freed from detention. They are people integral to the success of our community and our economy.

I ask my honorable Republican colleagues to stand with them and oppose the executive order.

NAYS—8

Amash	Duncan (TN)	Sanford
Bacon	Jones	Smith (NE)
Brat	Massie	

NOT VOTING—28

Blackburn	Gutiérrez	Quigley
Bustos	Huizenga	Renacci
Clark (MA)	Johnson (LA)	Rush
Costa	Kinzinger	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Marchant	Slaughter
DesJarlais	Meng	Tiberi
Ellison	Messer	Titus
Gallego	Mulvaney	Zinke
Green, Al	Pocan	
Grijalva	Price, Tom (GA)	

□ 1900

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes:

1. H.R. 374, To remove the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105-384, and for other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

2. H.R. 538, Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park Boundary Revision Act of 2017, as amended. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, for today's vote series, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 66 and rollcall 67.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 66 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 374), and 67 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 538) I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both of the votes.

RECOGNITION OF THE ASIAN
PACIFIC DEVELOPMENT CENTER

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize the Asian Pacific Development Center, a community-based nonprofit organization, which has been serving the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities in the State of Colorado for over 35 years. Their commitment to service is truly an inspiration for all Coloradans.

The Asian Pacific Development Center guides itself by its founding mission, which is to advance the well-being of Asian American and Pacific Islander communities of Colorado by providing culturally appropriate and integrated behavioral, medical, and related services. By adhering to such a noble purpose, the Asian Pacific Development Center is able to provide crucial services in native languages with a cultural understanding.

Originally founded in 1980 by Dr. Rudy Lie, and currently headed by Ms. Chris Wanifuchi, I am proud of just how important the Asian Pacific Development Center is to our community. I look forward to working with them in the many more years of service to come.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S EXECUTIVE
ORDER SHOULD BE OVERTURNED

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons people across the country are outraged by the executive order issued by the administration this weekend is the impact it has on people who worked for the United States, putting their lives at risk. I spent 10 years on a bipartisan effort for the Special Immigrant Visa program, and with a stroke of the pen, these people have been denied.

On page A10 of The Washington Post, there is detailed the Sharef family where the husband had worked as an interpreter for United States soldiers. His life is at risk in Iraq. He worked 2 years to be able to get the visa. He sold his business, sold his home. His family was on a plane ready to come, and they were turned back to Iraq, turned back to danger. And we are turning our back on people who risk their lives to help Americans.

It is outrageous, it is immoral, and it is going to hurt America in the future. Who is going to help us overseas in the future if we are not dependable allies?

This outrageous order should be overturned and everyone, Republican and Democrat alike, should raise their voice in outrage.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S
IMMIGRATION BAN

(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, Donald Trump has stained the American Presidency with his unAmerican values.

His Muslim ban has caused the suffering of countless families seeking the American promise of a better life, and it has put the safety of the American people at risk by providing fodder for extremist groups who wish to do us harm.

I condemn this ban and the unfit President behind it. I ask my Republican colleagues who have stood by and said nothing: How can you remain silent?

The American people are sending a clear message that they will not remain silent. I have received a large volume of calls from constituents in opposition to the Muslim ban. It is unfortunate that these calls are necessary, but I am glad the American people are paying attention and are committed to holding this administration accountable.

I want to add that hundreds of Syrian refugees have settled in New Jersey. Many have settled in Jersey City, which is part of my district, and I am proud to be their Member of Congress. These refugees have escaped chaos at home and went through a rigorous screening process before entering the United States. They are respectful of America's values. The same cannot be said of this President.

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

□ 1915

ALTERNATIVE FACTS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a time I never thought I would experience. I am a proud Member of the United States Congress, and I proudly took my oath to support the Constitution. In the last 10 days, we have seen alternative facts stated as something that has become part of America—right out of “1984.”

This executive order, the administration says, is not directed to Muslims; yet it has a waiver for Christians and other minorities, which means it is directed at Muslims. It is unbelievable that they can put something on paper and then tell you not to believe what is on paper. This is a violation of the First Amendment; it is a violation of everything America is known for in its not discriminating on the basis of religion; and it is a shame that we have come to alternative facts, alternative Constitutions, and alternative mindsets.

God bless the United States, and God save the United States.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that we have been served with a subpoena for documents, issued by the District Court for the District of Maryland in Benisek v Lamone.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, we have determined that compliance with the subpoena will be consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE STENY H. HOYER,
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable STENY H. HOYER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a witness subpoena for documents, issued by the District Court for the District of Maryland in Benisek v Lamone.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena will be consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

STENY H. HOYER.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER,
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that we have been served with a subpoena for documents, issued by the District Court for the District of Maryland in Benisek v Lamone.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, we have determined that compliance with the subpoena will be consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Sincerely,

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SARBANES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN P. SARBANES, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that we have been served with a subpoena for documents, issued by the District Court for the District of Maryland in *Benisek v Lamone*.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, we have determined that compliance with the subpoena will be consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Sincerely,

JOHN P. SARBANES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS:
VOTER SUPPRESSION AND MUSLIM BAN

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, this was a sad week for our country. We saw anger, despair, and chaos at American airports when people from all different types of backgrounds from the Middle East were banned from coming into the United States. We had individuals who were green card holders who were denied entry into the United States. We had individuals who were interpreters for our United States military, who kept them safe in the Middle East, who were denied the right to come into the country. It was a sad day in our country's history.

This past weekend, I took my son to an exhibit at one of the synagogues in Fort Worth, Texas, where I live. It was an exhibit on Jews in baseball. There was a picture of Hank Greenberg and Joe DiMaggio. Joe DiMaggio, an American lexicon, is about as American as you get; but, in looking at the exhibit

and at the caption that was next to it, it read, while Joe DiMaggio was fighting for our country in World War II, the United States Government listed his parents as "enemy aliens." In revisiting that sort of sad chapter in our history, when individuals were treated that way in our country, I think it is very sad, Mr. Speaker.

We have a lot of Members who would like to express their discontent at what happened. I yield to our chair, Mr. CEDRIC RICHMOND, from the State of Louisiana, to come and address us because what we have to talk about tonight is very serious.

Mr. RICHMOND. I thank Congressman VEASEY for the work that he does in representing Fort Worth, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to be the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus in that we represent almost 80 million Americans, 17 million of whom are African American; but the real reason is that it is a talented group of 49 people, and we are going to need each and every one of them to keep track of this rapid, schizophrenic style of governing that we are dealing with. I will just talk about the two most egregious things from this past week, which are the allegations of voter fraud and his nomination of a person to run the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and his unconstitutional ban on Muslims.

Since 2010, 20 States have restricted voting rights by enacting discriminatory voter ID and proof of citizenship laws, illegally purging thousands of proper voters from the rolls, cutting back early voting, limiting voter registration, and engaging in other suppressive tactics. These laws were put in place to combat the notion of voter fraud despite the fact that there is no evidence of widespread voter fraud in the United States.

More than a dozen recent investigations and studies all show voter fraud to be virtually nonexistent. A 2014 Washington Post investigation found 31 incidents of voter fraud in the more than 1 billion ballots that were cast in elections at all levels of government from 2000 to 2014. Of the more than 137 million ballots cast in the 2016 election, election and law enforcement officials in all 50 States have yet to report any indications of widespread voter fraud.

But, if there is no evidence of widespread voter fraud, what reason could anyone have, including the President, for this claim? The truth is that Republicans have used the voter fraud lie to restrict voting rights for years. Voter ID laws have been sponsored by Republicans and have been passed overwhelmingly by Republican legislatures.

Richard Posner, a conservative U.S. circuit court judge appointed by President Reagan, has called the concerns about voter fraud a mere fig leaf that is intended to justify laws that appear to be aimed at limiting voting by minorities, especially Blacks. In July 2016, a U.S. circuit court struck down

North Carolina's law, calling it the most restrictive voting law North Carolina has seen since the era of Jim Crow. The judges charged that Republican lawmakers had targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision.

Let me just turn very briefly to the President's ill-advised, unconstitutional executive order that purportedly promotes national security. Keeping America safe is a top priority for all of us, but this order is wrong. It is wrong because it makes us less safe, and it is wrong because it goes against our American values. This is the latest in President Trump's series of actions that shows that his number one priority is short-term shows of intolerance instead of the long-term security of the American people.

Actions by the Oval Office directly affect people's lives. When the President is making policy up on the fly, it has real harmful consequences in the lives of everyday Americans. The fact that the Secretary of Homeland Security—a committee in Congress on which I serve—was not included in discussions about implementing the executive order, even though this Department is in charge of its implementation, is clear evidence of a broken system. Shutting out the mothers, children, fathers, and families who are fleeing the same violence that we fight against is exactly what ISIS and similar groups want us to do, and it only strengthens their hands. This haphazard order does nothing to keep Americans safe. In fact, it hurts our efforts to fight against terrorism.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from Texas that the President of the United States, when addressing Liberty University, cited "2 Corinthians," while most church-going people in the country would say "Second Corinthians." He cited 2 Corinthians 2:17, which reads, wherever the Lord is, there is liberty and freedom, but there can't be liberty and freedom without meaningful access to the voting polls. He didn't need to get to chapter 3. He really could have just stopped at the first few paragraphs of the Second Corinthians, which read: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . who comforts us in our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort those who are in any trouble."

The question becomes: Why go to Liberty University and offer your Christian values?

It always talks about the least of these in the Bible and what we are doing to help others and to do unto others as you would have them do unto you so that, as soon as mothers and children and families are fleeing persecution and certain death, we put a wall up around our country, shut down our airports, and say: We don't care what trouble you are in. You just can't come here.

That goes against everything that this country was founded on. It goes against my Christian values, and it

goes against any purported Christian values of anyone's in these United States of America.

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the chairman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I did not mention that we are also talking about voting rights, which is very important on the eve of the President making the selection for the next Supreme Court Justice of the United States.

I know, with Representative PLASKETT's representing the Virgin Islands and understanding the importance of voting rights, that that is very significant. I yield to the gentlewoman and thank her for being a voice in terms of refugees, immigration rights, and on the very important issue of voting rights.

Ms. PLASKETT. I thank Mr. VEASEY.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, my friend and colleague, the Honorable CEDRIC RICHMOND, for his continued leadership of this caucus and of his leadership on the issues impacting Black America and other minority communities across this great Nation.

Indeed, this evening, we are discussing not only minorities in this country, but those who are downtrodden and other individuals around the world who look to America for refuge, strength, and democracy.

□ 1930

I also thank my colleague, the Honorable MARC VEASEY of Fort Worth, Texas, for joining me in chairing this evening's Special Order hour, and also my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues who are joining us this evening to speak on these important issues.

Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight to speak to those two very important issues that go to the fabric of our founding: our ability to grow, diversify as a Nation, by bringing in the tired and the poor, the innovators, the ones who bring new changes to this country, and continue its dynamic growth, as well as voting rights.

Last week, President Trump—among a number of other things—expressed unsubstantiated claims of widespread voter fraud in the 2016 Presidential election. The remarks that we heard would appear to be inaccurate, reckless, and dangerous to our democracy in some of our opinions.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are here this evening to highlight the real voter fraud in this country, and that is the continued attempts to suppress minority voting rights across many States as well as the outright denial of the right to vote for millions of Americans living in the territories.

I want to underscore that the fight for equal voting rights for minorities in this country did not end with the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

In fact, today, more than 50 years after our esteemed colleague JOHN LEWIS and others courageously marched on Selma, we have seen the United States Supreme Court strike

down one of its most important protections.

Within hours of that decision, States were already moving forward with restrictive voter ID laws, which had already been rejected as discriminatory under the Voting Rights Act.

Six of the 16 States that passed voter ID laws since 2010 have a documented history of discriminating against minority voters.

The State of Alabama, in 2014, began enforcing a controversial voter ID law that required voters to show a State-issued ID in order to vote, and then announced plans to close 31 driver's license offices—most of them, ironically, in rural, impoverished, majority Black counties—making it even harder for residents to get the most common form of ID used to vote.

In addition to the Supreme Court's action, a Federal Court in a 2015 ruling used a racist, century-old opinion of the Supreme Court to uphold the denial of voting rights to American citizens in my home district of the United States Virgin Islands, and the citizens and residents of America's island territories.

They are called the insular cases, and the opinion was authored, ironically, by the same justice who wrote *Plessy v. Ferguson*.

March marks 100 years that my district has been a part of this country, but our service dates back to its very founding through the Virgin Islander and Founding Father Alexander Hamilton. He would be, I think, very upset to find out that people from the island in which he came could not vote for their President and Commander in Chief, even though the Virgin Islands and the territories have the highest rates of military service in the United States and have exponentially higher rates of casualties per capita in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. We believe we have earned the right to take part in this democracy.

In another example, last year, a Federal appeals court decisively struck down a North Carolina voter identification law and noted its provisions deliberately "target African Americans with almost surgical precision." That is a quote of the court in an effort to depress Black turnout at the polls. That, to me, sounds like voter fraud and voter suppression.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples of the real voter fraud happening across this country.

The members of this caucus continue to work to ensure that all American citizens, regardless of their race, income or location, can participate in this great democracy; and we implore the President to direct his efforts to investigate voter fraud at these and other issues.

We want to, as the Congressional Black Caucus, address another issue, because we don't just represent African Americans or minorities here in this country. We want to address an issue that is of great concern to me and

members of this caucus—and as demonstrated by massive protests this weekend and right across the street here this evening at the Supreme Court—the concern of a large majority of America, and that is the President's executive order to ban refugees entering into this country.

Banning entry to people fleeing persecution is perhaps as diametrically opposed to the foundational fabric of this country as you can get.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the President's refugee ban mean-spirited and misguided, it undermines our democracy, undermines our efforts to thwart terrorism, and is an affront to all who have sacrificed to defend it.

Viewing all refugees fleeing as suspects shows an extremely myopic understanding of the real threats and plays to extremist propaganda.

The refugee ban will not make us safe. It would have done nothing to prevent the 9/11 terrorist attacks, nor the others that followed. The terrorists of those attacks were American citizens, some of whom were even on the terrorist watch list and still allowed to legally purchase deadly weapons used to carry out their terrorist plot.

If this President and Congress want to protect the American people from terrorism, they should pass the no fly, no buy legislation that House Democrats stood to support.

Mr. Speaker, there are many of my colleagues here this evening who would love to speak on this issue.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Garden State of New Jersey, Mrs. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, who will speak to this House on the issues that the Congressional Black Caucus is taking up this evening.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

In his first full week as President, Donald Trump continued to make a mockery of the ideas upon which our Nation was founded. In addition, his de facto Muslim ban is contrary to the national security interests of the United States. His actions are not only discriminatory and bigoted, but also reckless, dangerous, and counterproductive to any authentic effort to defeat terrorism.

As a member of the House Homeland Security Committee, I am concerned this will only serve to stoke anti-American sentiment across the globe, including our international partners committed to eradicating global terror threats.

My colleagues have outlined the ways in which men and women they represent have been impacted at this present moment, and highlight the uncertainty that those constituents feel about the future. But we cannot forget those who have come to this country in pursuit of the future that the American Dream has promised.

Close to 17,000 students from the seven affected countries attend U.S. colleges and universities. The 12th District of New Jersey represents these

men and women, both young and old, at a multitude of 2-year, 4-year, and technical institutions.

The President of Princeton University—one of the most revered institutions in the world, housed in the heart of my district—released a statement concerned that the success of Princeton and many other institutions of higher education across this Nation depend on America's ability to attract and engage with talented people from around the world.

Rutgers University, the flagship public university in my State, has students, researchers, and professors from all seven countries on Trump's barred entry list who are currently traveling outside of this country. The impact on university personnel was felt most immediately after the executive order went into effect.

Two Iranian nationals who are associate professors at the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth were detained Saturday upon arrival at Boston Logan International Airport. Today I talked with university officials in my district who have faculty members that need to return home in order to renew visas, but are afraid to leave. At another college, one-fourth of their applicants come from the countries that are impacted by this ban.

A constituent in East Brunswick, who is a non-Syrian political refugee, sits in limbo as only one of her four minor children passed through our already thorough and extensive processing and was approved for a visa. USCIS put a hold on the process of the remaining three due to lack of communication and direction and understanding from this travel ban.

By feeding off of fear, hatred, and bigotry, this administration's incendiary Muslim ban has created confusion, disruption, and chaos that is rippling around the world.

As our Federal agencies and international partners seek to understand and combat this meritless policy, I call on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, on which I sit, to hold an immediate hearing with leadership at the Department of Homeland Security to review concerning reports about the crafting and execution of this President's order.

I also requested that the House Homeland Security Committee, which I also serve on, to move up its February 7 hearing on this issue so that we may urgently address the national security implications of this administration's actions.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. We respect diversity because this is a nation founded and made great because of immigrants. We are not going to stand by and allow President Trump, with his un-American ideals, to push forward on American policies. Understand that we will resist at every turn.

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her comments.

Now I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Illinois (Ms. KELLY). I thank Ms. KELLY for all of her work on so many issues that are important. I know that voting rights is particularly important to her with her representing the Chicago suburbs and the city of Chicago itself.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank Congressman VEASEY and Congresswoman PLASKETT for holding tonight's CBC Special Order hour.

With so much going on in our Nation right now, it is important that all Americans take seriously our responsibility to be guardians of our democracy. We owe it to those who came before us and those who will be here long after us to keep this democracy and its values moving forward, and reject the rhetoric and policies that take us backwards.

I was reminded of this just a week ago when over 3 million Americans of all ages, races, and religions, marched for women's rights, justice, and equal rights. Three million, a powerful resistance to concerning policies that we are seeing come out of the White House.

Just last night I was with scores of activists and families at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport, protesting President Trump's executive action barring refugees from entering the United States.

I wish that things hadn't come to this. It is a tragedy that these United States, the shining beacon of democracy around the world, the land that welcomes the tired, the poor, and the huddled masses has witnessed a President in his first week in office attempt to strip away our values as an inclusive democracy with an unconstitutional executive order and Muslim ban.

Our Constitution, our laws, our democracy is what we must hold dear as Americans. We must be wholly intolerant of those who seek to pervert our Constitution. We must not tread on our democratic values.

As part of tonight's conversation is protecting voter rights, I am reminded that the past Presidential election brought with it evidence of election hacking and cries of illegal voting.

For the first time in the history of this Nation, we are seeing a President who is intolerably obsessed with his failure to receive the popular vote.

Many of the families that I hear from find this obsession unbecoming of a student council president in Kankakee, where I represent, let alone the President of the United States.

Without evidence, President Trump continues to claim that 3 million illegal votes in California and New York cost him the popular vote. Three million people, the number by which Hillary Clinton won the popular vote. I hardly find that to be a coincidence.

Mr. Speaker, the election is over. The bunting and ribbons have been cleaned up. It is time to govern. A continued relitigation of the election based on unfounded and divisive claims of further fraud divides our Nation further.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

I am now going to call someone who also has a really good understanding of civil rights, voting rights in the State of Virginia, but then also the plight of immigrants and has a deep level of empathy because the other part of his State is very much a diverse State with people made up from various parts of the world.

I yield to the gentleman representing the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia, Representative DONALD MCEACHIN.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman as well as the gentlewoman for leading tonight's conversation about so many issues that are important to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the President's baseless executive order on immigration has hurt this country. It has hurt this country to the extent that it has made us less safe, and it has hurt this country to the extent that it goes against our values as a nation. Our Constitution says that we will not favor any religion over another, yet the President has instituted a religious test for entry in this country just 1 week after his inauguration.

Mr. Speaker, this is a travesty. This rule has inconvenienced travel back to America over the weekend for any number of permanent residents and those of all backgrounds who serve our country. I know this because it has actually impacted citizens of the Fourth Congressional District.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, I have a constituent who has been a permanent resident for 20 years. He had visited his family in Cairo and was on his way back to Virginia when he was turned around. He was actually sent to Qatar, Mr. Speaker, where he has no connections, where he has no business. He was just sent there because he was denied entry back home.

Mr. Speaker, my congressional staff worked around the clock, along with his employer, to get him back home and, thanks be to God, he is, indeed, home. But, Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable, and it cannot go on.

I can't help but think of Leviticus chapter 19, verse 34, where we are reminded, Mr. Speaker, to treat the foreigner in our midst as if he was one of our own.

Mr. Speaker, the President's order does not do this. It is an offense to all Americans. It is an offense to the Judeo-Christian ethic. Mr. Speaker, it cannot be allowed to stand, and I will work every day, along with my colleagues in the CBC and other like-minded individuals in this Congress, to reverse this order.

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentleman for sharing that story about his constituent. Again, it is such a terrible and shameful time for our country, for the world to have seen that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Columbus, Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank the gentleman, my classmate and colleague, Congressman VEASEY. And to my colleague, Congresswoman STACY PLASKETT, thank you for convening tonight's Special Order for the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, we are here for two topics tonight, and you will see many of us come and talk about these topics.

So to my colleagues, let me just cut my message short and say that we are here because we all witnessed, over the weekend, President Trump's latest executive order barring immigrants, refugees, and legal permanent residents from seven Muslim-majority countries. This has set off a protest across the Nation.

I was so proud that I was able to stand in my Third Congressional District with families and individuals protesting his unilateral move that is not making us safe. It flies in the face of the values and the freedoms enshrined in our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I am here because we had individuals in my district who were held in the New York airport, while many others weren't freed like they were. That is why I will continue to stand up to President Trump and stand with my people.

We are also here tonight to respond to another unsubstantiated but extremely dangerous claim made by President Trump. We know that last week he doubled down on his assertion that he would have "... won the popular vote," Mr. Speaker, "if you deduct the millions of people who voted illegally."

Obviously not satisfied with winning the Electoral College, Trump continues to focus on defending his national popular vote loss of almost 3 million votes. He now believes, without any evidence to support his claim, that 3 to 5 million people voted fraudulently in the 2016 election.

While this was par for the course for the Trump campaign, but now that he is in the White House, Mr. Speaker, he intends to make this voter fraud untruth the subject of an actual government investigation mandated by a soon-to-be executive order, wasting untold amounts of taxpayer dollars.

Well, when the Congressional Black Caucus hears people using terms like "voter fraud," "illegally voted," and "strengthening up voting procedures," we read between the lines; and that is why we are here tonight to stand up against voter fraud that he is saying, because we know it is voter suppression.

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, a State that knows a lot about voter suppression, also a very international State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. BASS) representing Los Angeles, one of our most international cities in the world that I

am sure was impacted very greatly by what happened at airports this weekend.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership tonight, and also Representative PLASKETT.

Let me share with you, especially Representative PLASKETT, that on my first day here 7 years ago, one of the first things that happened was a motion on the floor to further deny the right to vote for Representatives from the territories. And I have to tell you that I think, for myself, as well as the majority of people in our country, we don't realize that you only have democracy 50 percent. So I am glad that you raised it tonight, and I think it is very important that we continue to fight so that people from the territories will have the full representation of their country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the travesty that is taking place in our country, a travesty that has resulted in innocent people, students, grandparents, mothers, fathers, and children being unable to travel and enter the United States.

People are caught in a web of suspicion and hatred as a result of the recent executive order which is nothing less than a religious ban. So today, I speak for the Africans that are caught in that ban.

Let me give you an example of who has been caught up by the Muslim ban—a brilliant Stanford student, Ms. Nisrin Omer, studying anthropology. She is a graduate of Harvard who is from Sudan and has lived in this country since 1993.

She has a green card and is a legal resident who was returning to the U.S. from research in Sudan. She was detained for 5 hours and handcuffed, simply because she is from Sudan, the very same country that President Obama worked long and hard to improve relations and to move the country and the region forward.

Another example, a Somali woman and her two children detained at Dulles Airport for 18-plus hours as a result of the Muslim ban. According to reports, the children have U.S. passports, and their father was allowed to stay in the U.S., but his Somali wife would have been deported were it not for the emergency stay granted by the New York Federal judge.

Then there are refugees, mostly Somali, stuck in Kenya following the cancellation of their flight as a result of the executive order. These stranded travelers had been waiting, according to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, 10 to 15 years to resettle.

And I speak of seven people who are reportedly being detained at the airport in my city, Los Angeles airport. All of these situations are a result of the President's executive order which, despite the protestations from the administration, is nothing less than a Muslim ban.

I also speak of persons fleeing for their lives from Libya, who are now

stigmatized worldwide because of this ban.

Day 10 of the Trump Presidency. Heaven help us.

Mr. VEASEY. I thank Representative BASS for her commentary representing the very international city of Los Angeles, again, a city with many immigrants, with many people who have contributed to the greatness and vibrancy of that city that we know as Los Angeles. I just really do appreciate all of her input on that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to call up to come and speak Mr. DWIGHT EVANS. Mr. EVANS, hailing from Pennsylvania's Second Congressional District, a State that also is very international, I am sure that your State was heavily impacted by the travel ban that was implemented by the Trump administration, and I believe the world needs to hear your remarks tonight, so thank you for being here tonight to speak.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join and thank Representative VEASEY and Representative PLASKETT for this opportunity.

Tonight, I stand with my colleagues urging support of policy solutions that will ensure our communities have unfettered access to the ballot box and to call for solutions to Republican-led attempts to suppress minority voting rights across the country.

Additionally, I must state my view of the recent action taken by President Trump which I assert has reduced the national trust in our democracy.

In the short time since President Trump has taken office, he has set forth a national security plan that would require broad spending increases. He has set forth an executive order to repeal the Affordable Care Act without a replacement in place. He has seemingly put us directly at odds with Mexico, our bordering country, due to a wall that he has set forth as one of his key proposals, and then expected and even demanded that they actually pay for it.

He has ignored the facts and has declared that 3 to 5 million people allegedly voted fraudulently in the election.

And last, but certainly not least, he has set forth an executive order banning travel from Muslim countries and suspended the refugee program, an action that makes our Nation less safe.

Over the weekend, I joined with Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf, Philadelphia Mayor Jim Kenney, Representative ROBERT BRADY, and Representative BRENDAN BOYLE and spoke directly with those who were immediately impacted by this executive action.

We joined with the protesters in voicing extreme discontent over the executive order and vowed to do our part to remedy what we can only refer to as a "forced error" of global proportions. We must work collectively to tear down the ban and to be the open democracy that our Constitution allows us to be.

Just today, Acting Attorney General Sally Yates told attorneys in the Justice Department not to make legal arguments defending President Trump's order on immigration and refugees.

The actions taken by President Trump are not in the best interest of our Nation, our national security, nor are they in the best interest of our communities; that is why we must continue to move forward policy proposals that have been introduced by my colleagues to ensure equal access to the ballot box to ensure we protect the voting rights of those in our communities so that they know that their voices are being heard.

For instance, my House colleague, Representative SEWELL, introduced the Voting Rights Advancement Act, which would set forth a geographical coverage formula that is based on the current conditions that include 13 States.

The bill will establish a rolling nationwide trigger that continuously moves so that only States that have a recent record of racial discrimination in voting would be covered. The Voting Rights Advancement Act would set forth greater transparency in Federal elections to ensure that voters are made aware of the late-breaking changes in voter procedures and would deter discrimination from occurring and protect voters from discrimination.

Let us continue to ensure the voices of our communities are heard. My colleagues and I stand united and ready to combat these actions that run counter to the best interest of those we are elected to represent.

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. And just like the city of Philadelphia, just like the city of Los Angeles, when we heard from Congresswoman BASS earlier, oftentimes the State of Texas is portrayed through popular culture as not being a very international place, but we are a very international place.

Everyone has heard of the stories how every State Legislative Session, which one has just begun a couple of weeks ago, how Black and Hispanic voters, in particular, in the State of Texas, are targeted so our voting participation numbers will decrease.

Well, someone who has been in that fight to help protect Black and Latino voters in the State of Texas to expand voting rights in the State of Texas; and not just that, again, in pop culture, our State has oftentimes been portrayed as one way, but a lot of people forget that the city of Houston is the fourth largest city in the country and one of the most international cities in the entire world, one of the largest ballots in the entire country, printed in—I forgot exactly how many languages. Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE can tell you that later.

So not only are voting rights being impacted in her district, but also I am sure that she felt the plight of many of the people who she represents who were

stuck at airports, including the Houston International Airport, by the Muslim ban that was implemented by the Trump administration.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for their continuing leadership on a very important and needed response to the actions of many, in particular, this new administration.

My time is short, so I want to thank Mr. VEASEY for his leadership on the challenge to the voter ID law and, as well, his continuing leadership on the empowerment of voters, as well to Ms. PLASKETT for ensuring and fighting for the right to vote for the Virgin Islands.

□ 2000

I stand with both of them. But I come today to plead and also to enunciate what crisis we find ourselves in. The White House is in crisis. When the White House is in crisis, that means America is in crisis.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a frivolous statement that I make; it is a truthful statement because less than 72 hours ago, without the counsel of many experts, Members of Congress who are on the jurisdictional committees, without the notice and input of the Secretary of Homeland Security, an executive order was produced by one young staffer in the White House and another individual who has pushed an agenda of exclusiveness. That is not the way to run this country.

So this executive order came out, and what we find is that 67,000 refugees are stranded around the world who actually had documents, who were vetted, and, as some stories have told us, waited 10 and 12 to 13 years to be able to get in line and to be vetted to come to the United States of America. The tragedy is that some of them were, in fact, our friends from Iraq who have stood by our military personnel who had, in fact, provided them the interpretation that they needed to save their lives. In one story we heard tonight on the steps of the United States Supreme Court was a woman who finally got here with her two children. Her husband was murdered, and her father was tortured.

So, to Mr. Trump, today I think it is important as we have joined in to repeal and to rescind this unconstitutional order, it is clear that you need to read the writing on the wall. The Deputy Attorney General, duly appointed and confirmed, of the U.S. Department of Justice, the remaining individual who has power in that office, has made a very conscious decision that they cannot defend this order because it is unconstitutional. This is not a person who takes her task lightly. This is not someone who is not an officer who has not taken an oath of office. This is akin to what happened in the Nixon administration. They were willing to lose their position to stand for the Constitution.

So the Congressional Black Caucus is on the floor today with our chairman, Mr. RICHMOND, to be able to inform America that this is patently unconstitutional. It does not provide for due process. It did not provide for equal protection of the law. As well, it is a blatant attack on freedom of religion.

For those of you who need a better explanation, let me tell you what a ban on Muslims is. A ban on Muslims is one country, two countries, seven countries, and the idea of who cannot come in are Muslims—that is a ban on Muslims. It is not a ban on Christians. It is not a ban on any other faith. It is a ban on Muslims, and the White House needs to understand what an interpretation of that means.

Further, let me say, as I come to a close, please do not try to cover yourself with the announcement that was made by President Obama. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am well aware of that announcement that he had regarding a number of countries. It was not a ban. It was to take note that those countries were in conflict and that individuals who were coming from those countries specifically needed to have a higher level of scrutiny. It was not a ban. It is well documented that the tragedies that we have had from Boston to Orlando to San Bernardino were not individuals who came through as refugees or came from those particular countries.

What are we doing here? We are blatantly violating the Constitution. When the President of the United States violates the Constitution, this body has to stand up and respond. So I would ask this body to direct the President to rescind. In the alternative, I would ask that the legislation that is being introduced call upon the President to repeal this.

In all fairness, I would appreciate if the President took it up on his own to suspend this order that is impacting so many who are being left along the highway of despair, people who are able to—if you will, people and individuals who are able to seek refuge here are now being left.

I believe that the Congressional Black Caucus—the conscience of the Congress—stands now, tonight, to seek to ban the Muslim ban, to seek to stop the suppression of voting, and to also say to the nominee for the Attorney General: Are you prepared to represent all of us and to be able to support the institution, or reinstatement, of section 5 of the Voting Rights Act?

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for clearing up a lot of the misconceptions that are being purposely spread out there that this was something that was used by the Obama administration. It absolutely was not. It is being purposely spread on social media, and people are lying about the past and what happened. It is completely different, and I want to thank her for clearing that up.

I now yield to the gentleman from Newark, New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is the gentleman representing the eastern coast of New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Fort Worth and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for heading these Special Order hours. It is an honor that I had prior to them, and I am sure that they see the importance of being able to spearhead topics that are important for today.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump's claims of widespread voter fraud are unsubstantiated. Officials in both parties have said that there is no evidence of large-scale voter fraud. A comprehensive investigation found only 31 possible cases of impersonation fraud out of 1 billion votes cast in all elections between 2000 and 2014. President Trump lost the popular vote by 2.8 million, and it looks like he is looking for an excuse.

What is worse is that President Trump's unfounded claims will encourage Republicans to double down on their assault on voting rights. There is no significant evidence of fraud, but President Trump's claims will be used as cover to suppress the vote. He is already talking about launching a major investigation into nonexistent voter fraud. The only thing that would come from such an investigation would be further restrictions on voting rights.

If President Trump wants to investigate anything, he should investigate the real voter fraud talking place—the Republican-led attempts to suppress minority votes.

The strategy of Republican legislatures in some States has been to suppress votes by instituting voter ID laws, reducing hours for early voting, and closing polling places. According to the Brennan Center for Justice, in 2016, 14 States had new voting restrictions in place for the first time in a Presidential election. This Presidential election was the first in 50 years without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

As a country, we should make it as easy as possible for people to exercise the right to vote. Election officials should not erode our democratic principles. They should make sure that every American citizen has an equal voice in the democratic process.

Protecting every person's right to vote is essential to a fully functioning democracy. The countless men and women who have risked their lives to defend that right knew our system of government only works when it is inclusive and fair, when it enables all voices to have a say in the future of our country.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), who represents a critical State, a State that some people think actually went a certain direction in the Presidential race because of voter suppression tactics. She represents the city of Milwaukee.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Fort Worth for yielding this time to me.

I could just tell you that it is *deja vu* all over again. When President George W. Bush lost the election in 2000, he engaged in a lengthy investigation over so-called voter fraud to deflect from the fact that he, in fact, lost the popular vote, as did President Donald Trump. These allegations of voter fraud do nothing but to continue to bankrupt the Treasury. When, as the gentleman from New Jersey just pointed out, Loyola Law School did an extensive study, they found 31 cases of voter impersonation out of 1 billion votes cast in the last 14 years. We don't have enough time for me to do the math on that, but it is *de minimis*.

I can tell you that real voter fraud is voter suppression. 2016 was the very first Presidential election in 50 years, gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, that we didn't have the full protection of voting rights in 14 States, and it showed, including in my own swing State of Wisconsin. Brand-new voting ID restrictions disproportionately suppressed African American, low-income citizens' votes.

According to a Federal Court, nearly 300,000 registered voters in Wisconsin—in my State—could not obtain the voter ID required by the imposition of these new laws. Throughout the country, we saw 868 fewer polling places. We saw these voter ID laws, and we saw just a reinvention of these painful and unjust poll taxes and remnants of poll taxes and literacy tests imposed upon African Americans.

I can tell you, if there is any voter suppression, it is voter denial in this country; and I would call for, instead of spending taxpayer dollars to find 5 million votes that President Trump claimed voted for Hillary Clinton, I would rather spend that money investigating the Russian hacks into our election.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from the State of Wisconsin.

Now I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is my friend and colleague from another international part of the country, the Oakland Bay Area.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Congressman VEASEY for yielding and for his tireless work to defend rights and justice. Also to Congresswoman PLASKETT, I thank the gentlewoman for continuing to speak out, to organize us, and for her stellar representation of her district.

Mr. Speaker, in his first week as President, Donald Trump advanced dangerous conspiracy theories and enacted a Muslim ban that undermines our Nation's standing in the world. These actions show that President Trump will peddle his alternative facts no matter the consequences.

□ 2015

Now, let me be clear. This approach to governance threatens our democracy

and our national security. We must resist it. For starters, we cannot allow President Trump to erode our right to vote. Access to the ballot box is the cornerstone of American democracy, yet he spent his first week in office peddling the baseless myth that 3 to 5 million voted illegally in our election.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Both Republicans and Democrats have dismissed this myth as unsubstantiated, but the President continues to insist that millions of fraudulent voters cost him the popular vote.

Let's call this what it is. This is a campaign by our highest elected official to fabricate reasons why he lost the majority of popular votes. He will use these blatant falsehoods to further undermine access to the voting booth.

Mr. Speaker, this investigation that is being proposed really is a sham. The real attack on America's elections come from Republicans who make it harder for people of color, young people, and low-income people to vote.

I include in the RECORD an editorial from The New York Times, "The Voter Fraud Fantasy."

[From The New York Times, Jan. 27, 2017]

THE VOTER FRAUD FANTASY

(By Lilli Carré)

There are varying degrees of absurdity in the fallacies President Trump peddled during his first week in the Oval Office. Perhaps the most damaging was his insistence that millions of Americans voted illegally in the election he narrowly won.

Mr. Trump first made that false claim in late November, tweeting that he would have won the popular vote "if you deduct the millions of people who voted illegally." On Wednesday, he announced that he intended to launch a "major investigation" into voting fraud and suggested the outcome may justify tightening voting rules.

What once seemed like another hare-brained claim by a president with little regard for the truth must now be recognized as a real threat to American democracy. Mr. Trump is telegraphing his administration's intent to provide cover for longstanding efforts by Republicans to suppress minority voters by purging voting rolls, imposing onerous identification requirements and curtailing early voting.

"This is another attempt to undermine our democracy," said Representative Barbara Lee of California, one of the states where Mr. Trump falsely claimed results were tainted by large-scale fraud. "It's about not honoring and recognizing demographic change."

The apparent source of Mr. Trump's original claim of mass voter fraud was Gregg Phillips, a Texas man with a penchant for making wild allegations about voting fraud. Days before Mr. Trump's tweet, Mr. Phillips claimed on Twitter that he had "verified more than three million votes cast by non-citizens." State election officials across the political spectrum promptly rejected that assertion, noting that ballot box fraud in the United States is exceedingly rare.

On Friday, Mr. Trump tweeted that he was looking forward to seeing the results of an analysis of illegal votes, as promised by Mr. Phillips. Republican officials know the voter fraud claim is an indefensible lie. But few are challenging Mr. Trump or raising alarms about how severely this hurts our election system.

Voter suppression initiatives have grown increasingly common since the Supreme

Court invalidated a central provision of the Voting Rights Act in 2013, making it easier for local authorities to tweak election rules in a manner that disenfranchises particular groups of people.

Under the Obama administration, the Justice Department aggressively fought these efforts. Lawsuits filed by civil rights advocates and the Justice Department led a federal appeals court in 2013 to strike down a North Carolina voter ID law that justices concluded had been designed to target African-American voters with “surgical precision.” Litigation in a similar Texas case is now on hold, pending guidance from the new attorney general.

If Mr. Trump’s attorney general nominee, Senator Jeff Sessions, is confirmed, the Justice Department will be likely to all but abandon enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. Mr. Sessions once called it a “piece of intrusive legislation.” That would allow state and national lawmakers to impose even tighter voting requirements, harming minorities, the young and the elderly, who tend to vote Democratic.

Republicans may see these measures as a means of staying in power in the face of demographic changes. They should be ashamed of undermining the integrity of our system of government by trying to strip away a right Americans have fought for and died to secure.

Ms. LEE. If the President were serious about protecting access to the ballot, he would join members of the Congressional Black Caucus in our call for the restoration of the Voting Rights Act.

Since it was gutted in 2013, millions of minority voters have been prevented from casting their votes. Last year alone, hundreds of thousands of minority voters were disenfranchised before and on election day.

Instead of lodging investigations based on alternative facts, President Trump should be investigating the widespread efforts to disenfranchise voters, including the use of outdated voting machines, the mishandling of provisional ballots, the improper purging of voting rolls, and the widely reporting incidents of intimidation and misinformation at the polls.

These are the truth threats to our democracy. If these threats are not enough to occupy President Trump’s attention, he should turn to the widespread evidence of Russian interference in our elections. The facts are available and in need of bipartisan investigation, but President Trump has no interest in evaluating facts. He would rather focus on falsehoods.

But the President’s attacks on our democracy aren’t restricted to alternative facts. This weekend we witnessed the erosion of another American value: our proud tradition as a refuge for immigrants of every religion. The President issued an executive order banning immigrants and refugees from the United States on the basis of religion.

This outrageous executive order to shut people out from several Muslim nations runs counter to our fundamental values that we cherish as Americans. It is morally reprehensible and will only make the United States

less safe. The order has done nothing but create chaos and fear among refugees and immigrants who have been admitted or have been approved to come to the United States.

This Nation is, has been, and always will be a nation of immigrants and refugees. This is who we are. We don’t turn our back to those in need. And certainly, we do not do so on the basis of religion.

This is a watershed moment for our country, a moment that brings into question our moral character. Thousands of Americans took to the streets to protest the Muslim ban. Really? This is what the resistance must look like.

Tonight, many of us joined our colleagues on the steps of the Supreme Court to demand a reversal of this hateful policy. We will continue to fight every attempt to erode our values to appease ideology and radical special interests.

Our new bill, Statue of Liberty Values Act, known as the SOLVE Act, will reverse President Trump’s Muslim ban executive order and ensure that funds or fees shall not be used to implement the order. I hope everyone signs on to Congresswoman LOFGREN’s bill. The President’s order harms our families, our economy, and our national security.

Once again, this is not who we are as a nation. We are better than. We must wake up and fight because the future of our democracy is at stake.

My district is a district of immigrants. People are very afraid. We are a sanctuary district. What is taking place now is totally un-American.

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

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, within just days of assuming office, President Donald Trump has made a number of alarmingly fictitious claims about anything from the alleged failures of the Affordable Care Act to the skyrocketing murder rate throughout the United States. President Trump has even felt it was necessary to misrepresent the number of attendees at his inauguration. However, among his most egregious “alternative facts” that he has presented to the American people is the idea that there is widespread voter fraud across the country, which is undermining the electoral process in the United States. This is unequivocally false.

In fact, numerous reports, court findings, and official government investigations over the years have pointed to the fact that voter fraud is, in reality, extremely rare. In 2016, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which ultimately found the Texas photo ID law to be racially discriminatory, noted in its findings that there were only two convictions for in-person voter impersonation fraud out of 20 million votes cast in Texas within the last decade. In a separate case ruled in 2014, a special investigations unit for the State of Texas was found to only have identified a single conviction and one guilty plea of in-person

voter impersonation in any election in the State of Texas between 2002 and 2014. Nationally, countless studies—including one conducted by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office—have failed to identify any evidence of widespread voter fraud. The story is the same in states all across the country.

Yet, somehow President Trump and Republicans in Congress have arrived at a separate conclusion and are using this false notion to promote regressive voter laws that seek to suppress minority voting rights all across the country. These laws are an example of your classic “solution in search of a problem,” albeit with a more sinister objective to suppress liberal leaning voters and deny select groups of voters their fundamental right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have worked tirelessly throughout our careers to ensure that every American has equal access to the polls regardless of race, income, location, or background. We will not stop at making sure that every American preserves their right to vote, even in the face of a Republican-controlled Congress and Administration. The right to vote is a fundamental pillar of our democracy, and it is counter to our principles that our nation had defended for centuries to now try and erode that right for millions of Americans. I, and countless other Americans, unequivocally reject these efforts and will forever stand united against them.

FAST START UNDER THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

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. Mr. Speaker, we are off to a fast start this year under the Trump administration. It is difficult, apparently, for some of the press to keep up with how quickly some of the things are going.

I did want to make clear something that has been completely muddled by the mainstream media. They keep wondering why they continue to lose out to news channels like FOX News and why some of the conservative news sources online do so well compared to the left-wing sources. It is because a majority of people really are seeking truth, really are seeking answers.

I realize that is not true for everywhere. The areas that Hillary Clinton won are basically relegated to the edges, the fringes of the country: around the coasts and southern valley, Chicago, Detroit, and some of those areas. It is really the fringe party.

After someone—anyone with the least amount of even a small modicum of fairness—looks at the actual executive order that Donald Trump issued, it seems eminently reasonable. When looking at it, for example, compared to orders signed by a President named Obama, a President named Carter—I couldn’t find any CNN, MSNBC, or anything like CNBC, and I could have missed that somebody did break through all the misrepresentations of those networks and actually point out,

because sometimes I am going by and I don't have the sound on and I will be reading the subtext, but you would think that someone in one of those networks would make a big deal out of the fact that Muslims were not banned under the Trump executive order. Yet people all over the world and all over this country are still under the mistaken impression they can trust certain networks. They still haven't figured out that they can't.

They see that, my gosh, the President has banned Muslims. I actually have the executive order here because, just as I read ObamaCare before I voted against it, I have read the President's executive order. I made highlights in bold on some things. I saw that there is no reference—not one—to Muslims, to Islam. It is just not there. So it is a total misrepresentation.

Now, to try to cover for the way the executive order news is being spun, some of them, to try to grasp back just a small portion of something resembling fairness, would say the words "Muslim-majority country banned," try to bring it back so they can work in the word "Muslim" when it wasn't about religion at all. It is about the safety of the United States, the people we are sworn to protect, the Constitution that we raise our right hand and we swear to protect. We just took that oath earlier this month, and already it is forgotten.

The refugee program that President Trump has paused is the same one that ISIS terrorists have repeatedly vowed that they are infiltrating, and they are intending to use it to kill Americans. The President is acting temporarily and prudently to give his administration and this Congress the time it needs to properly evaluate the refugee program and reform it to ensure that we help legitimate refugees and ensure the safety, as much as is possible, of the American people.

When an FBI Director warns that they have no information from a country with which to compare identity information that refugees have or present or even orally convey, then I would think at some point we would take that information seriously from the sworn testimony.

Now, I realize that the past administration has played fast and loose when you keep telling the American people and the Members of Congress that the attack in Benghazi was all about a video, and you even try to cover that by encouraging the producer of the video to be arrested and put in jail to help with this misrepresentation of the truth. Then I guess, under those circumstances, you don't take testimony from the prior administration Cabinet members all that seriously because you know that they have been out there and misrepresented the truth before.

I don't know if Klein's book about, I think it was, the blood feud between the Obamas and the Clintons was right, but there had to be a reason that Hillary Clinton did not come out on the

Sunday shows after Benghazi and make this claim that was adverse to what she emailed her daughter and what she emailed to the President of Libya, saying that it was an attack. She didn't mention a video because it wasn't about a video. She knew that. I realize that, between the concussion, the problems, she may not remember that, but she knew it at the time.

According to that book, she called and talked to former President Bill Clinton; and she was encouraged not to go public and say it was about a video, that, in essence, that was indefensible. Nobody in their right mind was going to believe that, so she couldn't be out there.

There were thoughts being entertained of maybe resigning rather than going out and trying to defend that story, but, gee, they realized that if she was going to run for President in 2016 and she resigned right before the election in 2012, it would have likely cost President Obama a second term, and then Democrats would not be very kind and forgiving even though that would have been a stance based on truth and honor. If it cost the Presidency in 2016, it was just not something that could be done.

□ 2030

Apparently, according to the book and his sources that he says are close friends of the people involved, they decided the best way was not to resign and cost the President the reelection in 2012, but refuse under all circumstances to go on the Sunday shows and try to tell America six times that the attack at Benghazi was not planned; it was just instantaneous that arose from a protest over the video, but just don't go make that representation. Make that clear to the administration you are not going to do that, and then let the chips fall where they may. Because we haven't been able to figure out outside that representation in the book, why in the world did Susan Rice come out and say all that?

That should have been Hillary Clinton's role. So he provides the excuse or the reasoning. So Susan Rice goes out and over and over on Sunday shows, it was all about a video.

Well, I know from my days as a judge hearing of incidents where someone perhaps in a company that was not being honestly run would keep somebody in the dark so they could go out and make certain representations. The person really didn't want to know what the real truth was so they could come out and say with a clear conscience, here is what happened, and that wasn't it. So it may well be Susan Rice just did not know that her statements were lies. And if she didn't know, then they are not lies; they are just falsehoods she didn't know were false.

We don't know, but it is an interesting representation. And it still brings us back to the fact that in certain countries in the world, we don't have adequate information to check in-

dividuals coming in against. No matter how much the credibility of the FBI Director may have been harmed last summer when he came out and made a totally political move of outlining that Hillary Clinton basically committed a crime, but no reasonable prosecutor would pursue this, that is my interpretation of what he said basically, and those who have prosecuted—I have prosecuted. You know, there are a lot of prosecutors who would take that. But he made the statement. So I figured that was pretty political.

Despite that, when he says, you know, look, we had some information from some of these countries we got from their governments so that when we see their passport, we see some of this information, we could say, all right, we can check it against their government's records: What do you have on this person?

But we had heard from Syria, for example, that they had actually taken over facilities that could print official passports. So they could print a totally fictitious passport because they have the means to do it. They have captured that. Not only do we not have a cooperating government, but we have no information. We don't have fingerprints off IEDs like we did from Iraq, and most of the time we had cooperation so we could compare this information. But we had nothing in some of these countries that could give us the assurance that the leaders of radical Islamist groups were not doing exactly what they said they were, and that is infiltrating the refugees with people who were going to come in and kill Americans. They said they were doing that in Europe. At some point we need to take these things seriously.

I am thrilled to have a President—fortunately it is nice being thrilled to death instead of being beaten or knifed or hit with a truck. But I am thrilled to have a President who is taking seriously the things that the Obama administration found should be taken seriously. Let's be clear, no one is being discriminated against in the President's executive order based on religion. Christians, Jews, Muslims, any religious group, agnostics, atheists from the countries designated for a pause—it is not a ban; it is a pause so we can look better at what we need to do.

I am thrilled to be joined by one of our sharpest new freshmen.

Mr. GAETZ. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I similarly thank him for many nights coming to this floor and defending values that are not only uniquely American, but which are unmistakably conservative. I appreciate him for being the fire keeper on this floor for those values and those principles for constituents in his district and in mine and all throughout this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my fellow northwest Floridians, brave airmen who serve at Eglin Air Force Base and Duke Field and skilled

aviators who train out at NAS Pensacola and Whiting Field and some of the planet Earth's most hardened and successful warriors in the 7th Special Forces Group and those who also deploy out of Hurlburt Field in northwest Florida. They are the best among us and they often inspire the best within us as a consequence of their patriotic service.

So when I encounter them at town-hall meetings or in church or at grocery stores, I often ask: How do you do it? How do you leave your family, your home, your community, risk your life, your health to go to places that many Americans couldn't point to on a map and to fight against an enemy who is evil and vicious and determined and increasingly equipped?

And almost to a man and woman, they tell me: We fight them over there so that we don't have to feel the consequences over here in America.

It is that spirit that I join in supporting and honoring in my full-throated and unequivocal support of President Trump's most recent executive order so that we are not devaluing the service of my constituents by risking the lives and the health and security of Americans here in this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I wish so much that President Trump's executive order were unnecessary. I wish that we lived in a world that was more stable and secure, where America could welcome with open arms anyone from anywhere for whatever reason at whatever cost. But the reality is that American taxpayers can't pay for everything, and American families cannot shoulder the risks of insecurity for the consequences of terrible foreign policy decisions that have been made over the last 8 years.

Maybe if the former President hadn't withdrawn from the Middle East, these regions would be more secure. Maybe if our policies hadn't so destabilized north Africa that we had failed state after failed state functioning as a caldron of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism, this order would not have been necessary. But, alas, it is necessary.

I think it is important to distinguish between the realities of this executive order and the hysteria that has been created by the media. Some would believe, if they were to look only at media reports, that this was a ban on all Muslims who would seek to come to this country.

Let me affirm: our war, our conflict is not with the Muslim faith. As a matter of fact, this consequence, this conflict we are engaged in is all about the future of that faith and religion, and I am hopeful as a Christian that we are able to forge a lasting peace among all people on Earth. The reality is that there are more than 50 countries that are majority Muslim, and most of those countries will see no impact as a consequence of this most recent executive order. But there are seven countries—I guess it is perhaps a bit gen-

erous to call them countries, Mr. Speaker, because they are failed states that function to do very little other than to breed more terror and discontent and anti-Americanism. But from those seven countries, the President has taken the position that we ought to take a closer look, we ought to have a belt-and-suspenders approach to the security of American families. Of the more than 325,000 people who have recently come to the United States from foreign countries since the President's most recent executive order, about 100 have been kept for additional screening, more thorough review, and a more thoughtful approach.

So as I stand here with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Speaker, know that I am in full support of President Trump's most recent order. When I go back to northwest Florida and I look into the eyes of the warfighters, the airmen, the sailors, and the patriots, I will know that in this House there were those who were willing to stand with them, honor their service and sacrifice, and do everything possible to put America first and to keep Americans safe.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as I told my friend from Florida, I am honored anytime he comes to the floor to speak because he knows what he is talking about. When I was a judge back in Texas, a young prosecutor also shared his first name, and he is now the DA. He is as sincere and intelligent. Anyway, it is just an honor to serve with Mr. GAETZ. I wondered if he might yield for a question.

The Attorney General—I am sorry, this is the acting Attorney General because the Senate is dragging its feet on one of its own, JEFF SESSIONS, but this came out today in The Hill that "Acting Attorney General Sally Yates sent a letter Monday ordering the Justice Department not to defend President Trump's executive order . . ." even though it is an order that basically has been done by the Obama administration—except President Obama had done it one country that is included in the seven for 6 months instead of 3—and also by President Carter. I don't think he was a Republican. Anyway, these things have been done before, and the letter says we are not going to defend it.

This story from Lydia Wheeler today says: "Yates's"—the acting Attorney General—"decision suggests she does not want to put the credibility of the Justice Department behind the order. . . ."

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Florida, does he have concerns that, if the Justice Department were to defend this executive order, it would hurt the credibility of the Justice Department when acting under its Democratic leadership?

Mr. GAETZ. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I believe his question highlights an increasing problem that we have had for the last 8 years that I hope we will cure, and that

is the politicization of the important work that the executive branch ought to be doing on behalf of the American people.

The Justice Department should not be Republican or Democrat. It should stand up for the rights of all Americans, the laws that are enacted by this Congress, and the orders that are issued by the President. We shouldn't have circumstances where we have to wonder whether or not the people who are tasked to uphold the law, as the gentleman from Texas did as a jurist and did in a very colored legal career—we shouldn't have to worry about that. But, in fact, for the last 8 years, that has been the problem. That is perhaps one of the reasons why the Senate should act with due haste in confirming JEFF SESSIONS as the Attorney General, so we go back to a system that is governed by the rule of law, not the rule of popular opinion or politics or one particular ideology.

More specifically to the gentleman from Texas' question, I believe that what undermines the Justice Department is this partisan tilt, are these lenses through which many of President Obama's appointees evaluate the great questions that impact the security of Americans.

The gentleman from Texas correctly points out that what President Trump has done is hardly unprecedented. In 1979, President Carter, hardly one that is held out among conservatives as a great standard-bearer on foreign affairs and a strong America, was one who recognized that there were unique challenges in a unique period of time from those who may be coming to the United States from Iran, and he took action.

□ 2045

Similarly, in 2011, President Obama was concerned that, during an act of conflict with Iraq, there may be circumstances where people would come from Iraq to do harm to Americans on American soil, and so he took action. I guess the difference with President Trump is that he is willing to take action immediately, and that we are not going to have a Presidency with a bunch of handwringing and bedwetting over the questions that impact the safety of Americans and the dignity of this country and its borders.

President Obama was unwilling to heed the counsel of those in his own administration who indicated that there were insufficient vetting procedures in place previously. And so it strikes me as only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that a new President coming in, having heard that there were inadequate screening procedures, not from a Trump appointee but from an appointee of President Obama, that we would take a finite period of time, 90 days, and we would analyze what would be the appropriate protocols, screening procedures, and vetting algorithms that we would use to ensure that America's interests were placed first.

I am glad we have a President who puts this country first; I am glad we have a President who does not view himself as a citizen of the world more than he views himself as a citizen of this country; and I am glad that he takes that responsibility seriously.

And to answer the gentleman's question, I would say that we ought to have a Justice Department that is led by those who will follow the rule of law, who will defend the rights of Americans, and who will stand up for the security of this country.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Great points. And I wish I were as articulate.

I have been critical of the majority leader in the Senate, Senator MCCONNELL, but this story is from CNS News. Majority Leader MCCONNELL says: "Well, I think it's a good idea to tighten the vetting process."

And he went on to say: "I don't want to criticize them"—the Trump administration—"for improving vetting."

And I applaud the majority leader for not running for the hills when all of the media does their typical thing and just goes freaking out. But, we found this story goes also, I think, to illustrate the point Mr. GAETZ was making. This is from Daniel Horowitz's article today. It turns out that 17 sitting Democrats in the House and Senate voted to ban visas from some Muslim countries and that law still exists today. Of course, this was back in 2002. And back at that time, you had some quite conservative Democrats in the House and Senate, people like Senator Ted Kennedy and Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, you know, real bulwarks of conservatism, who voted to ban visas from these type countries, of the Muslim majority countries, as CNN would like to call them. Gee, names like CARDIN, MARKEY, MENENDEZ, MURRAY, NELSON of Florida, REED of Rhode Island, SANDERS of Vermont. Wow, there is another conservative, SANDERS of Vermont. SCHUMER, another strong hearted conservative. STABENOW, WYDEN, DURBIN, FEINSTEIN, LEAHY, and UDALL.

So it kind of begs the question: If this is only a temporary ban from countries until we can ascertain better vetting, how much worse is it for these 73 sitting Democrats to have voted for a permanent ban? That is rather shocking.

And it is notable that President Obama, not exactly consistent with former President George W. Bush who went 8 years without coming out and making formal criticisms—well, President Obama has said he is very heartened by all of the anti-Trump protests. We even have Democrats here in the House who said: "... as we've heard before, the President fundamentally disagrees with the notion of discriminating against individuals because of their faith or religion." Because I know my friend here in the House would not misrepresent the truth. So it just shows, obviously, he hasn't read this executive order that makes very clear

it is not banning a religion or a faith, it is countries where we don't have enough information.

And I just find it interesting that we are standing on the side of 73 Democrats—MARKEY, BERNIE SANDERS, FEINSTEIN, people like that—who thought it was a good idea when they were closer to 9/11.

Mr. GAETZ. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding for a question.

Not long ago, we heard members of the Congressional Black Caucus take to this floor and make the argument that it was hypocritical and improper that in President Trump's order and in the follow-on execution of that order by the Department of Homeland Security that there would be some preference given to religious minorities in these predominantly Muslim countries, particularly Christians, who are often persecuted, harmed, or killed. In many circumstances in which the President has allowed for through exceptions to his order, there will be people from these seven countries allowed into the United States as a consequence of the persecution that they feel and that they endure as a consequence of their Christian faith.

And so my question to the gentleman from Texas is whether or not he shares the Congressional Black Caucus' view that it is improper to treat Christians who are being discriminated against in these predominantly Muslim countries differently and to give them the opportunity to immigrate to the United States of America and realize freedom in the absence of this terrible persecution that they feel?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, my friend makes such a great point. I think the way this country has, in recent years, been so discriminatory as has been the United Nations against Christian refugees, I am afraid that this United States of America could be called to account for the slaughter of so many Christians who we could have helped. And as we know from the numbers, there are a lot of excuses by the U.N. as to why they are not helping an equal percentage of Christians to the percentage of makeup of those countries they are coming from. There have been all kinds of excuses.

But even our Secretary of State, under the last administration, John Kerry, admitted there was a genocide going on of Christians in the Middle East. Now, there is not a genocide going on of Muslims in these countries. There are Sunni versus Shia and vice versa, and there are clashes within the Islamic religion, but there is not a genocide of all Muslims in any of these countries. And yet there is clearly a genocide clear enough for John Kerry to note.

So one of the most heinous and outrageous answers that I have heard a

U.N. general secretary make was—well, I didn't hear it, I read—that the U.N. general secretary was asked about a year and a half or so ago, when he was in charge of the United Nations' refugee program, and this issue of the U.N. not helping the same percentage, in fact, just helping a fraction of the percentage of Christians who exist in these countries, his response was basically that it was important to leave these Christians in the areas where they are being killed because they have historical precedence in those areas.

So we are going to bring Muslims out, according to the U.N. general secretary, because they didn't have as much historical significance, whereas the Christians who are being wiped out—throats cut, heads cut off, crucified, women raped, and just the most heinous of crimes committed against individuals are taking place—our U.N. general secretary and, apparently under our past President, the State Department felt like it was important to leave Christians there in larger percentages than existed among the refugees of Muslim because, hey, they have been there a long while, so let's leave them there, which ultimately means they will all be slaughtered. It is quite distressing.

But here is a point made by George Rasley today in an article, "President Trump Stops Suicidal Immigration Policy . . .," where he points out that:

"Had President Trump's policy been in place participants in many Muslim terrorist incidents would have been prevented from entering our country, for example the Ohio State University attack by Somali 'refugee' Abdul Razak Ali Artan, the September 2016 stabbing attack in a mall in St. Cloud, Minnesota, and two foiled bomb plots—one in Portland, Oregon, in 2010 and one in Columbus, Ohio, in 2000.

"Indeed, some 74 terrorist incidents have been attributed to Somali Muslims alone. And while the Obama administration did its best to cover-up the immigration status of the perpetrators we know that at least 13 of them were admitted to the U.S. as 'refugees.'"

"Fourteen were legal permanent residents at the time of their radical activity, and 10 were naturalized citizens."

So it is quite disturbing.

And by the way, as a result of the Kentucky case where we had two refugees who had been brought in from Iraq, it was reported, in 2013, that in 2009, two al Qaeda Iraq terrorists were living as refugees in Bowling Green, Kentucky. Anyway, because of that discovery, the Obama State Department stopped processing Iraq refugees for 6 months in 2011.

So I do think it is important, as people keep screaming around here, what I believe as a Christian, Jesus said: The greatest commandment is to love God, and the second, he said, is to love each other. But he had also stated: Love thy neighbor as thy self.

And what some have not realized, if you don't like America, if you don't

like Americans, if you don't like our own country, and you don't love yourself, it is a bit hard to love your neighbor as yourself if you don't love yourself.

I think it is time Americans stood up and thanked God for—and/or thank whatever force they may be, some would say, or agnostic, whatever—just thank your lucky stars, but be thankful we have had the opportunities to live in the greatest country in the history of the world. And the only one who has truly given lives and treasure, not for imperialist sake but simply for freedom sake, for liberty sake, for people we didn't know, but we wanted them to share in freedom and liberty. That is a rare country. It has been a blessed and blessed country.

And I think it is important that if we are going to continue or get back to being that city on a hill, glowing that draws people to it, that would draw people to the Statue of Liberty, you have to be a nation of laws, you have to protect the people in the country, otherwise we go back to the Dark Ages, and we become a country that no one wants to come risk their lives to get to because there is nothing special.

□ 2100

We squandered our opportunities and refused to take up our responsibilities to protect this Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for a friend like Mr. MATT GAETZ from Florida, as articulate and intelligent as he is, and I look forward to working with him and with the Speaker in the days ahead.

God has blessed America. Let's keep asking for God to bless America. If we ask, we are told: you will be given.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DESJARLAIS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending his father's funeral.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and January 31 on account of family emergency.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House rule XI, I am submitting the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 115th Congress. The rules were adopted during our Committee's organizational meeting on January 24, 2017.

Sincerely,

DIANE BLACK,
Interim Chairman.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

(a) Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, or a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), or a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of privilege in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

MEETINGS

RULE 2—REGULAR MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session, if notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c) and paragraph (g)(3) of clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

(c) The Chair shall give written notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 3—ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) The Chair may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chair shall provide public electronic notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least three days in advance when Congress is not in session.

RULE 4—OPEN BUSINESS MEETINGS

(a) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the Ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(b) Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) No person, other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and

departmental representatives as the Committee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

(d) Not later than 24 hours after commencing a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the Chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such measure or matter and any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 5—QUORUMS

(a) A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

RULE 6—RECOGNITION

(a) Any member, when recognized by the Chair, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

RULE 7—CONSIDERATION OF BUSINESS

(a) Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chair or by a majority vote of the Committee members, a quorum being present.

RULE 8—AVAILABILITY OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all Committee members at least 24 hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for Committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 9—PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the Committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the Committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

RULE 10—ROLL CALL VOTES

(a) A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

(b) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a quorum is present for such purpose.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(d) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a record of the vote of each Committee member on each recorded vote shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote, and, with respect to any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

HEARINGS

RULE 11—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

(a) The Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Such announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 12—OPEN HEARINGS

(a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the Committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes clause 2(g)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the task forces of the Committee are considered to be subcommittees.

RULE 13—QUORUMS

(a) For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 14—QUESTIONING WITNESSES

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the 5-minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion pursuant to clause 2(j) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule:

(1) First, the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the Committee members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, the Committee members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

(c) In recognizing Committee members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the Chair and Ranking Minority Member may designate an equal number

of members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes, or may designate staff from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes.

RULE 15—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS

(a) In accordance with clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee or by the Chair (pursuant to such rules and limitations as the Committee may prescribe) may be issued over the signature of the Chair or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(b) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.

RULE 16—WITNESSES' STATEMENTS

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(c) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

RULE 17—COMMITTEE PRINTS

(a) All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

RULE 18—COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS ON THE INTERNET

(a) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

RULE 19—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Subject to approval by the Committee and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to Committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, gender, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All Committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official Committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

RULE 20—STAFF SUPERVISION

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with Rule X, clause 9(c)

of the Rules of the House of Representatives) and job titles, and, at his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

RULE 21—PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken.

(c) Members of the Committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chair may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the Committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

RULE 22—ACCESS TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a)(1) The Chair shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to Committee records (in accordance with clause 2(e) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives).

(b) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(c) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the Committee members. Such information shall be kept in the Committee safe, and shall be available to members in the Committee office.

(d) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

OVERSIGHT

RULE 23—GENERAL OVERSIGHT

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d) of Rule X of the

Rules of the House of Representatives, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X of the House Rules, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Appropriations in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS

RULE 24—AVAILABILITY BEFORE FILING

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the Committee shall be available to all Committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or by a majority vote of the Committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chair or with a majority vote by the Committee.

RULE 25—REPORT ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) The report of the Committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each outyear along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

RULE 26—PARLIAMENTARIAN'S STATUS REPORT AND SECTION 302 STATUS REPORT

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of Committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate Committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

RULE 27—ACTIVITY REPORT

(a) After an adjournment sine die of a regular session of a Congress or after December

15 of an even-numbered year, the chair of the Committee may file any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives without the approval of the Committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(b) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee; a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made; a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon; and a delineation of any hearings held.

MISCELLANEOUS

RULE 28—BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 29—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chair subject to the approval of the majority party members of the Committee.

(b) The Chair shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the Committee.

RULE 30—WAIVERS

(a) When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chair may, if practical, consult with the Committee members on whether the Chair should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House Rule XI, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform adopted its rules for the 115th Congress on January 24, 2017, and I submit them now for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

RULE 1—GENERAL

(a) Rules of the House. The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on

Oversight and Government Reform ("the Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Application of the Rules. Except where the terms "the Committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee and its subcommittees as well as to their respective chairs, ranking minority members, members, and staff.

RULE 2—MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meetings. The regular meetings of the Committee shall be held on the second Thursday of each month at 10 a.m., when the House is in session. The Chair of the Committee is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof when circumstances warrant.

(b) Additional and Special Meetings. The Chair of the Committee may call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the Committee may be requested by members of the Committee pursuant to the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(c)(2).

(c) Subcommittee Meetings. Each subcommittee shall meet at the call of its chair, subject to Rule 7.

(d) Presiding Member. The chair of the Committee or a subcommittee shall preside over each meeting and hearing thereof ("the presiding member"). If the chair of the Committee or a subcommittee is not present during a meeting or hearing thereof, the Vice Chair of the Committee or subcommittee, designated pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(d), shall serve as the presiding member during the absence of the chair. If the chair and vice chair of the Committee or a subcommittee are not present during a meeting or hearing thereof, the ranking member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee who is present shall serve as the presiding member during the absence of the chair and vice chair.

(e) Notice. The chair of the Committee or a subcommittee shall announce the date, place, and subject matter of a meeting or hearing pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(3)(A).

(f) Agenda. Every member of the Committee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least 72 hours before each meeting or hearing explaining: (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The ranking minority member shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request.

(g) Availability of Text. To the maximum extent practicable, amendments to a measure or matter shall be submitted in writing or electronically to the designee of the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee or a subcommittee at least 24 hours prior to its consideration of the measure or matter. The chair may exercise discretion to give priority to amendments submitted in advance.

RULE 3—QUORUMS

(a) Generally. A majority of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall form a quorum for the Committee or subcommittee, respectively, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one third of the members shall form a quorum for taking any action other than for which the presence of a majority of the Committee or subcommittee is otherwise required.

(b) Subcommittee Field Hearings. The Chair of the Committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chair, make a temporary assignment of any member of the Committee

to such subcommittee for the purpose of constituting a quorum at and participating in any public hearing by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington, DC. A member appointed to such temporary positions shall not be a voting member. The Chair of the Committee shall give reasonable notice of such temporary assignment to the ranking minority member of the Committee and of the respective subcommittee.

RULE 4—COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) Bills and Resolutions. Each bill or resolution approved by the Committee shall be reported by the Chair of the Committee pursuant to House Rule XIII, clauses 2-4.

(b) Approval of Investigative and Oversight Reports. Only those investigative or oversight reports approved by a majority vote of the Committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present may be ordered printed, unless otherwise required by the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) Notice of Investigative and Oversight Reports. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall not be considered in the Committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of the Committee for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, unless the House is in session on such days) before consideration of such proposed report in the Committee. If a hearing has been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearing printed and available to the members of the Committee before the consideration of the proposed report in the Committee.

(d) Additional Views. If at the time of approval of a report, a member of the Committee gives notice of intent to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views any member of the Committee shall be entitled to file such views following House Rule XI, clause 2(1) and Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1).

RULE 5—RECORD VOTES

(a) Request for Record Vote. A record vote of the members may be had upon the request of any member upon approval of a one-fifth vote of the members present.

(b) Postponement of a Record Vote. Pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2 (h)(4), the presiding member at a meeting is authorized to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment and to resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed. After consultation with the ranking minority member, the chair shall take reasonable steps to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

RULE 6—SUBCOMMITTEES; REFERRALS

(a)(1) There shall be six subcommittees of the Committee, with appropriate party ratios, as follows:

(A) Subcommittee on Government Operations, which shall have legislative and oversight jurisdiction over government management and accounting measures; the economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities; procurement; federal property; public information; federal records; federal civil service; government reorganizations; the U.S. Postal Service; the National Archives; the Census Bureau; and the District of Columbia.

(B) Subcommittee on Healthcare, Benefits, and Administrative Rules, which shall have

oversight jurisdiction over health care policy, administration, and programs; regulatory affairs; government-wide rules and regulations; financial services; and the administration and solvency of benefit and entitlement programs; and legislative jurisdiction over regulatory affairs and federal paperwork reduction.

(C) Subcommittee on the Interior, Energy, and Environment, which shall have oversight jurisdiction over energy policy, public lands, environmental policy, fish and wildlife, mining, energy development, pollution, and related regulations.

(D) Subcommittee on Information Technology, which shall have oversight jurisdiction over information security, including cybersecurity and federal information security; information technology policy, management, and procurement; emerging technologies; intellectual property; telecommunications; and privacy.

(E) Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs, which shall have legislative and oversight jurisdiction over the relationship between the federal government and states and municipalities, including unfunded mandates, federal regulations, grants, and programs.

(F) Subcommittee on National Security, which shall have oversight jurisdiction over national security; homeland security; foreign operations, including the relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; immigration; defense; and criminal justice.

(2) In addition, each subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair of the Committee refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee with legislative jurisdiction shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its general responsibility.

(b) Referrals. Bills, resolutions, and other matters may be expeditiously referred by the Chair of the Committee to subcommittees, as appropriate in the determination of the Chair of the Committee, for consideration or investigation in accordance with subcommittees' jurisdictions. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be re-referred or discharged by the Chair of the Committee when, in the judgment of the Chair, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement therein.

(c) Membership. The Chair of the Committee shall assign members to the subcommittees and shall designate the chair and vice-chair of each subcommittee. Minority party assignments, including designation of the ranking minority member of each subcommittee, shall be made only with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(d) Ex Officio Membership. The Chair of the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees. They are authorized to vote on subcommittee matters; but, unless they are regular members of the subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for taking testimony.

RULE 7—SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING AND MEETING PROCEDURE

(a) Generally. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, markup legislation, and report to the Committee on any measure or matter referred to it.

(b) During Committee Meetings and Hearings. No subcommittee may meet or hold a

hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(c) Scheduling. Each subcommittee chair shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chair of the Committee with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of meetings or hearings.

RULE 8—STAFF

(a) Employment Authority. Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the Chair of the Committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the Committee and subcommittees.

(b) Duties. Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the staff of the Committee and subcommittees shall be subject to the direction of the Chair of the Committee and shall perform such duties as the Chair of the Committee may assign.

RULE 9—HEARINGS

(a) Generally. Hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, clause 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the Committee or a subcommittee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration, and the presiding member shall rule on the relevance of any question put to a witness.

(b) Recognition and Order of Questioning. A member may question witnesses only when recognized by the presiding member for that purpose. In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(j)(2), the five-minute rule shall apply during the questioning of witnesses in a hearing. The presiding member shall, so far as practicable, recognize alternately based on seniority of those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others based on their arrival at the hearing. After that, additional time may be extended at the direction of the presiding member.

(c) Extended Questioning. The presiding member, or the Committee or subcommittee by motion, may permit a specified number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(d) Staff Questioning. The presiding member, or the Committee or subcommittee by motion, may permit Committee or subcommittee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(e) Time for Questioning. Nothing in paragraph (c) or (d) affects the rights of a member (other than a member designated under paragraph (c)) to question a witness for 5 minutes in accordance with paragraph (b). In any extended questioning permitted under paragraph (c) or (d), the presiding member shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by majority members or staff, and the ranking minority member shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by minority members or staff.

(f) Witness Statements. Witnesses appearing before the Committee or a subcommittee shall, so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours before their appearance.

(g) Oaths. The presiding member may administer oaths to any witness before the Committee or subcommittee. All witnesses appearing in hearings may be administered the following oath by the presiding member prior to receiving the testimony: "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

RULE 10—COMMITTEE RECORDS, OPEN MEETINGS, TRANSPARENCY

(a) Generally. The Committee and subcommittee staff shall maintain in the Committee offices a complete record of Committee and subcommittee actions from the current Congress including a record of the roll call votes taken at business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the Committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement.

(b) Transcripts of Proceedings. A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the Chair of the Committee may prescribe.

(c) Open Meetings. Meetings and hearings shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(d) Committee Website. The Chair of the Committee shall maintain an official website on behalf of the Committee for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. To the greatest extent practicable, the Chair of the Committee shall ensure that Committee records are made available on the Committee's official website in appropriate formats.

(e) Minority Website. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee is authorized to maintain an official website on behalf of the minority members of the Committee for the same purpose as in paragraph (d), including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members and other members of the House.

(f) Archived Records. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 11—AUDIO AND VISUAL COVERAGE OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

(a) Generally. An open meeting or hearing may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, internet broadcast, and still photography, unless closed subject to the provisions of House Rules. Any such coverage shall conform to the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 4.

(b) Committee Broadcast System. Use of the Committee Broadcast System shall be fair and nonpartisan, and in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4(b), and all other applicable rules of the House and the Committee. Members of the Committee shall have prompt access to a copy of coverage by the Committee Broadcast System, to the extent that such coverage is maintained.

(c) Other Coverage. Personnel providing coverage of an open meeting or hearing of the Committee by internet broadcast, other than through the Committee Broadcast System shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries. If the Committee Broadcast System is not available, the Chair of the Committee may, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, direct staff to provide coverage in a manner that is fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4.

RULE 12—ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE

The Chair of the Committee shall:

(a) Make available to other committees the findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the Committee, as required by House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2);

(b) Direct such review and studies on—
(1) the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the Committee's jurisdiction, as required by House Rule X, clause 2(c);

(2) the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining their economy and efficiency, as required by House Rule X, clause 3(i);

(3) the effect of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government, as required by House Rule X, clause 4(c)(1)(B); and

(4) intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member, as required by House Rule X, clause 4(c)(1)(C);

(c) Submit to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Appropriations the Committee's authorization and oversight plan as required by House Rule X, clause 2(d);

(d) Report to the House by March 31 in the first session of Congress, after consultation with the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leader, the authorization and oversight plans submitted by committees together with any recommendations that the Committee or the House leadership group described above may make to ensure the most effective coordination of authorization and oversight plans and otherwise achieve the objectives of House Rule X, clause 2;

(e) Submit to the House such recommendations as the Committee considers necessary or desirable in connection with the reports of the Comptroller General, as required by House Rule X, clause 4(c)(1)(A);

(f) Submit to the Committee on the Budget views and estimates required by House Rule X, clause 4(f), and to file reports with the House as required by the Congressional Budget Act;

(g) Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee;

(h) Prepare, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, a budget for the Committee;

(i) Make any necessary technical and conforming changes to legislation reported by the Committee upon unanimous consent; and

(j) Offer motions under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House (motion to request or agree to a conference) whenever the Chair of the Committee considers it appropriate.

RULE 13—CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) Commemorative Stamps. The determination of the subject matter of commemorative stamps and new semi-postal issues is properly for consideration by the Postmaster General and the Committee will not give consideration to legislative proposals specifying the subject matter of commemorative stamps and new semi-postal issues. It is suggested that recommendations for the subject matter of stamps be submitted to the Postmaster General.

(b) Postal Naming Bills. The consideration of bills designating facilities of the United States Postal Service shall be conducted so as to minimize the time spent on such matters by the Committee and the House.

(c) Resolutions. The Chair of the Committee shall not request to have scheduled

any resolution for consideration under suspension of the Rules, which expresses appreciation, commends, congratulates, celebrates, recognizes the accomplishments of, or celebrates the anniversary of, an entity, event, group, individual, institution, team or government program; or acknowledges or recognizes a period of time for such purposes.

RULE 14—PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) Generally. The Chair of the Committee is authorized to appoint panels or task forces to carry out the duties and functions of the Committee.

(b) Ex Officio Membership. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio members of each panel or task force established under this Rule.

(c) Appointment of Leadership. The chair of any panel or task force shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall select a ranking minority member for each panel or task force.

(d) Application of Rules. The House and Committee rules applicable to subcommittee meetings, hearings, recommendations, and reports shall apply to the meetings, hearings, recommendations, and reports of panels and task forces.

(e) Termination. No panel or task force appointed under this Rule shall continue in existence for more than six months. A panel or task force appointed under this Rule may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the chair.

RULE 15—DEPOSITION AUTHORITY

(a) Generally. The Chair of the Committee, upon consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, may order the taking of depositions, under oath and pursuant to notice or subpoena.

(b) Notices. Notices for the taking of depositions shall specify the date, time, and place of examination (if other than within the Committee offices).

(c) Oaths. Depositions shall be taken under oath administered by a member or a person otherwise authorized to administer oaths.

(d) Consultation. Consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall include three business days' notice before any deposition is taken. All members shall also receive three business days' notice that a deposition has been scheduled.

(e) Attendance. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their rights. No one may be present at depositions except members, Committee staff designated by the Chair of the Committee or the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, an official reporter, the witness, and the witness's counsel. Observers or counsel for other persons, or for agencies under investigation, may not attend.

(f) Requirement of Member Attendance. At least one member of the Committee shall be present at each deposition taken by the Committee, unless—

(1) the witness to be deposed agrees in writing to waive this requirement; or

(2) the Committee authorizes the taking of a specified deposition pursuant to H. Res. 5 without the presence of a member of the Committee during a specified period, provided that the House is not in session on the day of the deposition.

(g) Who May Question. A deposition shall be conducted by any member or staff attorney designated by the Chair of the Committee or Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. When depositions are conducted by Committee staff attorneys, there shall be no more than two Committee staff attorneys permitted to question a witness per round. One of the Committee staff attorneys shall be designated by the Chair of the Committee

and the other by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. Other Committee staff members designated by the Chair of the Committee or Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may attend, but may not pose questions to the witness.

(h) Order of Questions. Questions in the deposition shall be propounded in rounds, alternating between the majority and minority. A single round shall not exceed 60 minutes per side, unless the members or staff attorneys conducting the deposition agree to a different length of questioning. In each round, a member or Committee staff attorney designated by the Chair of the Committee shall ask questions first, and the member or Committee staff attorney designated by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall ask questions second.

(i) Objections. Any objection made during a deposition must be stated concisely and in a non-argumentative and non-suggestive manner. The witness may refuse to answer a question only to preserve a privilege. When the witness has objected and refused to answer a question to preserve a privilege, the Chair of the Committee may rule on any such objection after the deposition has adjourned. If the Chair of the Committee overrules any such objection and thereby orders a witness to answer any question to which a privilege objection was lodged, such ruling shall be filed with the clerk of the Committee and shall be provided to the members and the witness no less than three days before the reconvened deposition. If a member of the Committee appeals in writing the ruling of the Chair, the appeal shall be preserved for Committee consideration. A deponent who refuses to answer a question after being directed by the Chair in writing to answer may be subject to sanction, except that no sanctions may be imposed if the ruling of the Chair is reversed by the Committee on appeal.

(j) Record of Testimony. Committee staff shall ensure that the testimony is either transcribed or electronically recorded or both. If a witness's testimony is transcribed, the witness or the witness's counsel shall be afforded an opportunity to review a copy. No later than five days thereafter, the witness may submit suggested changes to the Chair of the Committee. Committee staff may make any typographical and technical changes. Substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by the witness must be accompanied by a letter signed by the witness requesting the changes and a statement of the witness's reasons for each proposed change. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be included as an appendix to the transcript conditioned upon the witness signing the transcript.

(k) Transcription Requirements. The individual administering the oath, if other than a member, shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall be filed, together with any electronic recording, with the clerk of the Committee in Washington, D.C. Depositions shall be considered to have been taken in Washington, D.C., as well as the location actually taken once filed there with the clerk of the Committee for the Committee's use. The Chair of the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be provided with a copy of the transcripts of the deposition at the same time.

(l) Release. The Chair of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall consult regarding the release of depositions. If either objects in writing to a proposed release of a deposition or a portion

thereof, the matter shall be promptly referred to the Committee for resolution.

(m) Provision of Rules to Witnesses. A witness shall not be required to testify unless the witness has been provided with a copy of the Committee's rules.

RULE 16—WITNESS PROCEDURE

(a) Witness Disclosures. Witnesses appearing at a hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee in a non-governmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), as well as the amount and source of payments or contracts originating from foreign governments, insofar as they relate to the subject matter of the hearing, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years, by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(b) Representation by Counsel. When representing a witness or entity before the Committee or a subcommittee in response to a request or subpoena from the Committee, or in connection with testimony before the Committee or a subcommittee, counsel for the witness or entity must promptly submit to the Committee a notice of appearance specifying the following: (1) counsel's name, firm or organization, bar membership, and contact information including email; and (2) each client or entity represented by the counsel in connection with the proceeding.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. HAAS, Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the 115th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

Attachment.

(Adopted January 25, 2017)

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Rules of the Committee. The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as is applicable.

(b) Rules of the Subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as is applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

RULE 2. MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meeting Days. The Committee shall meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other business, if the House is in session on that day. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The chairman of the Committee may, at his discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section,

after consultation with the ranking minority member.

(b) Additional Meetings. The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the chairman.

(c) Notice. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting of the Committee scheduled on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday when the House will be in session shall be announced at least 36 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting. The date, time, place, and subject matter of other meetings when the House is in session shall be announced to allow Members to have at least three days notice (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) of such meeting. The date, time, place, and subject matter of all other meetings shall be announced at least 72 hours in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(d) Agenda. The agenda for each Committee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least 36 hours in advance of such meeting.

(e) Availability of Texts. No bill, recommendation, or other matter shall be considered by the Committee unless the text of the matter, together with an explanation, has been available to members of the Committee for three days (or 24 hours in the case of a substitute for introduced legislation). Such explanation shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the matter to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.

(f) Waiver. The requirements of subsections (c), (d), and (e) may be waived by a majority of those present and voting (a majority being present) of the Committee or by the chairman with the concurrence of the ranking member, as the case may be.

RULE 3. HEARINGS

(a) Notice. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee shall be announced at least one week in advance of the commencement of such hearing, unless a determination is made in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner.

(b) Memorandum. Each member of the Committee shall be provided, except in the case of unusual circumstances, with a memorandum at least 48 hours before each hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the hearing and (2) the names of any witnesses.

(c) Witnesses. (1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least two working days in advance of his or her appearance, sufficient copies, as determined by the chairman of the Committee of a written statement of his or her proposed testimony to provide to members and staff of the Committee, the news media, and the general public. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, also provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the chairman. Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of the argument. The chairman of the Committee or the presiding member may waive the requirements of this paragraph or any part thereof.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, the written testimony of each witness appearing

in a nongovernmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any federal grant or contract or foreign government contracts and payments related to the subject matter of the hearing received during the current calendar year or either of the two preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. The disclosure shall include (i) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and (ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(d) Questioning. (1) The right to interrogate the witnesses before the Committee shall alternate between majority and minority members. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to question witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate a witness until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose. The chairman shall recognize in order of appearance members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee.

(2) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side. The chairman with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may also permit committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(3) Each member may submit to the chairman of the Committee additional questions for the record, to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. Each member shall provide a copy of the questions in an electronic format to the clerk of the Committee no later than ten business days following a hearing. The chairman shall transmit all questions received from members of the Committee to the appropriate witness and include the transmittal letter and the responses from the witnesses in the hearing record. After consultation with the ranking minority member, the chairman is authorized to close the hearing record no earlier than 120 days from the date the questions were transmitted to the appropriate witness.

RULE 4. VICE CHAIRMEN; PRESIDING MEMBER

The chairman shall designate a member of the majority party to serve as vice chairman of the Committee, and shall designate a majority member of each subcommittee to serve as vice chairman of each subcommittee. The vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting or hearing, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting or hearing.

RULE 5. OPEN PROCEEDINGS

Except as provided by the Rules of the House, each meeting and hearing of the Committee for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing, shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photog-

raphy coverage, consistent with the provisions of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 6. QUORUM

Testimony may be taken and evidence received at any hearing at which there are present not fewer than two members of the Committee in question. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for those actions for which the House Rules require a majority quorum. For the purposes of taking any other action, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 7. OFFICIAL COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a)(1) Documents reflecting the proceedings of the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form on the Committee's website and in the Committee office for inspection by the public, as provided in Rule XI, clause 2(e) of the Rules of the House not more than 24 hours after each meeting has adjourned, including a record showing those present at each meeting; and a record of the vote on any question on which a record vote is demanded, including a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the committee present but not voting.

(2) Record Votes. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. No demand for a record vote shall be made or obtained except for the purpose of procuring a record vote or in the apparent absence of a quorum.

(b) Postponement of Votes. In accordance with clause 2(h)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee or subcommittee, may (A) postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment; and (B) resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(c) Archived Records. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee. The chairman shall consult with the ranking minority member on any communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of noncurrent records pursuant to clause 3(b) of the Rule.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Establishment. There shall be such standing subcommittees with such jurisdiction and size as determined by the majority party caucus of the Committee. The jurisdiction, number, and size of the subcommittees shall be determined by the majority party caucus prior to the start of the process for establishing subcommittee chairmanships and assignments.

(b) Powers and Duties. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to

it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the chairman of the Committee with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(c) Ratio of Subcommittees. The majority caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party members for each subcommittee and the chairman shall negotiate that ratio with the minority party, provided that the ratio of party members on each subcommittee shall be no less favorable to the majority than that of the full Committee, nor shall such ratio provide for a majority of less than two majority members.

(d) Selection of Subcommittee Members. Prior to any organizational meeting held by the Committee, the majority and minority caucuses shall select their respective members of the standing subcommittees.

(e) Ex Officio Members. The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

RULE 9. OPENING STATEMENTS

(a) Written Statements. All written opening statements at hearings and business meetings conducted by the committee shall be made part of the permanent record.

(b) Length. (1) At full committee hearings, the chairman and ranking minority member shall be limited to 5 minutes each for an opening statement, and may designate another member to give an opening statement of not more than 5 minutes. At subcommittee hearings, the subcommittee chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee shall be limited to 5 minutes each for an opening statement. In addition, the full committee chairman and ranking minority member shall each be allocated 5 minutes for an opening statement for themselves or their designees.

(2) At any business meeting of the Committee, statements shall be limited to 5 minutes each for the chairman and ranking minority member (or their respective designee) of the Committee or subcommittee, as applicable, and 3 minutes each for all other members. The chairman may further limit opening statements for Members (including, at the discretion of the Chairman, the chairman and ranking minority member) to one minute.

RULE 10. REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND OTHER MATTERS

All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks of the date of receipt by the Committee unless action is taken by the full Committee within those two weeks, or by majority vote of the members of the Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee. In the case of legislation or other matter within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, the chairman of the Committee may, in his discretion, refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration, or may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and also refer the matter to one or more additional subcommittees for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction. Such authority shall include the authority to refer such legislation or matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the

chairman, with the approval of the Committee, from the members of the subcommittees having legislative or oversight jurisdiction.

RULE 11. MANAGING LEGISLATION ON THE HOUSE FLOOR

The chairman, in his discretion, shall designate which member shall manage legislation reported by the Committee to the House.

RULE 12. COMMITTEE PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFF APPOINTMENTS

(a) Delegation of Staff. Whenever the chairman of the Committee determines that any professional staff member appointed pursuant to the provisions of clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who is assigned to such chairman and not to the ranking minority member, by reason of such professional staff member's expertise or qualifications will be of assistance to one or more subcommittees in carrying out their assigned responsibilities, he may delegate such member to such subcommittees for such purpose. A delegation of a member of the professional staff pursuant to this subsection shall be made after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and with the approval of the subcommittee chairman or chairmen involved.

(b) Minority Professional Staff. Professional staff members appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who are assigned to the ranking minority member of the Committee and not to the chairman of the Committee, shall be assigned to such Committee business as the minority party members of the Committee consider advisable.

(c) Additional Staff Appointments. In addition to the professional staff appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee shall be entitled to make such appointments to the professional and clerical staff of the Committee as may be provided within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee. Such appointee shall be assigned to such business of the full Committee as the chairman of the Committee considers advisable.

(d) Sufficient Staff. The chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee.

(e) Fair Treatment of Minority Members in Appointment of Committee Staff. The chairman shall ensure that the minority members of the Committee are treated fairly in appointment of Committee staff.

(f) Contracts for Temporary or Intermittent Services. Any contract for the temporary services or intermittent service of individual consultants or organizations to make studies or advise the Committee or its subcommittees with respect to any matter within their jurisdiction shall be deemed to have been approved by a majority of the members of the Committee if approved by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee. Such approval shall not be deemed to have been given if at least one-third of the members of the Committee request in writing that the Committee formally act on such a contract, if the request is made within 10 days after the latest date on which such chairman or chairmen, and such ranking minority member or members, approve such contract.

RULE 13. SUPERVISION, DUTIES OF STAFF

(a) Supervision of Majority Staff. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman who, in consultation with the chairmen of the subcommittees, shall establish and as-

sign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(b) Supervision of Minority Staff. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

RULE 14. COMMITTEE BUDGET

(a) Administration of Committee Budget. The chairman of the Committee, in consultation with the ranking minority member, shall for the 114th Congress attempt to ensure that the Committee receives necessary amounts for professional and clerical staff, travel, investigations, equipment and miscellaneous expenses of the Committee and the subcommittees, which shall be adequate to fully discharge the Committee's responsibilities for legislation and oversight.

(b) Monthly Expenditures Report. Committee members shall be furnished a copy of each monthly report, prepared by the chairman for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year by the Committee and subcommittees, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel.

RULE 15. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chairman of the Committee, the subcommittee chairman, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House.

RULE 16. SUBPOENA POWER

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chair of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member prior to issuing any subpoena under such authority. To the extent practicable, the Chair shall consult with the ranking minority member at least 72 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority. The chairman shall report to the members of the Committee on the issuance of a subpoena as soon as practicable but in no event later than one week after issuance of such subpoena.

RULE 17. TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) Approval of Travel. Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following: (1) the purpose of the travel; (2) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (3) the loca-

tion of the event for which the travel is to be made; and (4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) Approval of Travel by Minority Members and Staff. In the case of travel by minority party members and minority party professional staff for the purpose set out in (a), the prior approval, not only of the chairman but also of the ranking minority member, shall be required. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the ranking minority member in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

RULE 18. WEBSITE

The chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purposes of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain an official website for the purpose of carrying out official responsibilities, including communicating information about the activities of the minority members of the Committee to Committee members and other members of the House.

RULE 19. CONFERENCES

The chairman of the Committee is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the chairman considers it appropriate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 31, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of June 13, 2016, through January 3, 2017, shall be treated as though received on January 30, 2017. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

387. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Notification, Evaluation and Reduction of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Federally Owned Residential Property and Housing Receiving Federal Assistance; Response to Elevated Blood Lead Levels [Docket No.: FR-5816-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD77) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

388. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Terrorism Risk Insurance Program (RIN: 1505-AC53) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

389. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

390. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Titanium Dioxide and Listing of Color Additives Subject to Certification; [Phthalocyaninato (2-)] Copper; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2016-F-0821] received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

391. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Certain Persons from the Entity List [Docket No.: 170103009-7009-01] (RIN: 0694-AH28) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

392. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Iranian Transactions and Sanctions Regulations received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

393. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Freedom of Information Act Regulation [Docket No.: FR-5986-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD81) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

394. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's revised mandatory guidelines — Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs received January 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

395. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — List of Fisheries for 2017 [Docket No.: 160219129-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BF78) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

396. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administra-

tion, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2017 Atlantic Shark Commercial Fishing Season [Docket No.: 160620545-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XE696) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

397. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Archival Tag Management Measures [Docket No.: 150817722-6703-02] (RIN: 0648-BF10) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

398. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Management Measures [Docket No.: 160630573-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BG19) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

399. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2017 Management Area Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 160906823-6999-01] (RIN: 0648-XE876) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

400. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Technical Amendment to Regulations [Docket No.: 161227999-6999-01] (RIN: 0648-BG49) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

401. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Commercial Sablefish Fishing Regulations and Electronic Fish Tickets [Docket No.: 140905757-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BE42) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

402. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Amendment 19 [Docket No.: 160126052-6974-02] (RIN: 0648-BF72) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

403. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Na-

tional Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2017-2018 Summer Flounder Specifications and Announcement of 2017 Summer Flounder and Black Sea Bass Commercial Accountability Measures [Docket No.: 161017970-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XE976) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

404. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery Off the Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 1 [Docket No.: 160302174-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BF81) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

405. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Observer Coverage Requirements for Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area Trawl Catcher Vessels [Docket No.: 160225146-6851-02] (RIN: 0648-BF80) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

406. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Individual Bluefin Quota Program; Inseason Transfers [Docket No.: 160527473-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BG09) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

407. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of Labor Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Annual Adjustments for 2017 (RIN: 1290-AA31) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

408. A letter from the Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2017 Civil Monetary Penalties Inflationary Adjustment [Public Notice: 9828] (RIN: 1400-AE09) received January 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

409. A letter from the Attorney-Adviser, FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Performance Management Measures; Assessing Pavement Condition for the National Highway Performance Program and Bridge Condition for the National Highway Performance Program [Docket No.: FHWA-2013-0053] (RIN: 2125-AF53) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

410. A letter from the Attorney-Advisory, FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Performance Management Measures; Assessing Performance of the National

Highway System, Freight Movement on the Interstate System, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program [Docket No.: FHWA-2013-0054] (RIN: 2125-AP54) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

411. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Operator Qualification, Cost Recovery, Accident and Incident Notification, and Other Pipeline Safety Changes [Docket No.: PHMSA-2013-0163; Amdt. Nos.: 190-19; 191-25; 192-123; 195-101; 199-27] (RIN: 2137-AE94) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

412. A letter from the Office Program Manager, Office of Regulation Policy and Management (OOREG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Recognition of Tribal Organizations for Representation of VA Claimants (RIN: 2900-AP51) received January 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

413. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delay of Effective Date for 31 Final Regulations Published by the Environmental Protection Agency between October 28, 2016 and January 17, 2017 [FRL-9958-87-OP] received January 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture.

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. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 70. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 38) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule (Rept. 115-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 71. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers", and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Rept. 115-7). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BUCK, Mr.

FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 720. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 722. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to implement, administer, or enforce the Executive Order entitled "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States" signed by President Donald J. Trump on January 27, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 723. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MENG, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE

LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CORREA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HECK, and Mr. PASCHELL):

H.R. 724. A bill to provide that the Executive Order entitled "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States" (January 27, 2017), shall have no force or effect, to prohibit the use of Federal funds to enforce the Executive Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 725. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent fraudulent joinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 726. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 727. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting after fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 728. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on portions of the Outer Continental Shelf located off the coast of New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 729. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and enforce taxation of tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MASSIE, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 730. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove limitations on the ability of certain dual citizens from participating in the Visa Waiver Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 731. A bill to permanently prohibit oil and gas leasing off the coast of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 732. A bill to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 733. A bill to provide for an accounting of total United States contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit against tax for landlords of veterans receiving rental assistance under the Veterans Affairs Supported Housing program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 735. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of certain executive orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 736. A bill to require automobile manufacturers to disclose to consumers the presence of event data recorders, or "black boxes", on new automobiles, and to require manufacturers to provide the consumer with the option to enable and disable such devices on future automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 737. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to promote trauma-informed practices, age-appropriate positive behavioral intervention and support, services for young children who have experienced trauma or toxic stress, and improved coordination between Head Start agencies and other programs that serve very young children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 738. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations in North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 739. A bill to prohibit the construction of new border barriers, including walls or fences, on certain Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 740. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to revise the regulations regarding the "do-not-call" registry to prohibit politically-oriented recorded message telephone calls to telephone numbers listed on that registry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 741. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on Medicare supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. KILMER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 742. A bill to prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting any Department of Defense position at, or in support of, a public shipyard; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HARPER, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 743. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 744. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 745. A bill to improve Federal employee compliance with Federal and Presidential recordkeeping requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 746. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 748. A bill to protect any State or local authority that limits or restricts compliance with an immigration detainee request remains eligible for grants and appropriated funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BERA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 749. A bill to increase competition in the pharmaceutical industry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 750. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand and revise the classification of and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. FLORES, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LATTI, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LAHOOD, and Ms. CHENEY):

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to "Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration relating to the Federal Acquisition Regulation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr.

KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BARR, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BOST, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BRAT):

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PALMER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JONES, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. COLE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YODER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BUDD, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LONG, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. BARR, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MOONEY of West

Virginia, Mr. BOST, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. AMASH, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HILL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. WALKER):

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to "Compliance with Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BARR, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. EMMER, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. REED, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HURD, Mr. BOST, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. FOX, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COOK, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUIZENGA (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PITTINGER, Mrs. WAG-

NER, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. HILL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALMER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. FOX, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LONG, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. COMER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. COLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. HILL):

H.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHENEY (for herself, Mr. TIP-TON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AMODEL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior relating to management of non-Federal oil and gas rights; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the National Park Service relating to "General Provisions and Non-Federal Oil and Gas Rights"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.J. Res. 47. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior regarding requirements for exploratory drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. JONES):

H.J. Res. 48. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the rights extended by the Constitution are the rights of natural persons only; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of the Interior relating to "Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 69. A resolution expressing support for designation of the 17th day in May as "DIPG Awareness Day" to raise awareness and encourage the research into cures for diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma (DIPG) and pediatric cancers in general; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 72. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Dominican Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 751. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 752. A bill for the relief of Jeanette Vizguerra-Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

AND

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1, and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grants Congress authority over the federal courts.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3: 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the Appropriations Power granted to Congress by that section;

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the legislative powers granted to Congress by that section;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Power, and all the other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 4, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 739.

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. FOX:

H.R. 740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution which states "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 9:

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, therefore, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation contains a clarification that is intended to limit the scope of an existing statute. As such, this bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 746.

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. PAULSEN:

H.R. 747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 749.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 14 of Section 3 of Article I

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; [Page H408]

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.J. Res. 36.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 and Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. FOX:

H.J. Res. 37.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.J. Res. 38.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, and Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. MESSER:

H.J. Res. 39.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 40.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.J. Res. 41.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.J. Res. 42.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.J. Res. 43.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; whereby 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.J. Res. 44.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, and Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 45.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.J. Res. 46.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) of the Constitution of the United States which grants Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes" as well as Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause) of the Constitution of the United States which gives Congress the authority to address and prevent new regulations.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 47.

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 Mr. NOLAN:

H.J. Res. 48.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 49.

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."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 44: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 60: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 66: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 83: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 99: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 112: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 113: Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ESTY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JONES, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 130: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 131: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 140: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 173: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 174: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 175: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 179: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 184: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. MAST.
 H.R. 198: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 202: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 233: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 275: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 305: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 328: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 329: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 350: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 351: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 355: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 361: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 367: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 372: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 374: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 381: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 390: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 395: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 400: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 406: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 422: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 430: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ROYCE of California.
 H.R. 468: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 474: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H.R. 475: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 488: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DENT, Ms. ESTY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 489: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BERA, Ms. MENG, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 496: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. REICHERT, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 505: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 512: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 520: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 523: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 526: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 545: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 546: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 564: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 578: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JONES, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 606: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 610: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 611: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. Thomas J. Rooney of Florida, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 619: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 630: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 632: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WALZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JONES, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 637: Mr. COMER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 645: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 669: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BASS, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 671: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 672: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 687: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 696: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 706: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. SOTO and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. DUNN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KATKO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Res. 15: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KATKO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LATTA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MENG, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Res. 31: Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. REED, and Mr. CICILLINE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions in H.J. Res. 36 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.J. Res. 37 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions in H.J. Res. 38 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

H.J. Res. 41 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Council of Former Mayors of the New Progressive Party of Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 1, requesting that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States that according to the powers given by the U.S. Constitution immediately begin a process of admission of the territory of Puerto Rico as a State through the filing of a draft admission to Congress and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7. Also, a petition of the Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Sayreville, NJ, relative to Resolution No. 2017-32, confirming and recording its support of H.R. 814 and urging the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate to enact this important legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8. Also, a petition of the Board of Directors of the Winslow Indian Health Care Center of Winslow, Arizona, relative to Resolution No. WHCC-2017-01, supporting preservation of the Indian Healthcare Improvement Act, Indian-Specific provisions under Medicaid, and other health-related provisions unrelated to the overall healthcare reform legislation; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 2017

No. 15

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TODD YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who inhabits eternity, whose throne is Heaven and whose footstool is the Earth, You have given us the gift of this day, and we will rejoice and be glad in it.

May our lawmakers never forget that they borrow their heartbeat from You. Continue to sustain them and give them all that they need to glorify Your Name. May Your Spirit move them that they will make concessions without coercion and be conciliatory without compromising. Compel them to be just and honest in all their dealings. May they remember that our country is no better than its citizens and no stronger than its commitment to righteousness. Lord, bless our Senators in their going out and coming in, their rising up and lying down, their labor and their leisure.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TODD YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. YOUNG thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

STREAM BUFFER RULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for too long, coal communities in States like Kentucky were unfairly targeted by the Obama administration as part of its War on Coal. We now have the opportunity to start providing relief to coal families, whose only crime was working to support their loved ones. Easing the pain of these regulations is a priority. I laid it out in a letter to President Trump earlier this year. That letter was a continuation of efforts I began several years ago to push back against the previous administration's assault on coal families. I am pleased the President has already begun taking steps to provide relief from several different regulations imposed by the former administration, regulations that for too long have stifled growth and held our country back.

Together, we can do more, including right here in Congress through the Congressional Review Act or CRA process. One of the first regulations we are working to address is the so-called stream buffer rule, a harmful regulation put into place by the Obama administration at the eleventh hour. One analysis estimates that it could threat-

en one-third of the Nation's coal-mining jobs—one-third. That is why so many across coal country have called for relief from this harmful attack.

We have heard individual voices against this regulation. We have heard union voices in opposition, like the United Mine Workers of America, and we have heard from groups like the Kentucky Coal Association, who recently wrote to me about its negative impact. Here is what they said:

The undeniable truth is that this rule will have a real impact on the real world. It will cause real harm to real people who support real families in real communities.

This regulation is an attack on coal families. It jeopardizes jobs and transfers power away from States and local governments. Today, I am introducing a bipartisan resolution to overturn it.

Congress will also continue acting to provide relief from other regulations that attack our economy and our constituents. In fact, the House will act on its own version of this Congressional Review Act resolution and several others this week. I urge our friends to do so quickly so we can pass them here in the Senate and start providing relief to our coal communities, to our national economy, and to our constituents.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will continue working to put into place President Trump's Cabinet, and tonight we will have a cloture vote on the nominee for Secretary of State. This nominee is well qualified. He has been a leader at one of America's largest employers, and he has the type of international work experience that will serve him well as our next Secretary of State. We are looking forward to advancing his nomination tonight.

Remember, it is in everybody's best interest to confirm each of the President's well-qualified nominees in a timely manner so they can begin the very important work before them on

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S461

matters of national security, the economy, health care, and so many others.

It is also in our Nation's best interests to confirm the next Supreme Court nominee, which the President has said he intends to announce tomorrow. Justice Antonin Scalia was a towering figure on the Supreme Court. His unfortunate passing was not only a great loss to our country, but it came, as we all know, as our country was already in the midst of a contentious Presidential election process. So in keeping with the Biden rule, which states that action on a Supreme Court nomination must be put off until the election campaign is over, I have stood firm on the principle that the American people should have a voice in the selection of the next Supreme Court Justice. I consistently maintained that the next President would fill this vacancy. I held to that view even when nearly everyone thought the President would be Hillary Clinton. Our friends on the left may lack the same consistency on this topic. The principle we have followed, after all, is not only known as the Biden rule but also the Schumer standard.

But there is one thing from which we can expect the left not to waiver: trying to paint whoever is actually nominated in apocalyptic terms. It does not matter whom this Republican President nominates. It does not matter whom any Republican President nominates really. The left has been rolling out the same tired playbook for decades.

When the Republican President was George Herbert Walker Bush, groups on the left said the record of his first Supreme Court nominee was "disturbing" and "very troubling" and that his opinions "threaten to undo the advances made by women, minorities, dissenters and other disadvantaged groups." That is what the left said about President Bush 41's first nominee. Who was it? David Souter.

When the Republican President was Ronald Reagan, groups on the left also said that the record of one of his nominees was "troubling." They even called him a "sexist" and said he "would be a disaster for women" if confirmed. The nominee in question? Anthony Kennedy.

When the Republican President was Gerald Ford, the left said that they had "grave concern with his Supreme Court nominee" and that the record of this nominee "revealed an extraordinary lack of sensitivity to the problems women face." In fact, they said he was disqualified from being a member of the Supreme Court of the United States because of his consistent opposition to women's rights. Who was the nominee they were referring to? John Paul Stevens.

I am serious. That is what they said about John Paul Stevens, David Souter, and Anthony Kennedy.

So we can expect to hear a lot of end-times rhetoric from the left again today. In fact, we already have. The

same groups on the left that always seem to say the sky is falling when a Republican President puts forward a Supreme Court nominee are saying it is falling again. Only this time, they are saying it before we even have a nominee yet. We don't even have a nominee yet.

President Trump has a list of about 20 Americans he is considering nominating to the Supreme Court. These men and women have different professional backgrounds, different life experiences. Some have distinguished themselves in State courts; others have distinguished themselves in Federal Court. Some are appellate court judges; others are trial court judges. Some passed the Senate without a single negative vote against their nomination; others passed the Senate without requiring a rollcall vote at all on their nomination.

The bipartisan support, the years of judicial experience, the impressive credentials—none of these appear to matter to some on the left. They say things like "We are prepared to oppose every name on the list." That is right. Every single name on the list they have already announced opposition to. Even more troubling, some Senate Democrats are saying the same thing. My friend from New York said it was hard for him to imagine a nominee from President Trump whom Senate Democrats could support. We don't even have one yet.

I hope we can all skip past that and get down to our serious work. The election is now behind us. The President has been working to make his decision on a nominee. We expect him to announce that decision tomorrow. The Senate should respect the results of the election and treat this newly elected President's nominee in the same way the nominees of other newly elected Presidents have been treated; that is, with careful consideration followed by an up-or-down vote.

We had two nominations in the first term of President Clinton: Ginsburg and Breyer. Both got up-or-down votes. There was no filibuster. We had two nominations in the first term of President Obama: Sotomayor and Kagan. No filibuster. Up-or-down votes. First-term Presidents. We have every right to expect the same courtesy from today's minority when we receive this nomination tomorrow.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRAVEL BAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon, like much of America, angry and perturbed but in resolute opposition to the President's Executive order issued on Friday. This Executive order was mean-spirited and un-Amer-

ican. It made us less secure. It put our troops in the field at increased risk. It was implemented in a way that caused chaos and confusion across the country. It must be reversed immediately. Let me give three reasons why.

First, it ought to be reversed because it will not make us safer, as the President argues. It will make us less safe.

The President's Executive order targeted seven Muslim-majority countries. Not one terrorist attack has been perpetrated on U.S. soil by a refugee from one of these countries—not one. Moreover, it could alienate and inflame the communities we need most in the fight against terrorism.

As my friend Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN noted, it could increase the small number of lone wolves, which pose the greatest threat of terrorism. Both the San Bernardino and Orlando attacks were done by lone wolves, American citizens imported by the evil ISIS. This rule would have nothing to do with that.

As my friend JOHN MCCAIN has noted, it could increase the small number of lone wolves, which pose the greatest threat of terrorism. As both Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM expressed yesterday, this order is a valuable propaganda tool for ISIS. We saw that happen today. They predicted it yesterday, MCCAIN and GRAHAM. It happened today. They want nothing more than to paint the United States as a country at war with all of Islam. This order feeds right into the perception ISIS and other extremists want to create. The bottom line is, the policy will make us less safe, not more safe.

Second, while there is no way to defend the order, it was poorly constructed and even more poorly executed. The order was signed into effect without the consultation of the Federal agencies that are responsible for enforcing it: the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, or the Department of State, and possibly others.

People across America saw utter chaos and confusion that resulted in our airports over the weekend. The people in charge of implementing it weren't even told about it. Folks were caught in detention at airports around the country, young children separated from their mothers, husbands from their wives, green card holders and legal residents being denied the right to see an attorney. Some folks were pressured into signing away their permanent legal status. We are looking into that right now.

It raises serious doubts about the competence—the basic competence—of the new administration when such an important order is so poorly vetted and executed, just like some of their Cabinet nominations. Such a far-reaching and impactful Executive order should have gotten extreme vetting. Instead, it was rushed through without much thought or deliberation. I could not disagree more with the intention behind the order, but the haphazard and

completely incompetent way in which it was implemented made matters even worse.

Third, and most important of all, the order should be reversed because it is un-American. We are a nation founded by the descendants of asylum seekers, a nation that has been constantly invigorated, replenished, and driven forward by immigrants, many millions of whom came under duress, seeking a new birth of freedom in America. The ability to find refuge from persecution, whether based on one's religion or race or political views, goes to the very foundation of the country, starting with the Pilgrims and Plymouth Rock. The Executive order is antithetical to everything we are about.

President Trump seems to want people to believe that all immigrants are terrorists or criminals, but when you meet immigrants, you see they are not the face of terrorism; they are families just like ours. Yesterday I met two. They were at my office. Mr. Hameed, an Iraqi refugee, worked at a local university department in English literature and, because he loved our country and what we were trying to do, he chose to use his language skills to be a translator for American soldiers in Iraq. He worked as a translator for the U.S. Army in Iraq for 10 years. He endured death threats and harassment to himself and to his family because he was helping us and our soldiers. So he began the refugee process about 2 years ago.

He arrived on January 5. If Donald Trump had been inaugurated on January 1 and enacted his order 6 weeks sooner, Mr. Hameed would have had to stay in Iraq. His life would have been threatened for cooperating with our military.

What kind of message does this send to the untold millions of people just like Mr. Hameed throughout the Muslim world who today will be less likely to work for and with our great country?

Then I met the Elias family. They were a different type. They have four children. They arrived here a month ago. Their journey to the United States began 5 years ago from war-torn Syria. After surviving the brutal civil war, where suicide bombs had been blowing up in front of their house, they were finally reunited with their family in the Bronx. You see, the driving force that brought them here were two American citizens, their grandparents. Mr. and Mrs. Elias came in around 1970.

They are model Americans, the Eliases. I met them. I talked to them. I enjoyed talking to them. Mr. Elias started out as a tailor, a skill that is disappearing. We don't have too many tailors left in America. He is an entrepreneur, like so many immigrants, and he started a small business. He now refurbishes the interior of boats mainly on City Island over there in the Bronx. I have been there. It is a beautiful place.

Well, he wanted to bring his people, his kids and grandchildren, here be-

cause their lives were threatened. They came again a month ago. I met the little boy, a beautiful little boy, a red-headed Syrian refugee.

I said: What do you want to be when you grow up?

A policeman.

I asked the daughter: What do you want to be?

A doctor.

The Elias family and their young children are not a threat to America; they are the promise of America, the same types of people, Mr. President, as your ancestors and mine who came here seeking a better life and working so hard for it.

It is my guess, if President Trump met these refugees, Mr. Hameed and the Elias family, he wouldn't be so hard-hearted.

Our country has a grand and proud tradition of welcoming families like these with open arms. America is at her best when she is a safe harbor in a world of stormy seas.

I urge my Republican colleagues to help us overturn this wrongheaded, counterproductive, dangerous, and un-American Executive order. So many of you know it is wrong. I understand party loyalty. I do. But what this order does is go against the grain that there are higher values at stake.

Eleven of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed reservations already. I urge them and others to back up their words with action. Let's repeal the order, then sit down and thoughtfully and carefully construct a better way to keep our country safe from terrorism.

President Obama toughened up vetting. If there is more vetting that has to be done, we will be happy to look at it and work with you on it but not something like this.

At 5:15 today, I will be asking unanimous consent to call for a vote on a bill offered by my friend from California Senator FEINSTEIN, the ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, to overturn the order, and I hope our Republican colleagues will join us.

As proponents of this legislation, we believe it shows strength.

Proponents of the order say it shows strength, but it is not true; it is not true. Let me explain why. My middle name is Ellis; Charles Ellis Schumer. I was named after my uncle Ellis, who was named for Ellis Island. My daughter's middle name is Emma. We named her for the poet Emma Lazarus, whose timeless words adorn the base of the Statue of Liberty: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

The Statue of Liberty is a symbol of our Nation. Around the world, people recognize it, that mighty beacon that I can see from my home in Brooklyn, and they know we are a nation whose might comes not only from our great military but from our morality, whose leadership—our country's leadership is demonstrated not by projecting a fear of outsiders but by inspiring them in a

hope for a better life here in America. Our country is a country whose strength comes from its values, and among them is a commitment to be that golden door that Emma Lazarus spoke about, a shelter, a commitment to shelter the oppressed and the persecuted.

Just as we faced down and defeated the threat of communism with our values—a respect for the rule of law, for equality under the law, for free markets and free societies—we must face down the twin threats of terrorism and jihadism, not only with military strength, as important as that is, but also with our values: religious freedom, tolerance, decency.

Our greatest weapon will always be our values. That is what makes us strong. They are "a new colossus," as Emma Lazarus called it over 100 years ago.

The only way we will lose the war against terrorism is if we lose ourselves and retreat from our values. Not only will this Executive order embolden and inspire those around the globe who wish to do us harm, it strikes against the very core of America, our values, our greatest strength. We are better than this. So I will fight with every fiber of my being until this Executive order is gone.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on Friday, the President reshuffled the National Security Council to remove permanent postings for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Director of National Intelligence and installed a permanent seat for White House Political Adviser Steve Bannon. It is a disturbing and profound departure from past administrations.

On the most sensitive matters of national security, the President should be relying on the informed counsel of members of the military and intelligence agencies, not political advisers who made their careers promoting a White nationalist Web site.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the President's primary military adviser, and his voice, along with that of the Director of National Intelligence, are the only independent, apolitical voices. President Trump's move to strip them of their seats is baffling. It endangers our national security and is contrary to the spirit and intent of the National Security Act.

This morning, Gen. Michael Hayden—I can't think of a more respected general and intelligence leader. He has served bipartisanly, the Clinton, Bush, Obama administrations. He said that the move—and these are his words, not mine, General Hayden's—"puts ideology at the center over the professional kind of information that the DNI and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs bring to the party."

That is a deeply disturbing thought. It reinforces this administration's preference to propagate its own reality, rather than grapple with the facts on the ground, and if that continues, America is going to have real trouble.

It is one thing when it comes to a dustup about the size of the inauguration crowd; it is an entirely different story when it is the most sensitive activities undertaken by our Nation's government.

Much like the Muslim ban, this decision was poorly thought out and ill-conceived. It has put a filter on the information going to the President and, like the Executive order, makes us less safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my 10 minutes be extended to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 9 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAVEL BAN

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, in just a few weeks, our great country will mark the 75th anniversary of President Roosevelt's Executive order authorizing the internment of hundreds of thousands of Japanese, German, and Italian Americans during World War II. They were rounded up with their families and held behind barbed wire like war criminals. But they had done nothing wrong; their crime was being Japanese, German, or Italian. They were labeled "enemy aliens."

Mark Twain reportedly said that history doesn't repeat itself, but it does rhyme, and this seems to be the path the President has pursued with his Muslim ban. This ban has already harmed green card holders, students, business people, and those fleeing violence and persecution. Remember, these are the people fleeing the vio-

lence, not the perpetrators of the violence. They are the victims, not the criminals. They have been pulled from their flights, left stranded in the airports. They have been detained without the ability to talk with a lawyer. And they are wondering if the United States of America is still the beacon of hope, the lamp by the golden door, the shining city on the hill.

Iraqis who risked their lives to serve our country as translators saw their visas revoked. An 11-month-old baby was detained. That is disgusting. It is un-American. It is contrary to everything we stand for.

We stand for providing refuge for those who want to escape their own awful circumstances and live in freedom and opportunity. It is my grandparents escaping Ukraine. It is my wife's grandparents leaving China. It is the Schatzes. It is the Binders. It is the Kwoks. It is Albert Einstein. It is Madeleine Albright. This is who we are. We are people from all over the world. We are united not by our ethnic extraction or religious affiliation but tied together by our love for America.

Here is the thing: It is not even as though we are trading liberty for security. We are getting no additional security. This is all about being cruel to Muslims because it is good politics for some people.

This isn't just morally wrong, it is also guaranteed not to work. This ban is ridiculous as a homeland security measure.

First, zero people from the countries on the ban list have been involved in terrorist attacks in America. Zero people from the countries on the ban list have been involved in terrorist attacks on America. It is almost as though the criteria for picking the countries is something other than the threat of terrorism.

Second, this ban has the potential to strengthen violent extremist groups by playing right into their hands. It encourages everyone to be afraid of people we don't know from other places. That is not America, and it will not work.

When President Gerald Ford repealed the Executive order interning Japanese Americans, he asked citizens across the country to make a pledge. He said: "I call upon the American people to affirm with me this American promise—that we have learned from the tragedy of that long-ago experience forever to treasure liberty and justice for each individual American, and resolve that this kind of action shall never again be repeated."

That promise is being broken. It is broken for the American who came to this country as a lost boy from Sudan and who now cannot see his family. It is broken for the American married to an Iranian, whom the government is splitting from her husband. It is broken for the millions of Americans, the majority of us, who want us always to have the moral high ground.

The world is watching. History is watching. We have to ask ourselves:

What do they see? Do they see Lady Liberty or do they see something darker? The choice is ours. We can fix this.

We start by following the wise words of Fred Korematsu, an outspoken voice against Japanese internment and an American hero who was born 98 years ago today.

He said: "Protest, but not with violence, and don't be afraid to speak up."

Today I call on every Member of the Senate to follow Mr. Korematsu's advice. Speak up, stand against this ban, and fight chaos and paranoia as official government policy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. CAPITO pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 10 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

NOMINATION OF SCOTT PRUITT

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, the Environmental Protection Agency, which bears most of the blame for regulations targeting energy jobs, is in dire need of a change of direction. The EPA under the Obama administration was unwilling to engage the people of West Virginia in public listening sessions or hearings about decisions that directly impacted our State's economy, and I have described what the result of that has been.

This failure to effectively engage resulted in a number of job-killing regulations, like the utility MATS rule for powerplants, the so-called Clean Power Plan, and the waters of the U.S. rule.

As the Presiding Officer knows, the waters of the U.S. rule is something that impacts not just mining but also agriculture, construction, and it really has far-reaching implications.

Scott Pruitt, who is President Trump's nominee to become the EPA Administrator, has gone through a thorough review process by the Environment and Public Works Committee. At Attorney General Pruitt's confirmation hearing, Senators from both parties were permitted to engage in as many as four rounds of questioning, and some of them were pretty tough. After the hearing, Attorney General Pruitt answered 1,078 questions for the RECORD. Combining both the hearing and the followup questions, Attorney General Pruitt answered more than 1,200 questions from our committees.

Through the process, Attorney General Pruitt has shown himself to be a person who cares about applying our environmental laws as they were written and intended by Congress. He has a

strong record of enforcing environmental statutes in a balanced way and ensuring clean air and clean water without unnecessarily sacrificing jobs or economic growth.

Attorney General Pruitt has been clear that he will work with State regulators and listen to the views of individuals who will be most heavily impacted by EPA's regulatory decisions.

I believe Attorney General Pruitt will keep his word and provide a refreshing change and direction for West Virginia coal miners, natural gas workers, manufacturers, farmers, and, indeed, for all of our communities struggling from the effects of overregulation.

I look forward to supporting Attorney General Pruitt's nomination in the EPW Committee, which will come before the committee on Wednesday morning, and I look forward to seeing him confirmed on the Senate floor soon.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 14 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF REX TILLERSON

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, shortly we are going to be taking up the cloture motion in regard to the confirmation process of Mr. Tillerson to be the Secretary of State for our country. I had the opportunity, as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to meet with Mr. Tillerson. I had a chance to talk with him concerning his vision for America. I participated in a lengthy committee hearing, where not only I had a chance to ask him questions but every member of the committee had a chance to ask questions and then had the opportunity to present questions for the RECORD and look at his responses to questions for the RECORD.

I wish to say, at the outset of this debate before the U.S. Senate, Mr. Tillerson is a successful businessman. I am certain he has great negotiating skills, as he has shown as the CEO of ExxonMobil, and I think that is an important ability to have if he were confirmed as Secretary of State.

I do think he wants to serve our Nation, and he has put forward his ability to serve as Secretary of State for the right reasons. However, I have serious reservations, as a result of this process, this confirmation process, that leads me to the conclusion that I cannot support his nomination, and I will be voting against his nomination. I wanted to at least start this debate by giving some of the reasons I will not be supporting Mr. Tillerson to be the Secretary of State.

Mr. Tillerson's business orientation and his lack of moral clarity to questions that were asked during the confirmation hearing, to me, compromises his ability to forcefully promote the values and ideals that defined America's leading role in the world for more than 200 years. When I am referring to the values, they are the values of good governance, the values of standing up for human rights, the values of speaking up for a free press, the values of recognizing the importance of civil societies, which is lacking in so many places around the world.

When Mr. Tillerson was asked the question as to how he would characterize what Russia is doing in Syria in supporting a regime that has attacked humanitarian convoys, whether that should be considered as war crimes, Mr. Tillerson was less than clear as to how he would characterize Russia's conduct in Syria.

When I asked Mr. Tillerson how he would characterize Philippine President Duterte's extrajudicial killings—this is a President who has authorized individuals to be killed on site without judicial process, which has been well-documented—whether that was a gross violation of human rights, Mr. Tillerson was less than clear as to whether that in fact would elevate to a serious human rights violation.

When I asked the question, whether under any circumstances we could have a national registry for any group of religious or ethnic minorities in America, his answer was not as clear as I would have hoped it to be. The answer should have been a simple "no," but he did not give that answer in that moral clarity.

For all those reasons, I have serious concern as to whether he will speak with a strong voice on American values or whether that will be compromised for narrow business interests or for other considerations that should not take priority to the values that have made America the great Nation it is.

I was concerned about this before what has happened in recent days, but when I take a look at President Trump's first 10 days in office and I look at the Executive orders he has

issued as President of the United States, it is even more critical that the next Secretary of State speak with moral clarity as to the values of America.

The gag order that was reimposed by President Trump wasn't the same gag order that other administrations have imposed. It is far broader and could prevent U.S. participation with health workers around the world to stop the spread of HIV-AIDS or to deal with the Zika virus or to deal with issues concerning global health issues, maternal health. I want someone, as Secretary of State, to say that America stands for providing the leadership we need on global health issues.

More recently, when President Trump announced his Mexican policy; that it would build a wall, he not only asked the taxpayers to pay for it once but to pay for it twice, to build the wall, which almost anyone will tell you will not work. We do have tunnels that we already know could go under walls. It will be expensive, but he is also asking Americans to pay for it twice because he is going to impose a tariff, at least that is under consideration, that middle-income families will end up paying—starting a trade war with Mexico. And why? Why would you start this? Mexico is working with us to stop illegal immigration. They are working with us to stop the illegal trafficking of drugs. They are working with us to build a regional, natural economy that benefits both countries. Why would we pick a fight with our neighbor? It makes no sense whatsoever.

The last thing that was done over this weekend points out even more clearly why we need a Secretary of State who will speak with moral clarity, and that was this outrageous, reckless, and dangerous Executive order that would ban certain individuals from coming to America. It would put a hold on our refugee program and would establish a religious test for people coming to America—a Muslim ban. That is not what America stands for.

I believe that Executive order is illegal. I know that Executive order will put Americans at risk. I would like to know from our Secretary of State how he, if he is confirmed, would respond when other countries ask: Why should we help you when you will not allow people from Muslim countries the right to visit your country? Why should we give you that information? How will Americans, who are traveling abroad, be treated? It puts all at risk. Our next Secretary of State has to have that credibility to deal with other countries with moral clarity. Time and time again, when confronted with questions, Mr. Tillerson was not clear.

Let me give you one example that may sum up my concern on his moral clarity issues, and that is with Russia. We had asked several times whether he would support the existing sanctions, would he support stronger sanctions. After all, the sanctions were put on because Russia invaded Ukraine. They

are still there. They are still in Crimea. They are still interfering with eastern Ukraine. Unless they comply with the Minsk agreement, our European allies are looking for America to say no way would we ever weaken our sanctions as long as Russia is violating its commitment in Ukraine.

Since that, they have been doing other things. I already mentioned the war crimes they are committing in Syria, but they also attacked America. They attacked us through cyber, trying to bring down our democratic system of government, free elections. I would certainly have hoped Mr. Tillerson would have shown some compassion for increasing sanctions against Russia. Instead, we asked him a question about Cuba, and Mr. Tillerson was very clear when he talked about Cuba. He said: Look, if we do business with Cuba, we are allowing a repressive regime to have greater resources. Why would we want to support a repressive regime?

Mr. Tillerson didn't show the same concern about Russia. He has no compulsion at all about doing business with Russia, even though that business is allowing the Putin repressive regime to carry out their activities of attacks against our allies, attacks against us, interfere with what is going on in Syria, and to do all the activities they are doing. I would have hoped that we were seeing a greater sense of moral clarity from our Secretary of State nominee.

There are other issues I am concerned about. I know we will have a chance to talk about it if this issue is still on the floor tomorrow, as I expect it will be. We will have a chance to talk about issues regarding his quick use of military power versus diplomacy. We asked him several times about external events and how he will respond to them. His answer was too quick about using our military and not quick enough about using our diplomacy. The use of military must be a matter of last resort. I want to make sure our next Secretary of State is very sensitive to that particular issue.

Then we get to the concern about the ethical issues. I need to mention this because when we asked him questions about his knowledge of ExxonMobil, he was less than forthcoming to the committee, not aware of ExxonMobil's lobbying on certain issues, and very unclear about how its activities were in Sudan, Syria, Iran, and other countries that have horrible human rights records. And his willingness to recuse himself from anything affecting Exxon for 1 year, not for the entire length of term that he would be Secretary of State if confirmed by the Senate—he should not deal with ExxonMobil for the entire length of his time as Secretary of State. He is a person who has substantial wealth as a result of his working at ExxonMobil. None of us criticize him for that, but it disqualifies him from dealing with ExxonMobil.

We are going to be involved in a lengthy debate on the next Secretary of State, as we should, but I just wanted to share with my colleagues my concern about Mr. Tillerson and why I am opposing his nomination. And I would just indicate that I think the events particularly over the weekend with this immigration policy really point out the need for the next Secretary of State to be willing to stand strong for American values, and I have serious questions in that regard on Mr. Tillerson.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I am pleased to rise in support of the nomination of Rex Tillerson to serve as our next Secretary of State. The proceedings in the Foreign Relations Committee for his nomination were fair, exhaustive, and in the best traditions of our committee and the Senate. Mr. Tillerson completed all of his required paperwork expeditiously, having met or exceeded the pace set by former Secretary Hillary Clinton after she was nominated in 2008. He testified in a public hearing for more than 8 hours and afterward responded to over 1,000 additional questions for the record from committee members.

Opinions and votes today on Mr. Tillerson may differ, but there is no question that the committee and the Senate have fulfilled their constitutional responsibility in carefully reviewing his nomination.

As we proceed in ensuring that the new administration has the leaders it needs to implement our Nation's foreign policy going forward, I have great confidence that Rex Tillerson will serve the United States well.

In both my private meetings with him and in the hours of public testimony he offered before the Foreign Relations Committee, it has become clear that he will be an effective leader at the State Department. Mr. Tillerson has led an exemplary and honorable life. He has been at the same company for over 40 years. As an Eagle Scout, he served as the national president of the Boy Scouts of America.

Furthermore, the nonpartisan Director of the Office of Government Ethics recently stated that Mr. Tillerson is making a clean break from Exxon and has even gone so far as to say that Tillerson's ethics agreement serves as a sterling model for what we would like to see with other nominees.

Having managed one of the world's largest companies by revenue, with over 75,000 employees, there is no doubt in my mind that Rex Tillerson is well qualified to lead the State Department. I encourage all of my colleagues to support his confirmation and look forward to his service as our next Secretary of State.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION, THE PRESS, AND RUSSIA

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, Trump's Executive order banning Muslims from seven countries, none of which was a source of terrorists who have carried out attacks in this country, was un-American, arbitrary, inhumane, and it will likely spur an increase in violence targeting Americans. I will have plenty more to say about it and other reckless actions by this White House in the days and weeks ahead.

In the meantime, I want to say a few words about the bizarre back and forth between the Trump administration and the news media regarding attendance at the inauguration and who is telling the truth and who is not.

One might think that with all that is happening in the country and the world and the rush by the President to sign Executive orders that would dramatically affect the rights, and the priorities, of millions of Americans, the question of how many people were at the inauguration would not generate such controversy. But it turns out that this is about much more than that, as it goes to the heart of the role of a free press in this country and whether the American people can have confidence that the President is telling the truth.

We already knew that candidate and now President Trump is prone to bragging and making wildly unrealistic promises and inaccurate claims, many of which he later disavows. He frequently ignores or misstates basic facts and refuses to correct those falsehoods. So it was no surprise when he predicted that the crowd at his inauguration would be "an unbelievable, perhaps record-setting turnout."

It was also no surprise, as usually happens at inaugurations and large public demonstrations, that high-elevation photographs were used to estimate the number of participants. To anyone who attended both the Obama and Trump inaugurations, it was obvious that the number of people at President Obama's inauguration was far larger than at President Trump's inauguration, as photographs clearly showed.

President Trump, however, insisted the photographs were fabricated. The morning after the inauguration, he said he could see from the stage on the West Front of the Capitol that there were "a million" or "a million and a half" people on the Mall.

When reports clearly showed only a fraction of that, he accused news organizations of lying, calling them "among the most dishonest human beings on Earth," and warned that they would regret it.

Later that day, the President's spokesman, Sean Spicer, also accused the press of lying. He said the photographs were deceptive, and he insisted that President Trump's inauguration was "the most watched ever." That, of course, was a clever distortion of what the President actually said.

President Trump was unmistakably talking about the number of people who were actually present on the Mall when he was sworn in, which seems to matter more to him than it does to anyone else.

Mr. Spicer expanded that number by an indeterminate amount to include anyone who had watched anywhere in the world on a cell phone, television, or other electronic device.

A day later, Mr. Spicer berated the press for being unfair by reporting on this. Perhaps he had forgotten that it was President Trump who initiated the whole thing by publicly promising something that did not happen and then falsely accusing the press of lying, as did Mr. Spicer, after being proven wrong.

Mr. Spicer also may have forgotten that, shortly after President Obama was inaugurated, the Senate majority leader announced that the Republicans' No. 1 priority was to prevent him from being elected to a second term. Failing that, they spent 8 years trying to obstruct, sabotage, and discredit everything President Obama tried to do.

During much of that time, Donald Trump carried on an utterly false campaign accusing President Obama of lying about his birthplace.

Two days later and without citing any evidence—because no evidence exists—President Trump resurrected his false claim that that he lost the popular vote because 3 to 5 million “illegal immigrants” voted. Mr. Spicer echoed this same claim, citing unnamed “studies.”

This, of course, is patently false and absurd, but one can assume that it will be repeated by Republicans to justify more onerous, discriminatory voter suppression voting requirements which have been a crusade of theirs, particularly in areas with large minority populations that traditionally vote Democratic.

To add insult to injury, Kellyanne Conway, the President's counselor, announced that President Trump will not be releasing his tax returns. This after candidate Trump repeatedly promised to do so once a routine audit is completed, and he even said he looked forward to doing that. Ms. Conway—who also came up with the phrase “alternative facts”—claimed that the fact that Mr. Trump won the election is proof that no one cared about his tax returns.

There are at least two problems with that. First, it is the only way the American people can know what President Trump's assets are, what conflicts of interest may exist, whether he has been telling the truth about what he owns, and whether he is working for the American people or to enrich himself and his family. The polls indicate that today between 60 and 74 percent of the American people want President Trump to release his tax returns, including 49 percent of his own supporters.

A few days later, Stephen Bannon, the White House strategist, said the

media should “keep its mouth shut and just listen for a while.” Ignoring that democracy is impossible without a free press, Bannon called the media the “opposition party . . . that [does not] understand this country.”

There is an even more disturbing aspect to this. Besides denigrating the press, candidate and now President Trump has attacked Muslims, the CIA, Mexico, Meryl Streep, the cast of “Hamilton,” Congressman JOHN LEWIS, politicians, undocumented migrants, or whoever else he thinks of at any particular moment, for meddling in the election or for any other reason, with one glaring exception: Vladimir Putin, one of the world's worst gangsters.

Despite credible evidence that the Russian Government, at Putin's direction, actively sought to sway the outcome of the U.S. election in favor of Donald Trump, candidate and now President Trump has repeatedly expressed admiration for Mr. Putin.

Think about what this means. The unanimous conclusion of U.S. intelligence agencies is that Vladimir Putin, a former KGB agent, ordered a cyber attack on our electoral system in favor of one candidate over another. Russia's goals “were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency.”

Can you imagine what the response would be from the Republican leadership if the tables were turned? They would have threatened to shut down the government until a new election was held. And if that failed they would have demanded that an independent commission be established to investigate Russia's cyber attacks. Such a commission is, in fact, what Senator DURBIN, I and others have called for and what the Republican leaders, who should care no less about the integrity of our democracy, have summarily rejected.

What was candidate and President Trump's response to Russia's acts to undermine our democracy? He continued to praise Vladimir Putin.

This should concern every American because, for years, Vladimir Putin has engaged in a systematic campaign to weaken the alliances and norms that the United States and our democratic allies have painstakingly built over the course of more than seven decades, for our national security and for global stability.

Putin would like nothing more than to discredit our democracy, weaken NATO, fracture the European Union, and in doing so deflect criticism at home and abroad of the repression and rampant corruption that have become the hallmarks of his iron-fisted rule.

While Mr. Spicer blithely spoke of the United States and Russia teaming up against ISIS, Russia has used its military power in Syria for one overriding purpose: to ensure the survival of Bashar al Assad's government, one of Russia's staunchest and most brutal allies.

We have learned that President Trump is also an admirer of Egyptian President al-Sisi and Philippine President Duterte, two populist leaders who have abused their authority to silence their critics and trample on the rights of their citizens.

If allying ourselves with the likes of Presidents Putin, al Sisi, and Duterte, bringing back black CIA detention sites and so-called “enhanced interrogation”—commonly known as torture—and declaring entire nationalities of men, women, and children fleeing war and devastation as ineligible for resettlement in this country is what the future looks like, we should think long and hard about what it will mean for our reputation as the oldest democracy and leader of the free world.

I have made a career of working across the aisle and with Republican and Democratic Presidents on legislation to help solve the country's problems. I hope to be able to continue doing so, as I learned early on that bipartisanship is the only way the Congress can succeed. I have voted to confirm several of President Trump's Cabinet nominees. I expect to vote for others, and there are several I expect to vote against.

I have never believed that we should keep doing things a certain way just because it is the way we have always done them or that the government cannot be made more efficient and more accountable to the people. Of course it can be.

But in times like this, each of us should rededicate ourselves to defending the things that made this country great in the first place because ours is a great country and a good country. I believe that above all it was, and must continue to be, the integrity of our democratic system, our free, fair, and transparent elections and the checks and balances of our three equal branches of government bolstered by a free press, and our commitment to uphold the fundamental rights of all Americans.

Donald Trump was not elected President to weaken any of that, and we in Congress have a responsibility to do our best to prevent it from happening.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Tillerson nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30

minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has not been specifically apportioned to the Senator from California.

(The remarks of Mrs. FEINSTEIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 240 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be yielded 5 minutes for myself and then 5 minutes for the Senator from Arkansas to answer and perhaps object after I make motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—S. 240 AND EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will speak and then make my two motions, and then the Senator from Arkansas can speak and either object or not, whatever he decides.

Mr. President, earlier I spoke at length on the President's Executive order. I just want to repeat that this Executive order has made us less safe, less secure, put our troops in the field at increased risk, and was implemented in a way that has caused chaos and confusion across the country. Most fundamentally of all, it is un-American. It flies in the face of a grand American tradition of granting refuge to those fleeing persecution, regardless of their race, religion, or political views. It is dangerous. It is shameful. It is wrong. It must be reversed immediately. And I know that many of my colleagues agree with me. They know this is wrong. A dozen Republican Senators and counting, including my good friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, have expressed serious concern. One former Republican CIA Director said that it "makes us less safe than we were on Friday."

So let's repeal the order and then sit down to discuss a smart, thoughtful, effective way to counter terrorism. President Obama wanted tougher vetting. Democrats are happy to look at proposals to that effect but not this ineffective, un-American policy that will do more to empower our enemies and inspire those around the globe who would do us harm.

Now I am going to make a second unanimous consent request, and I will do them seriatim, as the UC allowed.

The second request is, I ask unanimous consent that we delay the confirmation vote on Secretary of State nominee Rex Tillerson until these Executive orders are overturned and he commits to opposing them.

So far, this is the most important foreign policy order of the new administration, and in the committee hearing for his nomination, Mr. Tillerson

appeared—he wasn't 100 percent certain—to roundly reject the idea of a blanket travel ban just like the one President Trump signed. He said: "I don't support a blanket type of travel ban on people coming to this country." He stressed in his opening statement that moderate Muslims are going to be our greatest allies in the fight against Islamic extremists. The implication was that he wouldn't support a proposal that would in any way alienate and inflame them. He said he didn't think it was helpful to suggest that Americans should be afraid of Muslims. That would suggest he might be wary about a policy that explicitly singles out seven majority-Muslim countries for different treatment under U.S. policy.

Now, many of the comments Mr. Tillerson made to the committee are at odds with the President's policy. So Democrats and Republicans alike and the American people, most of all, deserve to know whether Mr. Tillerson would implement this Executive order or not because it seems to directly contradict comments he made under oath to a Senate committee. Key allies around the world are wondering whether the potential future Secretary of State supports this policy, and so are the American people.

Here are some important questions: Did he have any involvement or consultation in the construction or drafting of the Executive order? How would he answer the outcries from countries around the world that are asking that President Trump rethink this policy? Does he think it would make us less safe? Does he think it would alienate moderate Muslim communities in the United States and around the world? And does he believe current green card holders should be subjected to another round of scrutiny if they come back to the United States, even though they have been vetted before?

We need these answers from President Trump's nominees, and Mr. Tillerson's nomination is before the Senate right now, so it is imperative that we know what he thinks before moving forward.

So, Mr. President, I am making two unanimous consent requests.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senator FEINSTEIN's bill, S. 240, introduced earlier today; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill; finally, that there be no amendments, motions, or points of order in order to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

If the Democratic leader wants to proceed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I have a second unanimous consent request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote on Calendar No. 2, the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson for Secretary of State, be postponed until Executive Order 137 is rescinded and Mr. Tillerson has provided in writing to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee information pertaining to his involvement in the development of the Executive order, as well as a statement declaring whether or not he agrees with the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the first request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I object to the first request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the second request of the Democratic leader?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, so once again we are hearing the Democrats and the media traffic in fake news. We heard a lot on this floor and over the weekend about a Muslim ban. This is a so-called Muslim ban that applies only to seven countries, and it does not apply to Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, or Nigeria—the five largest Muslim populations in the world. I have heard lots of claims on TV about 134 million Muslims who could be affected. Of course that leaves 1.6 billion Muslims who are not affected.

This is not a Muslim ban; this is a temporary pause of movement from seven countries, which President Trump did not pick from thin air. He picked from acts of this Congress and the Obama Department of Homeland Security—five countries in a state of near anarchy; a sixth country, Iraq, which has had a large part of its territory overrun by the Islamic State; and a seventh, Iran, which is the world's worst state sponsor of terrorism. Moreover, it is not a ban; it is simply a temporary pause for 3 to 4 months to evaluate whether Obama administration policies are strong enough to keep this country safe.

We also heard claims that this is somehow unconstitutional. However, there is no free-floating global right of people around the world to come to this country. President Trump's order is nothing more than a temporary pause on migration from countries with very weak state institutions or which sponsor terrorism, while the President and the administration take a more thorough review of our vetting procedures and the refugee program as a whole.

Secretary Kelly has stated that it does not apply to green card holders. Secretary Mattis is reportedly advising that the long-term policy accommodate Iraqis with a documented history

of serving with our troops, which I obviously support.

In fact, a temporary pause for security evaluations is so sensible that in November 2015, after the Paris terrorist attacks, even the minority leader suggested that “a pause may be necessary.” It wasn’t beyond the pale then, and it is not now. Moreover, the people who are enforcing our laws on the frontlines agree with President Trump. The union for Border Patrol and Customs Enforcement agents has stated that they support this order and two other related immigration orders.

Yet here is the minority shedding crocodile tears over President Trump’s immigration refugee policy, but where were those tears for the last 8 years when President Obama’s foreign policy created all of these refugees? Where were the tears when President Obama overthrew the Government of Libya with nothing to follow? Where were the tears when President Obama withdrew from Iraq, leaving that country to fend off Iran and the Islamic State? Where were the tears when President Obama gave Iran \$100 billion to continue its imperial campaign throughout the Middle East, to include overthrowing the Government of Yemen through its proxies? And most notoriously, where were the tears when President Obama stood idly by and watched Syria go up in flames? Spare me the tears now.

If the minority is worried about the President’s counsel and wants to make a difference in the real world, I suggest we get to work and we confirm Rex Tillerson to be the Secretary of State and JEFF SESSIONS to be the Attorney General. In the meantime, I object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there further debate?

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Jerry Moran, Pat Roberts, James Lankford, Johnny Isakson, Bob Corker, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, Dan Sullivan, David Perdue, James M. Inhofe, Deb Fischer, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is necessarily absent.

(Disturbance in the Visitors’ Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will restore order in the Senate.

The Galleries will remain quiet.

The Sergeant at Arms will restore order.

Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 34 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Sessions
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	King	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Enzi	McCain	Warner
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young
Flake	Murkowski	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Franken	Peters
Bennet	Gillibrand	Reed
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Hassan	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

Heinrich

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAVEL BAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is the 11th day of the Trump Presidency. To say that these have been tumultuous days is certainly an understatement. What happened over this past weekend really was unsettling to many people all across the United States.

Candidate Trump made it clear that he had strong feelings about refugees and strong feelings about immigration, but I don’t think anyone anticipated the Executive orders that were issued by the Trump administration, by the President, on Friday. The net result of that we saw across the United States

at O’Hare International Airport, JFK, Dulles, many other airports. International travelers, en route, learned that the laws of the United States were being changed because of President Trump’s Executive order. As a result, there was a lot of confusion and uncertainty, and hardships were created. Individuals who were coming to the United States as refugees were being turned away.

For the record, this decision to indefinitely suspend the admission of Syrian refugees into the United States is not a decision based on fact. Since 9/11, since the war in Syria began, we have not had a single—not one—instance of terrorism by a Syrian refugee—not one. The United States has not stepped up as other countries like Canada have in admitting Syrian refugees. We have gone to great lengths, extraordinary lengths, to give background checks that are as consuming as one can imagine, to verify their identity and their safety to the United States.

Overwhelmingly, these Syrian refugees are the victims of a deadly war which has gone on for years, and overwhelmingly they are children with their mothers. I have met them. I sat down with them in Chicago. It is heartbreaking to think that they have lived through war, may have been lucky enough to make it to a refugee camp, and then waited for years—for years—to be cleared by the United States and be given a chance to come to this country.

It has to be a heartbreaking process. Through it all, many of them have endured losses in their families that they will never be able to forget—injuries and deaths of people whom they love. These are men and women in Syria escaping a deadly war and the terrorists who have ravaged that country. They have tried to come to the United States for safety and security.

The history of refugees in America is one that in modern version is very admirable, but unfortunately before—during World War II—it was a sad chapter in our history. Not only did we inter about 120,000 Japanese Americans in camps during the war for fear that they would betray the United States, but during that war, time and again, the administration of President Roosevelt as well as Congress refused to allow those who were escaping the Holocaust in Nazi Germany to come to the United States.

Here on this Senate floor where I stand, an effort was made by Senator Robert Wagner of New York to admit 10,000 Jewish children out of Nazi Germany into the United States so that their parents would have the peace of mind that they would not be killed by the war or the Holocaust. That measure was defeated on the floor of this Senate. Prior to our entry into the war, those who tried to escape Nazi Germany and come to the United States were turned away by the United States.

The most notorious example was the SS St. Louis, which sailed from Germany, came to, first, Havana, Cuba, then to Miami, FL, and was turned away in both places with about 900 passengers who feared for their lives because of the anti-Semitism and the killing that was taking place in Nazi Germany.

They tracked that passenger list. Several hundred of them were rejected by the United States. They were not given refugee status. They were forced to return to Germany. Several hundred of them perished in the Holocaust.

It was after that bitter experience that the United States decided to try to set an example for the world when it came to compassion and humanity for refugees. We stepped up time and again to be that place of security and safety. We can point proudly to the fact that when the Cubans were fearful of a Communist takeover in their country, fearful for their lives and their rights and their liberties, they came to the United States in tens of thousands.

Now Cuban Americans, a proud part of our country not only in Florida but around our Nation, can point to the U.S. refugee policy as the means by which they finally made it to the safety of the United States. Here we were in a Cold War with the Soviet Union; Cuba, 90 miles off our shore was being taken over by a dictator, Fidel Castro, who was declaring his loyalty to the Soviet Union. Yet we were readily receiving tens of thousands of refugees from Cuba in the midst of that Cold War. Talk about a chance—and taking a chance. Those men and women who came to the United States were not vetted for months, years, and in many cases not at all. They were allowed into our country. Thank goodness we did it. It was the right thing to do.

Time and again, whether it was refugees coming in from Vietnam after the end of that deadly war or whether it was Soviet Jews, persecuted by the Soviet Union, trying to escape, coming to the United States, we opened our doors and said: The United States of America will set an example for the world when it comes to refugees. That defined who we were and who we still should be.

Now this new President is ready to walk away from that. If we had one instance of a Syrian refugee coming into the United States after that vetting process who caused harm to our citizens or engaged in an act of terrorism—if we had one—then perhaps this President could start to make his case.

All he has is fear, unreasoned fear, unproven fear. We recall what Franklin Roosevelt said to this Nation, standing right out here on the steps when he was inaugurated in March of 1933: We have nothing to fear but fear itself. It is fear itself that is motivating this President to make decisions inconsistent with more than 50 years of American history and inconsistent with American values.

When you meet these refugees and you hear their heartbreaking stories,

how can you say that there is no room for you in this country? Yet that is exactly what he said.

Sadly, he not only came up with this Executive order, he did it in a fashion where the agencies that were supposed to implement the order really were caught by surprise. Now they are priding themselves on the fact that they can turn on a dime when given instructions that are important for national security. But in this case, where national security was not the motive—political security was the motive; I am talking in the crassest terms. In those cases, these agencies were forced to make split-second decisions, and some of them were horrible.

A man who came to the United States from Iraq, from one of the seven countries designated by President Trump, came from Iraq after having risked his life for American soldiers. He was rewarded with an opportunity to come to the United States, was detained at the airport, questioned at length, threatened to be returned to Iraq, and finally—after 19 hours—allowed to stay.

There is story after story of families coming to see someone who was on the deathbed, their last chance to be together, and families who had gone overseas for what they thought were just casual or really easy trips who were subject to detention and some turned away. Why? It certainly was not in the interest of the security of the United States, and it was not handled in a professional manner. It was impulsive and not decisive. It was ill conceived instead of wise.

Here we are today. As I stand here at this chair and this desk in the Senate, across the street thousands have gathered in front of the Supreme Court to express their outrage over the Executive orders issued by President Trump. I am happy to report that almost one dozen Republican Senators have joined us in expressing reservations about this policy.

It gives me hope that maybe on a bipartisan basis we can rein in some of the excesses of this administration. God forbid we ignore the basic constitutional issue that has been raised by these Executive orders. It is no coincidence that these seven countries are predominately Muslim countries. It is no coincidence that President Trump went on a Christian broadcasting station and said preference would be given to Christians.

The Constitution which we are sworn to uphold and defend, the Constitution which guides this Nation is one that was written at a time when religion was a divisive issue that led to people coming to the United States.

I think in this section, our Founding Fathers probably showed more wisdom and more understanding of our future than any other on the issue of religion. They only said three things in the entire Constitution, three things over 200 years ago. They said that this Congress, this government, will not estab-

lish an official religion. They did that, of course, many of them having come from England, where they had a national church. They didn't want that in the United States. Most importantly, they said each person in America had freedom of religious belief, to believe what they wished or to believe nothing if they wished, and that would be an honored freedom under our Bill of Rights. The third element: Religion could not be used as a litmus test for public office. That is it.

When you think of all the wars and all the deaths and all the persecution based on religion, the fact that we have largely escaped it is because of the wisdom of that document.

Now comes this 45th President of the United States who decides to rewrite the book, to ignore this basic constitutional direction and mandate, and to say on the Christian Broadcasting Network: We are going to favor Christian refugees coming to the United States. That, to me, is unacceptable and unconstitutional, and inconsistent with who we are, what we are, and the values we treasure in this country.

My mother was an immigrant to this country. I never knew my grandmother, who brought her over on the ship from Lithuania. I do have one thing now in my office upstairs that my grandmother carried with her to this country. It is a prayer book. We are a Roman Catholic family. She was a Roman Catholic in Lithuania. The Russian Orthodox religion was being pushed by the czar, who was dominant when they left Lithuania, and they banned Catholic prayer books written in Lithuania.

I never knew my grandmother. I wish I had. She risked everything to bring that Catholic prayer book, that contraband from czarist-controlled Lithuania into the United States. I have it upstairs. It means the world to me that this woman with limited formal education but unlimited courage was willing to risk a lot, bringing three small children into this country, carrying with her that prayer book which might have gotten her imprisoned in Lithuania back in her day. So religion means a lot to our family, not just on a personal basis but what America means when it comes to religion.

When this President is so casual with the constitutional guarantees of religion, I don't believe he is serving the United States or honoring the history that came before him.

There have been so many issues that have come up during the 11 days of his Presidency, but President Trump's decision to turn away innocent people fleeing persecution, genocide, and terror and to ban immigrants on the basis of religion is the worst, in my view. This attack is not only un-American, it risks alienating 1 billion Muslims around the world. Some of the most conservative people in this country—I am certain Republicans—have said over and over again: Don't do this. There are Muslim countries that are

allies in fighting terrorism, and if you alienate them, it is going to lessen our ability to stop the spread of Al Qaeda and ISIS.

Furthermore, this is a recruiting tool. You know what is going to happen. Those who hate the United States are going to use this action by President Trump to verify their belief and their credo that the United States is anti-Muslim.

There was a Republican President, George W. Bush, whom I disagreed with many times, but thank goodness, after 9/11, he had the wisdom and showed the leadership to come before the American people to say: We are not going to condemn the Muslim religion. We are going to go after those who corrupted it, but we are going to honor it as a religion of peace.

How different President George W. Bush, that Republican President, was to President Donald Trump, this Republican President.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN is the ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee. She has introduced a resolution, on which I am proud to be one of the original cosponsors, to repeal and rescind these reprehensible President Donald Trump Executive orders on refugees and immigration.

We are in the midst of the worst refugee crisis in the history of the world. More than 65 million people have been forcibly displaced from their homes. The brutal Syrian conflict, which is the epicenter of this humanitarian crisis, has killed hundreds of thousands, injured more than a million, and displaced half of the population of that country. In some areas, children literally starve to death in Syria. This conflict has forced more than 4.7 million refugees to flee. Around 70 percent of them are women and children who are looking for a safe place in this world. Half of Syrian children today are not in school because of this conflict and because of the forces that have dispersed them around the world. Millions in and outside of Syria need humanitarian assistance.

Last week—the same week President Trump signed this awful Executive order on refugees—the United Nations issued an appeal for \$4.6 billion to meet the basic needs of Syrian refugees and struggling communities hosting them in neighboring countries.

Lebanon is a country where I believe half of the children in school today are Syrian. Jordan, one of our best friends and allies in the Middle East, has made more sacrifices on behalf of refugees per capita than any nation on Earth. What message does it send to our friends in Jordan that while they risk the security and safety and stability of their nation to absorb these refugees from Syria and around the world, that as an official policy of President Donald Trump, the United States no longer will even consider allowing a Syrian refugee to come to the United States? How can we in good conscience ask the King of Jordan to risk his monarchy

and his country for refugees when President Trump says they are not allowed in the United States?

Earlier this month, I am happy to report, more than 1,700 Jewish rabbis called on our government to maintain and strengthen the refugee program for refugees of all ethnic and religious backgrounds—not to halt it, pause it, or restrict it. This weekend, I was so proud of the Catholic cardinal in Chicago, Blase Cupich, who came out and said the Executive orders of Donald Trump are not consistent with American values and certainly are not consistent with the beliefs of the Catholic Church. Religious leaders all across the country are speaking out. They understand that this is more than a political test; this is a moral test of who we are as Americans.

Many of the refugees who came to this country were fleeing regimes that were hostile to the United States. We gave them safety.

Refugees are the most carefully vetted and investigated of all travelers. Before refugees are admitted into the United States, they go through security screening that is almost unheard of. All of that screening takes place before they can even consider being allowed to set foot in America, and Syrian refugees go through an even stricter review. Extreme vetting? I have news for this President: Syrian refugees and refugees all over the world are already going through extreme vetting.

Shutting down the Refugee Resettlement Program won't protect our security. It plays into ISIS's argument that the United States is waging a war against Islam.

Listen to what Michael Hayden, former Director of the CIA and National Security Agency under Presidents Bush and Obama, said about President Trump's Executive order:

It's a horrible move. It is a political, ideological move driven by the language of the campaign and, frankly, campaign promises—promises in the campaign that were hyped by an exaggeration of the threat. And in fact, what we're doing now has probably made us less safe today than we were Friday morning before this happened because we are now living the worst jihadist narrative possible, that there is undying enmity between Islam and the West. Muslims out there who were not part of the jihadist movement are now being shown that the story they were being told by the jihadists—they hate us; they're our enemy—that's being acted out by the American government. And frankly, at a humanitarian level, it's an abomination.

That statement was not made by the Democratic National Committee; it was made by Gen. Michael Hayden, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency under Presidents Bush and Obama.

If we are serious about protecting America, we should be serious about closing the real loopholes that might threaten us. Think of the hundreds of thousands of foreign visitors to the United States under the Visa Waiver Program who go through no vetting,

not even fingerprinting, before they get on a plane to come to the United States. Want to close a loophole in security? Let's look at that one seriously.

Instead of real security threats, President Trump is focusing on innocent people—children, women, families who are fleeing terrorism.

Today's refugees, like millions before them from all over the world, will become proud Americans who contribute greatly to our society and economy.

Albert Einstein was a refugee. Thank goodness he came to the United States. Today, so many of the leaders of our major corporations and high-tech companies are immigrants to this country and, in some cases, refugees.

Building walls on our borders and fear in our hearts will not move America forward. Let's not continue the cruelty or deception of blaming immigrants and refugees for our security and economic challenges. Let's work together to build a better America for all Americans, including new Americans, no matter the color of their skin, where their parents were born, or how they pray.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, citizens across the country are very concerned. In fact, they are more than concerned; they are terrified that our President is degrading the fundamental values on which our Nation was founded: religious tolerance, freedom of religion, the ability to worship as you please, and a fundamental principle that we would be welcoming to refugees, that we would be a nation that embraces immigrants.

Tonight Lady Liberty is crying. She said, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free," but our President has slammed the door on the tired and the poor and the huddled masses. It is an action the citizens in my home State have come out to protest. They have gone to the airport in Portland en masse 2 days in a row to say that we are welcoming to the world, that we are not going to slam the door shut on refugees, that we are not going to single out Muslim nations and say: We do not want you here.

Indeed, I held two townhalls over the weekend. The first was in a gymnasium about this size. There were 600 people jammed into it. They are very upset and angry that our fundamental values are being disregarded by the President of the United States. Then I went to my second townhall. I thought 600 was a lot; there were 3,700 Oregonians who came out to my second townhall. Every one of them is wanting to send a message to President Trump: You are taking us on the wrong road—a road that hurts people around the world, a road that hurts our fundamental values, and a road that decreases our security.

This Executive order, this Executive action from the President has had an

immediate and painful impact—hundreds of people en route to our country detained at airports although they were legally traveling here. Many of them have been vetted on extended periods, some of them going through several years of vetting, and finally they have in their hand that visa that says, yes, I am going to have a country, and it is going to be the United States of America. And the President crushed that hope.

Chaos and confusion abounded. Lawyers and protesters and advocates descended on airports everywhere across this country to tell the administration that there is no mandate, no public will for this path that is so destructive to our values. They came out to say: Mr. President, when you tear down women in America, we stand with the women of America. Mr. President, when you tear down the disabled, we stand with the disabled of America. Mr. President, when you tear down African Americans and Hispanics, we stand with African Americans and Hispanics. And, Mr. President, when you tear down Muslims, we stand with our Muslim brothers and sisters because this is the United States of America, where we value religious freedom, where we value religious tolerance. This is a nation of immigrants. If you are not 100 percent Native American, then you are either an immigrant yourself or you are the child or the grandchild or the great-grandchild of an immigrant. Most of us can track members of our family who came from the ravages of war or the ravages of drought or the ravages of oppression to come here to this soil, this land of freedom. James Madison remarked: "America was indebted to immigration for her settlement and for her prosperity." This remains just as true today as it was in Madison's day.

Here we stand, but the President of the United States has denied access to our Nation to a group of people based on nothing more than religious beliefs, betraying our values of religious tolerance and shutting the doors on refugees. The President has said this is not a ban on those of the Muslim faith, but of course it is a ban on those of Muslim faith because it is a ban on seven nations that are Muslim nations, with an exception made for individuals who are Christians so it is nothing more than a ban on Muslims.

The President says this is about protecting our citizens, but let us be very clear about that. Numerous refugees have come to our land, numerous immigrants, and there have been zero fatal terror attacks carried out by the immigrants from the seven countries listed in the order. Zero. We have been attacked by individuals from other countries which are not listed in the order, from Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Egypt, and Lebanon. Those nations aren't listed on this order. What we do know is that this ban does not make our Nation safer. National security experts recognize that it does

exactly the opposite. By signing this Executive order, the President has betrayed our most fundamental values and principles, antagonizing 1.6 billion citizens of the world, and given our enemies ammunition for their false narrative that America is at war with Islam because that is exactly what they have used to recruit. That is exactly what they have used to increase and pour fuel on the fire to persuade people to attack Americans. The President has basically handed them this argument—this false narrative—and put our Nation at risk.

Former CIA Director Gen. Michael Hayden said to National Public Radio this morning, "In fact, what we're doing now has probably made us less safe today than we were Friday morning before this happened, because we are now living the worst jihadist narrative possible, that there is undying enmity between Islam and the West."

I share the value of Daniel Benjamin, the former Coordinator for Counterterrorism at the State Department, who said this: "It sends an unmistakable message to the American Muslim community that they are facing discrimination and isolation," and that message, he said, will "feed the jihadist narrative that the United States is at war with Islam, potentially encouraging a few more Muslims to plot violence."

This is the wrong move in every possible way. It is ill-considered, it is hasty, it is dangerous, it is wrong-headed, it puts American citizens at risk, and it helps our enemies. Benjamin Franklin once said: "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety." In this case, President Trump's Executive order has degraded both our liberty and our security—both our liberty and our safety.

We have turned our backs on friends and allies who are helping us in the war against ISIS. The President has made it clear that he wants to take on ISIS as we had been, but he wants to amplify it, and he has sabotaged that effort with this Executive order.

There are individuals like Hameed Khalid Darweesh, who worked for more than a decade for the United States as an interpreter in Iraq. Our interpreters place their lives at risk to assist our soldiers. They place the lives of their families at risk to assist the United States of America. This man risked his life for more than 10 years for us, and how is he greeted when he arrives here in our country? He is greeted with handcuffs. Muslim Iraqi interpreters like Mr. Darweesh have earned the right to come to America. They risked their lives and their family's lives. They assisted us in multitudinous ways.

What about this ban on refugees? Refugees are the most thoroughly vetted of all those who come to the United States. If a terrorist wants to come to the United States, a terrorist wouldn't

attempt to come as a refugee. It would be 1 to 2 years of waiting in miserable conditions in a refugee camp, with all kinds of vetting, and they might never get permission to come. If you want intense vetting, then look to how we vet refugees. Blocking women and children and interpreters from coming to our country who have been the most thoroughly vetted of all potential immigrants is simply wrong. In fact, the model for vetting refugees is intense. Women and orphans are just searching for a safe haven, but we have turned our back and we have slammed the door.

America is better than this. For centuries we have been a beacon of hope to the world. We have been a beacon of justice, a beacon of compassion, and we must restore our Nation as a beacon of hope, justice, liberty, and compassion.

Millions of Americans are coming out in the snow and the rain and in some places in good weather. They are coming out in any possible conditions to speak out and say: This is not America. This is not us. Change paths. Tear down this ban. Tear down this ban that has slammed the door on refugees. Tear down this ban which has placed our Nation at risk.

Let us together put our Nation back on track. Let us together fight for the values that made America great for the last two centuries. Let us together fight for the richness of our culture and our community, the strength of our society that comes from being a nation of immigrants. We need to act and act urgently.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, Mr. Trump's poorly drawn and implemented Executive order blocking refugees from the United States sacrifices fundamental American values and does not make us safer.

For the first time in memory, the order imposes a ban on all refugees entering our country, many of whom are fleeing war or who risk persecution for their religious or political beliefs. The order affects many thousands of children, women, and men whom our government has vetted for years and cleared for rescue.

President Trump's action—taken in the first days of his new administration, for political reasons, without regard for real world consequences and without the expertise of our national security professionals or even some of those appointed by the President himself—represents a rare, but shameful, departure from a constitutional heritage that has made America strong and a beacon to oppressed people throughout the world.

For generations, immigrants and refugees have come to our country to flee religious persecution and to seek a better life. Indeed, these are the very people who founded our original colonies. Although, as now, we have occasionally failed to live up to our ideals, over generations the United States has accepted millions of refugees from around the world.

My own family is part of this story, as so many people's families in this Chamber are. My mom was born in Poland in 1938 while Nazi tanks massed at the border. She and her parents miraculously survived the Holocaust—one of the worst human events in history.

After the war, after arriving in Sweden and then Mexico City, they were able to come to New York City in 1950. They wanted to come to the United States because it was the only country in the world where they believed they could rebuild their shattered lives. And they did.

This weekend, my mom joined hundreds of thousands of Americans to call on the President to change course, knowing that our family's struggles in Europe require us to recognize the danger and persecution facing families throughout the Middle East today.

Out of a population of 22 million, almost 5 million Syrians have fled to neighboring countries—some to Europe—and have registered as refugees. More than half of those displaced are children.

According to the United Nations, more than half of the remaining Syrian population—6 million of them children—require assistance such as food, water, and health care. Nearly one in four people in Lebanon today—tonight—is a Syrian refugee, and the fourth largest city in Jordan is now a refugee camp.

In the wake of President Trump's refugee ban, it seems useful to ask—and I am sure the American people are asking—why are so many millions of people fleeing their homes, their countries, and their history?

They are doing it to save their lives—and, in many cases, their children's lives—from ISIS's medieval barbarism and Assad's unrelenting brutality. They seek to escape the murder, rape, detention, and torture they suffer because of their religion or their ethnicity or both.

Assad is their enemy. ISIS is their enemy. Today's refugees are fleeing the violence and extremism that threatens our own national security. Their enemies are our enemies. The same is true of the refugees from Afghanistan, Libya, Somalia, and Sudan.

Does this mean we have an obligation simply to open our borders to them? Of course not. We have a national security imperative to ensure that no terrorist tries to sneak into the United States as part of the refugee program.

I have long said that the burden of proof is not on the United States to accept a refugee. Rather, the refugee has the burden to demonstrate that they

are not a threat to the United States. We have no obligation, nor should we, to take anything on faith. It is for this reason that refugees are more thoroughly vetted than anyone else entering the United States. They must pass stringent screening standards to ensure that they pose no threat, a process that can take up to 2 years.

First, the United Nations screens them and collects biometric data. Only those who pass that test are then referred to the United States. And, by the way, no refugee knows at that stage of the process to which country they will be referred—to the United States or to any other country that is accepting refugees. After that, multiple agencies—including the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, the State Department, and our intelligence agencies—conduct rigorous screenings. This process includes repeated biometric checks, several layers of biographical and background screening, health checks, and interviews. Syrian refugees, in particular, receive enhanced scrutiny through an additional security risk review by specially trained officers.

Out of the nearly 60,000 people referred to the United States, only about 12,000 have been accepted. Of those Syrian refugees accepted by the United States, three-quarters are women and children and half were under 13 in 2016.

We are the leader of the free world, a republic founded on the premise of religious freedom and a society that for generations has called out to the tired, the poor, and the huddled masses yearning to be free. That is who we are. Yet, in the name of fighting terrorism in his first week as President, Mr. Trump has sacrificed what has made us exceptional and has banned these children and their mothers from our shores.

These children are no different than Omran Daqneesh, whose distant stare from the back of an ambulance in Aleppo bore witness to the senseless violence he suffered; or Alan Kurdi, whose lifeless body on a Turkish beach condemned the worst savagery of mankind.

Once he learns the details—if he chooses to study them—if President Trump wishes to make our vetting even more extreme than it already is, I guess he may do so. But banning refugees and prioritizing immigration by religion or ethnicity simultaneously abandons our principles and weakens our counterterrorism efforts. It sends the wrong message to our Muslim partners who fight with us in places like Iraq and Afghanistan, including civilians in those countries who have risked their lives alongside our troops. It also hands ISIS a recruiting tool by fueling their narrative that the Western and Muslim worlds cannot coexist in peace.

If the President really wants to secure our borders and ensure extremists stay out of the country, there are far better alternatives, and they are alternatives that are not at war with who

we are as Americans. We should work together to close security gaps in our Visa Waiver Program and partner with European countries to better track the flow of foreign fighters throughout Europe and the Middle East. We should also do more to counter the ability of terrorists to radicalize and recruit, both here at home and abroad. We should do more to equip our agencies with tools and capabilities to degrade the ability of terrorist organizations—in particular, ISIS—to persuade and inspire using social media. Congress should enact ideas passed by the Senate in 2013 to strengthen border security, double the number of border agents, and address visa overstays.

By tackling real vulnerabilities and investing in smart security solutions, we can secure not only our borders but also our values, and we will not repeat the darkest moments of our history when America turned away from those fleeing persecution around the world.

A year ago, I came to the Senate floor to share a note sent to me by my grandparents on my first birthday. It is a message that bears repeating tonight. The year was 1965—15 years after my mother and grandparents came to this country after surviving the horrors of the Holocaust in Poland. This is what they wrote:

The ancient Greeks gave the world the high ideals of democracy, in search of which your dear mother and we came to the hospitable shores of beautiful America in 1950. We have been happy here ever since, beyond our greatest dreams and expectations, with democracy, freedom, and love, and humanity's greatest treasure. We hope that when you grow up, you will help develop in other parts of the world a greater understanding of these American values.

Like so many immigrants, my grandparents knew how special these American values are and how rare they are. We cannot take them for granted or subvert them for a political moment. These values make us who we are.

Edmund Burke once wrote: "In history a great volume is unrolled for our instruction, drawing the materials of future wisdom from the past errors and infirmities of mankind."

This is a time when we can learn from the past errors and infirmities of humankind. We cannot turn our backs on women, children, and families who risk persecution, starvation, or death.

The President should rescind this Executive order. If not, the Senate should end the ban immediately and start a serious conversation on how to make our country safe again in a manner that is consistent with our fundamental values.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow that very eloquent speech by my colleague from Colorado and to be followed on the floor by our colleague from Massachusetts.

We are here today with stories. Every one of us has a story going back one

generation, maybe two or three, maybe five or ten, but we all have an immigrant story. Most of those immigrant stories are about people coming here to seek hope, opportunity, and, yes, safety; to escape violence and persecution; to come here for refuge.

I met one of those refugees over this weekend in West Hartford at a Holocaust remembrance ceremony. Abby Weiner is a Romanian Jew who survived Auschwitz and Buchenwald but lost his parents there. He was honored by Voices of Hope at this Holocaust remembrance ceremony at a synagogue in West Hartford, attended by 500, 700 people. There was a massive outpouring of support for him and for the values that are represented by people who come here as immigrants fleeing persecution and violence, as he did in Nazi Germany. He said: The words came before the bullets and gas chambers. The words of Nazi Germany came before the bullets and gas chambers. Words have consequences. Edicts and orders have consequences.

When I spoke, I told my own story—a proud story of my father, who also came here from Nazi Germany in 1935. He was 17 years old. He spoke virtually no English, he had not much more than the shirt on his back, and he knew almost no one. This great country, the greatest in the history of the world, gave him a chance to succeed. He was a proud American. How sad and ashamed he would be today to see actions by the President of the United States that ban a group coming to this country based on their religion—a ban that is antithetical to our history, our values, our Constitution, and the rule of law.

I salute Sally Yates, who has taken a stand based on moral and legal principle in the highest tradition of the Department of Justice, saying that these orders cannot be defended and that the rule of law and morality is more important than the politics of the moment and the impulsive edicts of a ruler who apparently fails to understand that law—or, at least his administration does.

It raises the question of whether the next Attorney General—she is only acting—will have the strength and courage to uphold the rule of law. Tomorrow, I will vote against our respected and admired colleague, JEFF SESSIONS, because I believe that the next Attorney General must be a champion—a steadfast advocate and protector of the rule of law and rights and liberties that are overridden and abridged by this order banning people from Muslim-majority nations, in effect a ban on a religious group.

We are better than this kind of discriminatory edict. We know it harms mainly children and families fleeing violence and oppression. Refugees like those children have helped to shape and build this Nation. We are stronger because of our diversity. We are a nation of immigrants. Our strength comes from the talents, energies,

strengths, and vibrancy they bring to this country.

Often, when I am feeling down about our public life, I go to immigration and naturalization ceremonies. They occur every Friday in courts around the State of Connecticut. I welcome people who are becoming citizens, and I say to them: Thank you for becoming a citizen of the greatest country in the world. You are a source of strength for us, and you have taken a test that most Americans could not pass.

They laugh because they know it is true. They will never take for granted what it means to be a citizen of this country. I look at them in their diversity, and I know that is America. That is our future.

We will be less safe because of this order, which will alienate allies and deny us sources of intelligence to troops on the ground that we need to win the war against ISIS, and we must win that war. It will provide a recruiting tool to ISIS, convincing young people who may be tempted to join their ranks that, in fact, this country is engaged in a war against Islam, which is utterly and totally untrue. It will discourage people from within the United States who are part of the Muslim community from coming forth when they see threats and could provide information that would forestall an attack by violent extremists within our country.

This order makes us less safe, but it weakens us mainly in a deeper moral sense: It is wrong. It is wrong for this great country, devoted and founded on the ideals of welcoming people seeking that beacon of hope and protection and opportunity.

The Statue of Liberty is a symbol, but the ideals and the values are living. The damage that has been done to them can be repaired. We must repair it and reverse this order. That is why I have sponsored legislation that will rescind it, and why I am proud to join my colleagues today on the floor of the Senate to say: Rip up this order, Mr. President. With all respect, do the right thing. Be on the right side of history and the right side of our Constitution. Rip up this illegal order.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on Friday night, President Donald Trump issued an Executive order that strikes at the very heart of our democracy.

I wish I were exaggerating. I wish this were some sort of game. But the ban that imposes religious tests and keeps refugees and immigrants from entering our country is illegal, it is unconstitutional, it is immoral, and it must be overturned.

The effects of this order were immediate and terrifying for people in Massachusetts and all across this country. My office got a call from an Iranian citizen who was traveling to Massachusetts to see his daughter who is currently receiving treatment for cancer.

He was denied boarding in Germany and sent back to Iran. We heard from a woman who already has an approved immigrant visa but still hasn't found an airline that will allow her to board a flight to the United States. A Massachusetts resident called because her cousin who holds a student visa was not allowed to board a flight either. Another Massachusetts resident called because her Iranian sisters were denied boarding at London Heathrow. Both have their valid J-1 visas. One is a visiting professor at Harvard, and the other is a postdoc fellow at Harvard Medical. We heard from an Iranian student studying at MIT. She was denied entry on Saturday, and when she tried to return on Sunday, after the temporary stay had been issued, she was denied boarding by Lufthansa. A Massachusetts student on a student visa called because his wife was denied boarding in Switzerland.

None of these people are criminals. None of these people are threats. They are students at some of the world's top universities; they are doctors and scientists at some of the country's best hospitals. Most of them have already been vetted and granted the right to come to America. One is a father who wants to see his cancer-stricken daughter. They are husbands and wives, mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, friends and neighbors. They are people. They are real people. They are part of what makes Massachusetts great, and they are part of what makes America great.

Donald Trump's radical ban on Muslims isn't in line with American values or with our Constitution. It is also not in line with what the Republican Party stands for.

In the months following the attacks of September 11, President George W. Bush made a point to remind the United States that we were not at war against Islam. In a speech in April of 2002, he said:

America rejects bigotry. We reject every act of hatred against people of Arab background or Muslim faith. America values and welcomes peaceful people of all faiths—Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, Hindu and many others. Every faith is practiced and protected here, because we are one country. Every immigrant can be fully and equally American because we're one country. Race and color should not divide us, because America is one country.

Do Senate Republicans agree? If so, then come down here and say so. Where are you? Where are Senate Republicans when their Republican President issues an order targeting one religious group?

Let's be clear about what happened here. Keeping the details secret, working with a small group of operatives inside the White House, consulting no experts in diplomacy or homeland security, and getting advice from outsiders with no actual legal authority, President Trump acted unilaterally to issue this order.

Make no mistake, while it may not affect every Muslim in the world, Donald Trump's Executive order is a Muslim ban, and it is unconstitutional.

This is a crisis. The Senate should take up and pass Senator FEINSTEIN's bill to overturn this illegal order right now. What is happening is shocking. It is shocking, but it is not surprising.

Donald Trump is doing exactly what he said he was going to do. During his Presidential campaign, he promised "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States." That is what he said. Last year, it seemed like pretty much everyone agreed that this was not acceptable in the United States of America.

Speaker PAUL RYAN declared:

A religious test for entering our country is not reflective of America's fundamental values. I reject it.

Where are you now, PAUL RYAN? Have you rejected President Trump's order to impose a religious test for entering our country? Have you introduced a bill to overturn it? You have the power. Where are you?

As Governor of Indiana, Vice President MIKE PENCE said: "Calls to ban Muslims from entering the U.S. are offensive and unconstitutional." Where are you right now, Vice President PENCE? Have you called to overturn President Trump's offensive and unconstitutional order? Have you asked Republicans to introduce a bill to overturn it? You have a platform. Where are you?

Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL called a Muslim ban "completely and totally inconsistent with American values." Where are you right now, MITCH MCCONNELL? Have you rejected President Trump's Muslim ban that is completely and totally inconsistent with American values? Have you introduced a bill to overturn it? You have the power. Where are you?

President Trump ignored these Republican leaders. Today these Republican leaders will not stand up for what is right. President Trump may be willing to ignore the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and the Republican leadership in Congress may be willing to ignore the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, but the American people are not.

This weekend, Americans across this country came together to reject this sort of fear and hate. The American people showed courage, even as the Republican leadership hid out. Crowds of people raced to airports across this country to welcome immigrants and refugees and to demand compliance with court rulings that gave individuals and families temporary relief and to demand that this reckless order be rescinded.

I was proud to stand with hundreds of people at Logan Airport in Boston on Saturday night and then with more than 20,000 people in Copley Square on Sunday. We had one of the biggest demonstrations in the country. I also want to say I am in awe of the hundreds of lawyers and translators who dropped everything and spent sleepless nights in airport terminals and courts

fighting for justice. Because of their tireless work, we have already been able to undo some of the damage caused by President Trump.

While I am encouraged by our victories in the courts this weekend, the Trump administration has derided these judges and, in some instances, refused to follow these orders. This is shocking and unconstitutional. Congress must act. We must act now. Congress must stand up and say to President Trump that this is not who we are. Congress must say to Donald Trump and to the world: We will not turn our backs on lawful immigrants and refugees fleeing murderers. We will not turn our backs on people who risk their own lives to protect our soldiers in Iraq and in the fight against ISIS. We will not give ISIS more recruiting material. We will not promote an imagined religious war between America and Islam. We will stand for our values, for American values, for human values. We will not be divided by hate and fear.

Fifteen months ago, I traveled to the Greek island of Lesbos. This is the first stop for many Syrian refugees as they flee from the terrorists of ISIS. That was where I saw the shoddy, paper-thin river rafts that people cram onto, with nothing more than a hope and a prayer that they will make it across a choppy sea. I saw the little plastic pool floaties that people put on small children, hoping it would be enough to save them if the raft went down.

I met a 7-year-old girl who had been sent out on that perilous journey alone. I thought about what horrors her parents must have faced to hand a wad of cash to human smugglers with only the most desperate dream that their little girl would find something better on the other side.

President Trump is trying to shut the door on that little girl and on countless others who are fleeing for their lives. He is trying to shut the door on children, on doctors, on students, on engineers, on husbands and wives, on grandmas and grandpas. That is not all. President Trump is trying to shut the door on people who risked their lives helping American soldiers, people who face execution in the hands of terrorists if they are sent back.

President Trump is even trying to shut the door on legal immigrants, on students and faculty, on people who work in Massachusetts and across this country, on people who have already been thoroughly screened for entry into the United States and have been granted permanent status to live and work in our country. This has nothing to do with security—nothing.

Little girls fleeing from murderers are not a threat. Elderly grandparents detained at airports are not a threat. Students and teachers and people who work in Massachusetts and across the country are not a threat. Iraqi translators who put their own lives at risk to protect American soldiers are not a threat. We should welcome them. We

should welcome them with open arms. That is who we are.

Voices from across the political spectrum, including many of my friends from across the aisle, have already stepped forward to criticize this order, but criticism is not enough. President Trump's Executive order must be overturned. We must overturn it.

For those who remain unconvinced, I would like to take some time this evening to talk about some of the people who are hurt by the President's reckless, heartless, illegal, and unconstitutional actions. As stories have poured into my office, on the evening news, on social media, we have heard time and again about the consequences of President Trump's reckless and illegal order, and I would like to share some of those stories in my time tonight. I want to read one.

My staff and I have spent the weekend listening to and meeting with people who have been affected. I have seen firsthand the devastating effects of President Trump's actions. I want to start with a story of someone I met at Logan Airport on Saturday night. The story I want to read is from CBS Boston, "Detainee Released After Federal Judge Grants Stay On Trump's Immigration Freeze."

Hamed Hosseini Bay was questioned at Logan Airport Saturday while trying to get back into America after caring for his sick father in his native Iran. Hosseini Bay has lived in the Boston area for approximately nine years. After a judge granted a case brought by lawyers from the American Civil Liberties Union Saturday night, Hosseini Bay was reunited with his wife and daughter, who had traveled with him to Iran but returned two weeks earlier.

He was not angry about his questioning. "Everybody was friendly," Hosseini Bay told WBZ-TV's Jim Smith. "They had to do what they had to do. I'm grateful for all the people back there, but it was chaotic."

Hosseini Bay's wife is now questioning what the future will be like for her family in America. "It's just terrifying how my life has changed in two days, in three days," she said. "I don't know (about the future). Last week everything was normal. I would pick up my daughter from preschool, she was like everyone else, I was like everyone else. But now we're different."

I met with this family. This is what President Trump's order means. It means stopping people like this and telling them that their future is different now in America.

I am going to read another story. This one is from NBC Boston. "Protesters Rally as Doctors, Students Blocked From Entering Country After Trump's Orders."

At Boston's Logan International Airport, at least six people from Iran were detained Saturday after their flights landed in the U.S. A Federal judge in New York issued a temporary stay late Saturday for all detainees affected by Trump's executive orders, which barred all refugees from entering the United States for four months, and indefinitely halted any from Syria. Trump argued the ban is needed to keep out "radical Islamic terrorists."

A tweet by Samira Asgari, an Iranian doctor, stated that she was denied boarding when she arrived for her flight to the U.S.

from Germany. In a Skype interview from Switzerland, Asgari told us she had planned to come to the U.S. to start a study at Harvard Medical School analyzing tuberculosis.

"My view of America of course, doesn't change because of a decision a politician makes. My view of America changes because the land that used to be the land of those who want to be there, who want to do something good to the community and take something good from the community—that picture of America has changed for me," she said.

Several students at Massachusetts colleges also tweeted that they were being blocked from entering the country.

In a statement, MIT officials said they're "very troubled" that Trump's executive order is affecting the university's community and are exploring options for helping impacted students.

Northeastern University in a statement to their community offered support to their students, faculty and staff reminding them of "their commitment to each other."

We believe in the commitment to inform each other, but that is what it is that Donald Trump is trying to destroy.

Another story, from WBUR, a "Somali Family Resettling In Lowell Worries For Other Refugees As Trump Promises Restrictions."

The order will have global implications, including for one newly arrived Somali family now living in Lowell.

The three Ahmed sisters from Somalia huddled on a couch with their mother in a lobby of a busy office. Each woman wore a brightly colored head scarf and winter jacket, and each clutched a plastic bag carrying their personal documents.

They are the most recent refugees to be welcomed at the International Institute of New England's Lowell resettlement office. And, with Trump's refugee restrictions hanging in the balance, they are likely the last Somali family to enter the state for some time.

"My mom and dad fled from the conflict in Mogadishu," explained Hawo Ahmed, 24. She and her twin sister were only 4 months old when their parents fled for Kenya.

Hawo retold the story of her mother, Fatuma, and why she and Hawo's father left in 1993 amid the Somali Civil War.

"She said that it was, like, conflict all over the country," Hawo said. "People were killing each other, like tribes, different tribes were killing each other. Whenever they see you, they kill you, and they even used to come in the houses to rape the girls and kill them. So they had to move."

The youngest daughter, Asha, was born in Kenya, where the girls grew up, and went to school and learned English. Still, they all very much consider themselves Somali.

When asked about their father, one of the young women said she watched him die in 2006 from an asthma attack. She said the family didn't have enough money for a new inhaler.

After beginning the refugee application process in Kenya 6 years ago, the family arrived in Manchester, NH, only a few days ago.

Hawo and Muna said their arrival barely felt real, like a dream come true. And then, Hawo said, as soon as they got off the plane, they saw the news about Trump's executive orders on the airport television.

"Even tears were filled up in my eyes, because I felt very bad for others," she said. "They have more expectations, some were even told where they are going, which city they are going, and if they stop all the things, it's going to be very painful. I just have a very sincere request to the President,

that he should drop out that idea. That is all."

Hawo said that they know many fellow refugees in Kenya who are in the final phases of their application process.

She said her aunt and cousin, who live in a refugee camp in Kampala, Uganda, had only one more interview to complete before they were hoping to meet them in Massachusetts. Now they're not sure what will happen.

"I couldn't sleep last night just thinking about them, and she has been in the process for so long, and we want, if you can help her," Hawo said.

That is what Donald Trump is doing to people around the world.

Another story—WCVB TV.

Trump's executive order worries Massachusetts family awaiting loved one.

With the stroke of a pen, President Donald Trump fulfilled a campaign promise that temporarily bans more than 130 million people from entering the United States.

Several people were prevented from entering Boston due to Trump's executive order.

"We are very worried. We are very concerned," Omar Salem, of Canton, said. "I'm hoping for the best. I'm hoping that I could get a text from him saying, 'I'm here.'"

Salem is anxiously awaiting his brother's arrival back in Massachusetts. The Syrian-born, Boston-based orthodontist was on vacation when the President signed the executive order suspending visa entry from seven countries.

"We didn't know it was going to be that bad and that shameful," Salem said.

Salem's brother thought his green card would be enough to secure his return, but the business owner is now facing uncertainty.

"It always starts somewhere and we see it evolving to become much bigger and much more sophisticated," Salem said.

While Salem is hoping to see his brother soon, his heart is heavy for the millions of refugees and visa holders, who see the U.S. as a sanctuary of freedom and acceptance.

"I really call it un-American to do this with the stroke of a pen," Salem said.

The seven countries included in the executive order may be just a starting point as the order left room for a broader ban.

That is what Donald Trump is doing around the world.

Another story—this is a Facebook post from Niki Rhamati, a student at MIT.

I just got back home (Tehran) and I figured I should break the silence. I want to start by saying how grateful I am to all the friends, faculty, alums, sorority sisters, staff and admin at MIT and other parts of the US who have contacted me in the past couple of hours. My inbox is flooded with messages and emails of love and support. I am truly speechless, grateful and proud to be part of the MIT community. I have never been subjected to any form of religious or racial discrimination at MIT. Our community is extremely diverse, inclusive, supportive and accepting of individuals and their backgrounds. But I cannot believe all this love is coming from the same country that banned me from entering its borders just a couple of hours ago.

I don't want to get to the political mess that has created this situation for me and many others. I just want to share what millions of other people and I are going through, and simply what it feels like to be an Iranian and targeted to such racism and discrimination—things I have been very familiar with most of my life.

I currently have a valid multiple entry student visa that I've used for the past year and a half and have traveled very smoothly

(thank you Obama!). I came home (Tehran) to visit my parents and family. I suspected I would not be able to travel as easily as before with the new President, so I extended my stay.

Here's the story of what happened this past week. On Wednesday, I woke up to the announcement of the new Executive Order by President Trump that would restrict entry for Syrian refugees and citizens of seven majority-Muslim countries (Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, Somalia, Syria, Yemen) for 30 days. As BBC Persian, one of the reliable sources here, contacted immigration attorneys and Politicians, this order was read and interpreted as, "issuance of any types of immigrant and non-immigrant visas would be banned for citizens of those countries for 30 days."

The President had not yet signed this order so the ban was not yet effective. I changed my flight to another one that would get me to Boston on Saturday night with a transfer in Qatar. It was rumored that the President signed the Order once I was on my way to the airport, and it was executed while I was in my first flight to Doha. But I looked on the White House website, BBC and Washington Post and nothing had been published yet. When I got to Doha, I was stopped at the gate for my U.S. flight.

We found out that the ban (which is effective for 90 days now instead of 30), included everyone currently holding an immigrant, student or tourist visa as well as Green Card holders. We heard a lot of people were deported at the American border in different cities.

About 30 other Iranians and I were stuck in Doha, waiting for flights back to Tehran. Among them were old couples trying to go and see their children in the US, 2 old women trying to be with and help their pregnant daughters there for their third trimesters, students who had just gotten their visas and families who had sold their belongings back home so they could build a better life in the US. All these people had gotten visas legally and had gone through background checks. The President had said that the goal of this Order was dealing with illegal immigration. Do any of the people sound like illegal immigrants?

This will not secure the borders from the terrorism and illegal immigrants. It will only increase racism in the American society. The President is trying to make Islamophobia a norm and policy by which he wants to lead the country. There has not been a single terrorist activity from those 7 countries listed above, in the US.

If you feel like helping millions of people facing this, please contact your representatives or senators in your areas and ask them to fight against this absurd ban. Reach out to friends and ask them to do the same. Please also let me and everyone else know how we can contribute to this.

As I was stuck in Doha, with other Iranians, I was telling stories of interactions with many of the Americans I know. Please know that I love and respect all of you because you have always treated me with love and respect.

This is who Donald Trump is trying to keep out of the country.

Another story—this time from CNN.

A Syrian teen was headed to MIT and then came the ban.

Mahmoud Hassan was ecstatic when he got the acceptance letter.

All through high school, the 18-year-old had one goal in mind: get an engineering degree from the prestigious Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

But Hassan is from Damascus, Syria. And Friday, he had his hopes crushed through no fault of his own.

When President Trump signed the executive order on immigration, temporarily banning citizens from certain Muslim-majority countries, Syria was one of the seven.

"Now Trump's orders will prevent me from going there," he told CNN. "My dreams are basically ruined."

Hassan had been looking forward to his journey to the Cambridge campus in the fall. He says he had been offered a scholarship.

He's read and reread that letter from MIT dozens of times.

"Dear Mahmoud, On behalf of the Admissions Committee, it is my pleasure to offer you admission to the MIT Class of 2021! You stood out as one of the most talented and promising students in one of the most competitive applicant pools in the history of the Institute."

Hassan doesn't know what he'll do next.

This is who Donald Trump is determined to keep out of America.

Another story. This one is from our office.

A constituent from Concord, MA, came into my office in Boston just this morning—Monday, January 30, 2017. She came looking for more information on the current status of the Muslim ban, on behalf of her husband, who was originally born in Iran.

She explained that when he was young, he received refugee status in Australia for religious persecution, as he was raised in the Baha'i faith. He now has dual citizenship in Iran and Australia and is a green card holder of 10 years here in the United States. He is the vice president of a startup company that requires him to travel outside the country often but has decided that, because of the latest Executive orders, to stay grounded in the United States until further notice. He is currently safe in the United States.

Emam has also decided to begin his U.S. citizenship application, and the couple have two young children whom they are raising in the United States, afraid to travel outside the United States on business because of President Trump's ban.

Another story. This is a story via the Wall Street Journal.

Iraqi interpreter Laith al-Haydar received multiple death threats for working with the American military at the height of the war in his country. In return for helping the U.S., he and tens of thousands of other Iraqis were promised U.S. immigration visas.

Nearly four years after he applied, the 41-year-old father of two is still waiting for a visa—and now he faces a new setback: President Donald Trump signed an order suspending immigration from several countries with a Muslim majority, including Iraq, and a temporary ban on all refugees.

Mr. Haydar is among roughly 58,000 Iraqi applicants for U.S. immigrant visas and refugee resettlement under the federal programs that promised to fast-track entry for Iraqis who worked with the U.S. government and other institutions deemed critical to the U.S.-led effort in Iraq, according to the State Department. A similar program for Afghans who've worked with the U.S. government may also be at risk.

At least one Iraqi and two Afghans who worked with the U.S. government and also qualify for expedited immigration visas were turned away from American ports of entry on Friday and Saturday, a State Department official said, adding that several more were prevented from boarding planes to the U.S.

A substantial backlog of applications remains in part because Congress limits the number of visas that can be granted each year. Frustration with visa delays has now been aggravated by Mr. Trump's executive orders.

Critics of the visa ban say it abandons thousands of valuable allies abroad and risks deterring such people from working with the United States in the future at a time when Mr. Trump is promising a more aggressive military posture abroad.

"These guys laid their lives on the line alongside American soldiers and got paid a fraction of what I made," said Jake Thomas, a U.S. Army veteran who worked with Mr. Haydar in Iraq and who now lives in Georgia. If they want out, we need to honor our promises and get them out. Mr. Thomas is one of several U.S. military officers who have written letters to the State Department appealing for Mr. Haydar to get a visa. He said he sympathizes with some of the views regarding immigration that Mr. Trump campaigned on, but he added that Iraqis like Mr. Haydar "were singled out and shot at for serving the United States and we made a promise." Mr. Thomas said he knew of five Iraqi interpreters who were killed in the 15 months of his last tour in Iraq, including 3 who were gunned down in their homes for working with the U.S. military.

President Trump continues to ignore the damage he is doing to the safety of our country and our servicemen and servicewomen overseas. Brave men and women who risked their lives to help U.S. soldiers in Iraq have already been caught up in the President's unconstitutional order.

I just want to associate myself with the man who said—who had been there, the soldier who had been there—that America made a promise. I believe in an America that keeps its promises. Donald Trump's order breaks our promises.

Another story, this one from Marcolla via PRI:

The Iraqi linguist who worked side by side with US troops in Baghdad put her life on the line for America's war effort.

Now her family is in danger back in Iraq and she fears her efforts to get them to safety in America are all but doomed.

"I'm scared. The chance to see my family reunited again is very slim now," she says. "People like me and my family who helped and supported America, I believe we should be reunited. The history of the United States is to support people and help them, not to separate the families."

Marcolla was just 18 and living in Baghdad shortly after American tanks rolled into the Iraqi capital in 2003. She was recruited to work for the US military. Her role caught the attention of Iraqi militants. They sought revenge. They burned down Marcolla's house, kidnapped her father and murdered her husband.

Fearing for her life, she applied for a US visa. And in 2013, after seven years of waiting, she received the permission she had been waiting for. But Marcolla had to leave her parents and siblings behind, even though she says they too were in danger because of her service with US troops. She says she tries to talk with her family in Baghdad daily. "Every day their lives are in danger," she says. "They have to change their address, move from place to place. They live in the unknown."

Marcolla is worried that the refugee ban proposed Wednesday means her parents and siblings will never reach American soil.

"We already been in extreme vetting," she says. "I understand and I respect the US rules and the safety and national security. . . . I understand that and I respect that. However, there are people in Iraq who have a long history of supporting America in Iraq and Afghanistan—the linguists, the translators—they deserve and they need their papers to be expedited."

These are the people Donald Trump is keeping out of America.

Another story from Mother Jones:

"Immoral," "Stupid," and "Counterproductive": National Security Experts Slam Trump's "Muslim Ban."

"At the moment we need them most, we're telling these people, 'Get screwed.'"

While Trump's executive order claims to be in the interest of "protecting the nation," experts in national security and counterterrorism who spoke with Mother Jones argue that it poses potentially disastrous immediate and long-term security threats to the nation and US personnel overseas.

"Not only is it immoral and stupid, it's also counterproductive," says Patrick Skinner, a former CIA terrorism case officer who now works at Soufan Group, a security consulting firm. "We've got military intelligence and diplomatic personnel on the ground right now in Syria, Libya, and Iraq who are working side by side with the people imbedded in combat and training and advising. At no time in the US's history have we depended more on local—and I mean local—partnerships for counterterrorism. We need people in Al Bab, Syria; we depend on people in certain parts of eastern Mosul, Iraq; in Cert, Libya. At the exact moment we need them most, we're telling those people, 'Get screwed.'"

Kirk W. Johnson, who spent a year on reconstruction in Fallujah in Iraq with the US Agency for International Development (USAID) echoes Skinner's fears: "This will have immediate national security implications, in that we are not going to be able to recruit people to help us right now, and people are not going to step forward to help us in any future wars if this is our stance."

The US-led war on ISIS is but one front of a constellation of fights against extremist groups that could be hampered by Trump's decision. "The US is officially banning people in these countries at the same time we are trying to build up local support to fight ISIS," Skinner said. "It takes a long time to build trust with these people. You have to start over, say, 'Okay, starting now, trust me.' How many times can you get away with that?" It also sends a message that groups like the so-called Islamic State can exploit. Elizabeth Goitein, the codirector of the Brennan Center's Liberty & National Security Program, says, "The message this projects is that America sees Muslims as a threat—not specific actors who are intent on committing terrorist acts. The message that America really is at war with Islam will be ISIS's best friend."

BuzzFeed reporters Mike Giglio and Munzer Al-Awad spoke with five current or former ISIS fighters who cited Trump's divisiveness as a factor that will weaken America. They added that his rhetoric against Muslims will help them reinforce their narrative that America and the West are fighting not just terrorism, but Islam itself. "Trump will shorten the time it takes for us to achieve our goals," said one.

Meanwhile, the very allies who have operated alongside US personnel in war zones for years—contractors and translators like Darweesh—are once again being abandoned. For the past decade, Johnson has been leading an effort to resettle Iraqi allies, many of whom, he says, face torture, kidnapping, and

death after collaborating with American soldiers. It all started in 2006 when he heard from an Iraqi USAID colleague who had been identified by a militia. The militia left a severed pig's head on his door step, along with a message saying that it would be his head next. Despite his years of helping the United States, the US government offered no help, and he had to flee the country with his wife.

"We are not going to be able to recruit people to help us right now, and people are not going to step forward to help us in any future wars if this is our stance."

This is what Donald Trump's Executive order is doing. It is putting Americans at risk around the world.

Another story from Newsweek: "Spy Veterans Say Trump's Muslim-Country Visa Ban Will Hurt Recruitment."

President Donald Trump's temporary ban on immigrants from seven Muslim-majority nations takes a major recruiting tool out of the hands of US spy handlers, say a growing number of intelligence veterans.

For decades, CIA and US military spy recruiters have held out the promise of eventual resettlement in America to induce foreigners to turn coat and work secretly for the United States against terrorist groups or repressive governments. In reality, many were caught before they ever made it, but during the Cold War countless Eastern Europeans living under communist rule, and more recently, Muslims across the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia, have worked secretly for US spy agencies on the promise that they or their children would eventually be extracted. Another effective recruiting tool for US operatives has been to offer their agents' families medical care or education in the United States.

Those inducements, a primary recruiting tool in Muslim land, were effectively suspended with Trump's executive order Friday to temporarily ban immigration from seven critical targets of the U.S. spy agencies—Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Libya and Somalia. The departments of State and Homeland Security, the order stipulates, may allow entry from those countries on "a case-by-case basis," but it's a balky arrangement not likely to appeal to the managers of the CIA's highly secretive operations directorate, its espionage and covert action arm.

Intelligence veterans with vast counterterrorism experience are expressing dismay about how the order will affect their spy operations.

"These individuals often put themselves at the risk of death for working with the U.S., and without the ability to offer them safety, we will be reducing the likelihood that those in countries targeted by the ban will work with us in the future," Phillip Lohaus, a decorated veteran of the U.S. Special Operations Command and CIA, tells Newsweek.

"We relied heavily on local translators, many of whom have gone on to forge productive lives for themselves here in the States," Lohaus added. "Why would they take such a risk if they knew that they would face retribution or death by staying in their home countries?"

"Absolutely," agreed Cindy Storer, a former member of the CIA intelligence team that tracked al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden. "It hurts," she said in a brief interview. "Capital h-u-r-t-s." Imagine, she said, if the ban had been in place when Jamal al Fadi, a Sudanese Muslim and key al-Qaeda operative, showed up at the American embassy in the mid-1990s and volunteered to defect to the United States. FBI counterterrorism agents brought him into the U.S., where he provided "a major breakthrough of intel-

ligence on the creation, character, direction, and intentions of al-Qaeda," according to the official 9/11 Commission report.

And that is what Donald Trump is putting an end to.

Another story from the Washington Post: "Dissent memo circulating in the State Department over Trump's policy on refugees and immigrants."

For this one, Foreign Service officers have written a memo—and they shared it with the Washington Post—in opposition to President Trump's Executive order. Here are excerpts from a leaked dissent memo by U.S. Foreign Service officers regarding the Executive orders:

It will immediately sour relations with these seven countries, as well as much of the Muslim world, which sees the ban as religiously motivated. These governments of these countries are important allies and partners in the fight against terrorism, regionally and globally. By alienating them, we lose access to the intelligence and resources we need to fight the root causes of terror abroad before the attack occurs within our borders. It will increase anti-American sentiment. It will have an immediate and clear humanitarian impact. It will have a negative impact on the U.S. economy.

Looking beyond its effectiveness, this ban stands in opposition to the core American and constitutional values. This ban stands in opposition to the core American and constitutional values that we, as Federal employees, took an oath to uphold.

The United States is a nation of immigrants, starting from its very origins. The concept that immigrants and foreigners are welcome is an essential element of our society, our government, and our foreign policy. So, too, is the concept that we are all equal under the law and that we, as a nation, abhor discrimination, whether it is based on race, religion, sex, or national origin. Combined together, that means we have a special obligation to maintain an immigration system that is as free as possible from discrimination, that does not have implied or actual religious tests, and that views individuals as individuals, not as part of stereotyped groups.

Banning travelers from these seven countries calls back to some of the worst times in our history. Laws enacted in the 1920s and which lasted through the 1960s severely restricted immigration based on national origin and, in some cases, race. The decision to restrict the freedom of Japanese Americans in the United States and foreign citizens who wanted to travel to settle in the United States during the 1940s has been a source of lasting shame for many in our country. Decades from now, we will look back and realize we made the same mistakes as our predecessors: shutting borders in a knee-jerk reaction instead of setting up systems of checks that protect our interests and our values.

We do not need to place a blanket ban that keeps 220 million people—

men, women, and children—from entering the United States to protect our homeland. We do not need to alienate entire societies to stay safe. And we do not need to sacrifice our reputation as a nation which is open and welcoming to protect our families. It is well within our reach to create a visa process which is more secure, which reflects American values, and which would make the Department proud.

Again, this is a dissent memo circulating in the State Department over President Trump's policy on refugees and immigrants.

And this is what Donald Trump's Executive order does; it makes us less safe. It is wrong.

Another story, from a Boston Globe op-ed, Matt Gallagher, who is a veteran. The headline: "Trump rejects the Muslims who helped us."

The bravest person I've ever known went by the nickname Suge Knight. He was as physically imposing as the infamous music producer, but he was calm and bighearted, with a smile as wide as a canyon. A Sudanese Muslim, Suge served as my scout platoon's interpreter during our deployment to Iraq in 2007 and 2008, and he went on every patrol and mission with us, no matter the circumstances. He'd survived multiple roadside bomb attacks, had lost three young children to the bombings of the first Gulf war, and yet still believed in America and what America represented to him and his family.

Though he doubted he'd ever get to our country, he aspired for his children to do so. "Perhaps my grandchildren will go to school with your kids," he once told me with typical paternal charm. "I'd like that very much." I felt the same. We all did. He was one of us.

President Trump's recent executive order on Muslim refugees and immigrants works to ensure that such a dream never comes true. Muslim allies, including interpreters like Suge in Iraq and Afghanistan, have done more for the United States during the past 16 years of war than most Americans will even think of doing their entire lives. Yet we're abandoning them in their hour of need, wrapping ourselves up in a big, billowing flag of fear and pretending it's for safety. We're also abandoning Middle Eastern refugees fleeing the very terrorists we've professed to combat, who have seen their homes and lives destroyed and now seek shelter on our shores the same way immigrants have for generations.

This is a national disgrace. The president's executive order betrays American values and weakens our national security all at once. Our country was founded as a haven. Trump and his administration seem intent on turning it into a medieval fortress.

In November, shortly after the election, I joined a nonpartisan group in Washington, D.C., to advocate for Muslim refugees and immigrants—Veterans For American Ideals, a project of Human Rights First. There was a gray pall over the city, and a deep sense of uncertainty for what awaited, even in Republican offices. No one knew then what we all know now: Trump really did mean to do what he'd said on the campaign trail.

Time and time again, Democrats and Republicans alike told us the United States already has in place the best and most thorough refugee and immigrant screening process on the planet. A prominent Republican adviser assured us that Trump's "extreme vetting" idea was just a ploy to rustle up votes. A national security official suggested that we should be more thankful Congress

had saved the Special Immigrant Visa program for interpreters and translators who served with the US military, and maintained that the amount of issued visas was sufficient, despite the overflowing backlog of requests.

A shouting match ensued. Enraged veterans can have our own sort of diplomatic style.

I look back at that week with both pride and despondency. On one hand, to see so many young American veterans standing up for the principles of our nation—often the very same principles that led them to enlist in the military to begin with—was stirring. We tried, sometimes successfully and sometimes not, to convey to politicians the importance of remaining true to our Muslim brothers- and sisters-in-arms. We also tried to remind them of the secondary and tertiary effects of not honoring the bonds forged in combat. On the other hand, bearing witness to how easily dismissed entire lives and formative experiences can be by fellow citizens (let alone elected representatives) was rather dismaying.

Even in our era of yellow-ribbon patriotism and star-spangled grandiosity, veterans' stories of heroic Muslim translators and brave, dedicated local Iraqis and Afghans were, sometimes, met with hollow stares and empty platitudes in Washington. What we were telling these officials defied their preconceived notions about vets, and Muslims, and how vets of the terror wars were supposed to feel about Muslims. What we were telling them was that American security was dependent on opening our doors to as many vetted refugees and immigrants as possible, not barricading ourselves and saying, "We're not that America anymore." What we were telling them was that we knew, more than any other group of Americans, what the hearts and souls of the Middle Eastern people were, and that those hearts and souls were so very much like our own.

These are just some of the stories of what Donald Trump is doing to people here in America, to Americans abroad, and people around the world.

This Executive order is illegal. It is unconstitutional. It is immoral, and it must be overturned by Congress.

I understand that under the rules, a majority can stop any Senator after speaking for an hour postcloture, but there is a bit more I would like to say.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I will continue with the story that was published this morning in the Boston Globe. This is from a veteran who was writing of his own experiences.

He says:

Trump's executive order, which seeks to "keep radical Islamic terrorists out of the United States," will only embolden those very same people, who already had a near-zero chance of gaining entry to our country to begin with. This order proves too many ISIS and al-Qaeda talking points true about what the United States really is, and will serve as an excellent recruiting tool for those organizations and others.

This executive order isn't about national security. It's about fear-mongering for ends we can only guess at.

This shouldn't be a partisan issue. As my friend Phil Klay, winner of the National

Book Award and a Marine veteran, pointed out last year, Ronald Reagan's "city on a hill" speech outlined an America "For all the pilgrims from all the lost places who are hurtling through the darkness toward home."

"I get that people are scared," Klay continued. "But it's only during frightening times when you get to find out if your country really deserves to call itself the 'home of the brave.'"

Donald Trump's zero-sum worldview and flimsy understanding of the intricacies of modern war and terrorism threaten to undermine our republic. His policy on Middle Eastern refugees and immigrants must be checked and resisted by citizens of all political stripes, legislators of both major parties and the judicial courts.

After 16 years of war, much of my generation of military veterans stands with the Middle Eastern people we sweated, labored and bled with, and sometimes died for. It's going to be a fight, but it's one we're not going to lose. The legacy of America's past is at stake, as well as the soul of its future.

Matt Gallagher is the author of the novel "Youngblood" and the memoir "Kaboom: Embracing the Suck in a Savage Little War." He is an Iraq war veteran and a former US Army captain.

And he wrote this morning in the Boston Globe.

We are here tonight because this country is in crisis. We are here tonight because it is a constitutional crisis, because it is a moral crisis. We are here tonight to stand up and ask the rest of the U.S. Senate to overturn Donald Trump's Executive order. We have that power. All we need is the courage, the courage to stand up and do what is right. This is why we came to the U.S. Senate, to stand up and do what is right.

I call on the rest of the Senate to overturn Donald Trump's illegal, unconstitutional, and immoral Executive order.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise in gratitude for the opportunity to speak on the Senate floor. I want to express a lot of gratitude toward the Senator from Massachusetts. She has been an advocate for the truth of our country. She has spoken here on this hallowed floor. I have now watched her speak in the streets, at airports, at rallies. She is one of those people—like so many Americans, literally millions of Americans over the course of these last few weeks—who is saying with the force of conviction that they will not be silent when the cause of our country is at stake.

I join with her tonight, along with some of my other colleagues, to stand up and really speak from the heart. I think this floor has seen many partisan speeches, but this is not going to be about Republican or Democrat. This is not a speech I ever imagined I would be giving in the U.S. Senate. I never thought I would be here today talking about something that quite honestly was unimaginable to me just months ago.

This is a time I could not have foreseen, and I fear my generation of

Americans maybe, perhaps, should have known that moments like this are possible; that we who believe in the values of our Nation, we who believe in the ideals enshrined in our Constitution, such as religious liberty, we should know that every generation of Americans has to prove worthy of these ideals and stay forever vigilant in their protection and never get so complacent as to think that this could never happen. The ideals we enjoy were fought for and struggled for and often bled for and died for. We of our generation who have the privileges we enjoy, the blessings of liberty that we luxuriate in, we have the obligation to stay the course to ensure that these moments never come, and when they do, that we stand with conviction to speak out against them, work against them to resist any retrenchment of American values.

What Donald Trump did in this Executive action issued this past Friday is, in no uncertain terms, a break with American policy. I believe it is a violation of our very Constitution, that it is illegal, unconstitutional, as well as immoral. More than this, it very specifically makes this Nation less safe and not more so. I want to repeat that. It makes this Nation less safe and not more so.

The ban was put forth in a climate of fear, intending to try to appeal to people's fears, trying to tell people that doing this Executive order was going to make us safer, but in its essence it is illogical when you look at the facts. Not only should it be known that it blocks immigration from seven majority Muslim countries—seven countries. Not a single perpetrator of terrorist attacks on American soil has come from these countries, dating back to well before 9/11. In fact, well before 2000, well before the nineties, well before the eighties and, in fact, not since the seventies, in over 40 years, no American has been killed on American soil by any of these countries in terrorist attacks.

In addition to that, what this ban is doing is it is shutting down the Refugee Resettlement Program for about 4 months and suspends the Syrian refugee program indefinitely, despite the fact that individuals entering the United States as refugees undergo the most heavily vetted resettlement process of anybody traveling into the United States.

So understand this. If you are trying to come into this country through student visas, Visa Waiver Programs, there are so many ways to come into this country without going through the refugee process, which takes between 1 year and 3 years, and you are not just going through the vetting of the Department of State but also the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, the National Counterterrorism Center, numerous agencies for over up to 3 years are vetting you. Let me tell you right now, again, people who go through this

program, history is showing, you have not seen in any recent years that folks going through these programs pose a terrorist threat or are taking American lives. So the very argument being used to push this ban is illogical and has no basis for any of the experiences we have had in this country.

A former chief counsel for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration services remarked that no competent terrorist would choose the U.S. refugee process as a preferred strategy for gaining entry into this country. Subjecting yourself to the 1 to 3 years of vetting from multiple agencies, more than any other way to enter, is not a way for terrorists to try to gain access to this country at all.

What we see is that this terrorist ban is putting focus—excuse me, this Executive order is putting focus in areas that do not produce safety but do have the collateral consequence of making us less safe.

The order indefinitely suspends the resettlement of Syrian refugees in the United States. The majority of these folks are women and children who are fleeing barrel bombs, chemical attacks, military attacks on homes and schools. They are fleeing famine, they are fleeing starvation, they are fleeing the same violent extremism that we ourselves are trying to fight against. While the Syrian people face violence, terror, and oppression, the President has chosen to equate helpless refugees with those who are actually perpetrating the terror. Despite the fact that we have this stringent years-long vetting program for Iraqis and Afghans who risked their lives to help Americans by acting as interpreters, the ban ends—astonishingly, it ends a Special Immigrant Visa Program and substitutes it with nothing.

What is this Special Immigrant Visa Program that many of my colleagues have spoken about? It is a program that is specifically there for Iraqis and Afghans who helped America and put their families in danger, who put their necks out for us. They put themselves out there to assist our servicemen and servicewomen. It actually is there to help people who, because of their service to us and our country, now have their lives endangered where they are.

I want to read a series of tweets just yesterday from Kirk Johnson, a former USAID Administrator in Iraq who wrote about these folks who put themselves on the line for Americans who are our allies and our friends. This is what Kirk Johnson wrote:

I served in Iraq as USAID's man in Fallujah. Lived alongside Marines and interpreters as they fought terrorists.

Over 100,000 of these Iraqis risked their lives for us during the war. They bled for our country.

You said, before signing—

He is talking about President Trump—

“We only want to admit those into our country who will support our country, and love deeply our people.”

And what Kirk Johnson wrote follows:

I'd like you to know [Donald Trump] about some of these people.

“Homeboy” lost his leg dragging a wounded U.S. SSgt from MN out of the field of fire. He spent 4 years being vetted before coming here.

Hossam helped us build schools. When insurgents found out, in Oct '06, they left a severed dog head on his front step that said “run.”

Faisal, an interpreter for the troops you command [Donald Trump], died of a suicide bomb on 3/14/2008.

Mohammed was assassinated when terrorists, who wanted to kill the “traitor” booby-trapped his house in Jan 2008.

Ali had both his legs amputated by an IED blast while working as an interpreter in Nov 2007.

Hameed died of a gunshot wound to the head while helping our troops in July 2007.

I could do this all day, sadly.

He wrote in his remarks. He goes on to say:

Those that helped us were Christians, Muslims, Yazidis, atheists, you name it.

These people in Fallujah and the surrounding areas were our allies.

When they ran through gunfire to save our troops, they didn't think about such labels.

These Iraqis believed in America. They loved our country. They lost their country as a result of the choice they made to help us.

Your signature [Donald Trump] just banned them.

He continues:

I have heard from many, many soldiers and Marines (some of extremely high rank) who believe this is a huge mistake.

One senior military officer with extensive experience in Iraq and Afghanistan told me it was “heinous and counterproductive.”

Now why is it counterproductive? Well, for one, when we are conducting dangerous missions, when we are relying on people in country to assist us with our counterterrorism efforts, if they are going to take that risk, put their lives on the line, be subjected to terrorism themselves, there should be a process that allows them, after proper vetting, to get into this country. That has been American policy. Even people who have been threatened, victimized, and persecuted can't just walk into our country because some of our high-ranking Marines say so. They still go through vetting that often takes years. That is the process. It is a process that Donald Trump has now stopped.

Yesterday a report noted that radical jihadists—the people we are fighting against, the terrorists intending to kill us—were already using this Executive order as a victory, proof that the United States is at war with Islam. Now some people say that claim is hard to make. This is just banning people from seven countries. Well, look a little closer at the Executive order. There are exceptions made for non-Muslims in those countries.

Imagine this. We are the United States of America. Enshrined in our Constitution is this idea of freedom of religion; that there is no religious test to vote, there is no religious test to have citizenship, there is no religious

test to enjoy the richness of a nation that believes in religious liberty. But in one action by the President of the United States, who claims to be concerned about terrorism from these countries, he says: I am going to stop people from entering. Oh, wait a minute, only Muslims. Christians are welcome. If that is not a violation of core principles of freedom of religion that there should be religious tests to enter from these countries—that is an assault on all we proclaim in our country to be our core values.

This is not missed by our enemies. They are now trying to say this isn't a war between America and ISIS. This isn't a war between America and radical jihadists. They want, as a propaganda tool, for people to believe that this is a war between the United States and Islam, between America and a religion. That is a lie. But when Donald Trump takes actions like this that specifically target people because of their faith, he is playing into the hands of the propagandists who seek to hurt us.

National security experts from across the political spectrum, from Republicans and Democrats, have spoken out against this order on this basis and on how it will affect our security as a country.

The former Director of the CIA, Gen. Michael Hayden, said of this order that it “inarguably has made us less safe.”

Those people who want to help us, who want to serve with our marines, who want to be interpreters, who want to stand up for America, what are they to think now when America has shut its doors, when they have watched others do this, and now they can't gain access to this country? What about those allies of ours who say that the great United States of America is standing up against terrorism and Muslim leaders in other countries? But it is not about Islam; it is about the people who are conducting vicious terrorism, which is a sin on a peaceful religion. What can our allies say now, when we have specifically targeted an Executive order from our President not at a country but at a people who pray a certain way in that country?

What are we to think in the United States? This great Nation born from the ideas of liberty and freedom—freedom to pray as we want—what are we to think?

Despite all of the evidence to the contrary, just 2 days after President Trump instituted this ban, he remarked: Hey, this ban is going “nicely.” Earlier today, President Trump's spokesman referred to those being unlawfully detained as just being “temporarily inconvenienced.”

We know that the reality of the situation is much different for the families and individuals across the globe who are affected. Many of them are permanent residents and green card holders for whom this Executive order has amounted to a door slammed in their face by the country that is supposed to represent the shining beacon on the planet Earth of liberty and hope.

Hundreds of people of seven different nationalities have been trapped at American airports. Many of them were detained for hours on end without access to lawyers; they were handcuffed and interrogated; some were immediately deported, while many more have been turned away at the doors to their flights bound for the United States. These are people who followed all of the rules, who went through extensive vetting, who upended their lives—doors slammed in their faces.

I am sorry, but this is not an inconvenience. This is a denial of process, a denial of procedure; it is a denial of basic liberty and a violation of our principles.

It is no wonder, though, that judges across the country began issuing stays within hours of this order becoming effective. As we saw in New York, how people like Hamidiyah Al Saeedi, the 65-year-old mother of a sergeant—65-year-old mother of a sergeant in the 82nd Airborne Division of the U.S. Army, who traveled from Iraq to see her son for the first time in 5 years. A mother of a sergeant in the 82nd Airborne—someone who should be honored—lawfully entered the United States, and because of this order, she was detained for 30 hours, denied a wheelchair, and handcuffed, before her release.

On Saturday night and early into the morning, I saw Customs and Border Patrol officials at Dulles. I left Washington, DC, and drove to Virginia to go to Dulles Airport. I saw Customs and Border Patrol officials seemingly defy the orders coming from a Federal judge to at least permit all legal permanent residents in detention access to legal counsel. I held the judge's order in my hands. Because of the kindness of a local law enforcement officer who was stationed in Dulles, I was able to shuttle to Customs and Border Patrol, and I was then able to submit handwritten notes and questions to the officials who refused to meet with me. I did not get much of an explanation as to why they were defying a clear order from a Federal judge. Whether or not this was a case of bureaucratic confusion or a message from the courts getting lost, Federal law enforcement officers, under the supervision of the Department of Homeland Security, ignored and defied the orders of a Federal judge.

To me, this is more reason for outrage. In a Nation with three branches of government, the judiciary with a clear role giving an order to the executive branch, I believe the defiance of that order also was unconstitutional.

Access to counsel is a principle in our democracy. It is about fairness and due process. Failing to allow access to counsel, to me, seems a clear violation of constitutional norms and ideals. The judge obviously believes so, and that is why he ordered counsel to be provided.

Still, right now, we don't know how many people are being detained across the country in the wake of this Execu-

tive order or how many were immediately and quietly deported once they came here again, thoroughly vetted, in accordance with the law, but they were still deported upon their arrival in this country. I think Congress deserves answers. I wrote to Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly earlier this evening to seek them.

This mistreatment of any legal permanent resident or visitors to this country is wrong. It is un-American. It undermines the truth of who we are. It is patently unacceptable.

This Executive order has treated green card holders and immigrants in this Nation as if they were criminals. It has torn families apart across the world and pulled the rug out from families who were preparing to begin a new life in the United States of America. And this order has betrayed some of our closest allies—men and women who risked their lives to help American servicemembers deployed often on hostile soil. Ending the special immigrant visa programs established to help Iraqis and Afghans who risked their lives to help American forces is unacceptable. The United States cannot turn its back on those who stepped up and stepped in when we needed them most.

Just this morning, I read about an Iraqi man, Sami, who had risked his life to work with the American Government in Iraq. After waiting 7 years to gain entry, going through a laborious process of vetting under the special immigrant visa program, he and his family finally got the OK, and they were ready to start their new lives in America. On Saturday, he and his wife and two daughters had flown from Iraq to Istanbul, and they were sitting in their seats ready to take off when they were removed from the plane by security officials. Foreign Policy magazine reported that, through tears, Sami's 7-year-old daughter asked, "Why don't they want us in America?"

American servicemembers and veterans are joining a growing core, speaking out against this misguided decision which threatens the common-sense program that helps our military do their jobs.

Take Zachary Iscol, a former Marine infantry officer who wrote about some of the Iraqis he worked with who had risked everything to help the United States. He told the story of one man, Frank, who had served as an interpreter for his Marine Corps unit and, in doing so, had taken a bullet in his leg. Frank had remained in Iraq since then. Zachary wrote:

He was still living in Baghdad with daily fears for his and his family's safety. After six years of vetting, including what seemed like countless interviews and background checks by various government agencies, he had finally been cleared to come to the United States with his pregnant wife and 18-month-old son.

Zachary went on to write:

My wife and I began to prepare our guest room for their arrival. But now, because of a

new executive order by President Trump, Frank is no longer welcome.

This is an American military man, preparing to have these folks who put their lives on the line for him, stay in his home.

This special visa program is why people like Mohammed and Saif Alnasseri, whom I am proud to call Jersey residents—two of my constituents—were able to come to this country. I would like to share a little bit about this family.

Mohammed Alnasseri was finishing high school in Iraq in 2003 when the Americans arrived. As an English speaker, Mohammed began helping the Americans stationed near his neighborhood, working for free as their neighborhood translator. When the unit he had become friends with left, he decided to apply for work as an official interpreter with the U.S. Army. By 2004, he had been sent to Fallujah to work with and help protect American military fighting there. Because of his work with the American military, he recounts receiving hundreds of death notes, threatening not just his life but the life of his mother and his family.

He returned to Baghdad where he worked, despite these threats, as a contractor with an American company until one day he was targeted and almost assassinated in his car. He knew at that point, with the death threats and the assassination attempt, that he had to get out of the country.

After moving to Australia, his sister informed him about America's special visa program, so he applied, and 2½ years later he was able to join his family in the United States.

In a call with my office just earlier today, he wanted to make it clear that he arrived in the United States on July 3, and by August 10, he had started his job. He remarked to my team that he couldn't understand why anyone would think he was coming to America because it was easy or because he wanted something. He spent most of his savings trying to get to America, and he had never taken any benefit since arriving here.

Mohammed met his wife in New Jersey and now lives in our State, works at Costco, and is working to obtain his citizenship. He shared that this Executive order made him more sad than scared and that it simply didn't make sense to ban regular, hard-working people who are also afraid of terrorists, persecuted by terrorists, almost killed by terrorists, and who had done so much to help our country. It made no sense to them.

This is what he said: "We ran away from these people. I paid all the money I had to leave." He did that for the safety of his family.

Mohammed's brother is now a proud American citizen, father of two, and resident of Scotch Plains, NJ. Saif and his wife had worked as pharmacists in Iraq, but when the war began, he knew he needed to get involved. So Saif worked as a translator and reporter for

the Los Angeles Times during the war in Iraq, providing support and key insights to the American media and the American public. They were able to come to the United States in 2008 through that special visa program—the SIV program—and slowly worked their way through school. Now, as pharmacy technicians, they have their pharmacy licenses.

Saif is a pharmacy manager in Cranford, NJ, a homeowner in Scotch Plains, and a proud father of two girls. He savors this country, this precious Nation. He celebrates our values. He is a glowing testimony to the truth of who we are. His success is our success. His family's security and safety and thriving lives in New Jersey give luster to the greatness of America.

In a phone call yesterday, Saif remarked that this Executive order was embarrassing and hurtful, that it was clear Muslims were being targeted, and that he couldn't understand why those who were so heavily vetted like his family posed such a threat.

Saif and his family are heavily involved in their community in Scotch Plains, and they make sure to offer support to families similar to theirs who come from Iraq seeking refuge. They are not just basking and luxuriating in their good fortune to become American citizens; they are honoring one of the great hallowed traditions of our country, which is service.

At the end of the call, Saif remarked that “[he] didn't think this would happen in any other country.” It seemed like he was about to say this kind of religiously targeted ban wouldn't happen anywhere else, and he might have been right. But instead, he said that “if this kind of executive order from a leader in any other country happened against any group of people, you would never see the kind of resistance and action of so many standing up for them.”

Even in one of the darkest moments in recent history, this man, this patriot, this person who served our Nation's interests and continues to volunteer in service to this day, could have every reason to be angry, upset, and cynical. But what is beautiful from our conversations with this man is that he hasn't given up faith. He still believes in the American people.

The beautiful thing about the conversations my staff has had with those New Jersey residents who once were serving our Nation in theaters of violence and terrorism, standing up for our military, for our press, victimized by terroristic threats, shot at, assassination attempts—these families now here in America witnessing this Executive order are saddened and embarrassed by it, but they are not giving up in their faith in America. That is our story.

I stand here today—dare I say, all of the Members of the Senate stand here today because of this tradition of our country, that even when we had dark chapters from our past where others in positions of power violated our values,

the faith and activism and engagement of American people remained.

I dare say we are the oldest constitutional democracy on the planet Earth. God, the genius of our Founders who put on paper ideals that have been heralded for centuries on planet Earth. Newer constitutional democracies literally would study our Constitution and model their nations after elements of our Constitution. I am sad to tell you that some of those countries' democracies have failed. They had the vaunted words, they put forth the same principles and ideals, but their countries' democracies have been overthrown, have seen despots who destroyed the very spirit of those ideals.

Why has America persisted? It is not just because of the documents that are sacred and so special in the course of human events. But what makes those documents true and real—because those sentiments are not just written on parchment; every generation has had them written on their hearts and have said: No matter what I may be experiencing in this country, I am going to dedicate myself to the principles and ideals, because as great as our Founders were when they founded this country in liberty and in justice and equality under the law, it didn't apply to everyone. It didn't apply to women. Native Americans were referred to as savages. African Americans were fractions of human beings. Yet the faith of a people in every generation worked to expand the concepts of liberty and freedom. They made the Constitution more real. They made our Union more perfect. They made our country's truth more true for more people.

It is why great poets like Langston Hughes wrote:

America never was America to me,
And yet I swear this oath—
America will be!

That is the call to the citizenry of this country.

There have been dark days in our past, but every generation of Americans, despite the dark actions of people in power, understands the truth that the power of the people is greater than the people in power. If we never lose faith in the ideals of this Nation, if we keep standing and working and sacrificing and struggling, every generation could advance the ideals of our country and make us more free and more true and more real for more people.

Last week, we saw yet another American leader shrink the ideals of this country, try to pull us backward to times past when we turned our backs on people fleeing persecution. What Donald Trump did is try to pull back on the ideals inscribed on that great statue that sits right next to New Jersey, the mother of exiles, who says in poetry, among other things, “give us”—not “Hey, you can come in” but a demand:

Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.

It is a demand to the world that we will take those who are oppressed, we

will take those who are being violated, we will take those who are being victimized. A President turns his back on those ideals. We have seen it before.

Dr. Lauren Feldman wrote to me about chapters of dark pasts. She wrote:

Today is Holocaust Remembrance Day. I am a Jew. My relatives were unable to find refuge in our country and were murdered by the Nazis. My grandmother lost her beloved aunt, Rokhl Rosnick Gertman, and an uncle and 4 young cousins that she never met. Had we as a country done the right thing and welcomed the refugees fleeing the Nazis, Tante Rokhl and millions of others could have joined their family members in safety and we could have been proud of our country, instead of ashamed of the racist paper walls built by the FDR administration to keep my family and others out.

Please tell Mr. Trump that we cannot go back. We must be a beacon of safety and refuge for the persecuted. Please do all that you can to prevent this ban from being enacted. Please think of my relatives and the relatives of your other constituents and fellow citizens who were needlessly and shamefully murdered because of our fear and racism. We are better than that. You are better than that.

She concludes, “Thank you for your time and service. Dr. Lauren Feldman, Princeton.”

We are the United States of America. We haven't been perfect, but there has been a striving and a yearning in every generation to be more so.

I am a product of people Black and White, Christian and Jewish and Muslim, who, even though issues didn't affect them directly, knew that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. They marched and they fought. They sat in. They got on buses for freedom rides knowing they would be bombed. They tried to cross bridges, standing up against law enforcement, State troopers, Governors who dared them to try to pass them. There were implacable walls of hatred and racism, but they stood anyway, and they bled the southern soil red—for my freedom, for our freedom, for this Nation's freedom.

I have worked all my career for the safety of communities. Yes, we must make sure our Nation is safe. But don't let fear and concern for safety ever make us ever turn our backs on our values as a nation. When we are threatened by our enemies, it is not a time to surrender our values, it is time to double down on them. The terrorists win if they change our free hearts and our souls set on liberty.

We as a nation are called to be great, to be a beacon of liberty and justice. There are people now pulled off of airplanes, forced to return to communities where their lives are being threatened. We made a bargain with them: Stand for America. Stand with our military. Stand against terrorism.

There are people who went through years and years of vetting by agency after agency, and when they were on the brink of freedom, like people of old who were on ships that came into our harbor, they were turned away, back to

face persecution and injustice. That is not the America I believe in. It is not who we are.

So I say to our President in prayer, in deep abiding faith: Repeal your Executive order. Stand up for our principles. Defend them. Be the champion millions of Americans want you to be.

I say to Americans, to all of us as a country: This is not a time to despair. It is not a time to give up. It is not a time to grow cynical or lose faith in our country or our values. No, remember our history. When dark times come, when it seems that people in the highest points of power are turning their backs on their ideals, it is not a time to retreat or equivocate, it is a time to fight, to stand up, to resist.

We are a great nation not just because of the words printed on a Constitution; we are a great nation because people with great sacrifice and struggle fought to live those words and to make them real in the lives of every single person.

America, we must now stand up. The opposite of justice is not just injustice; it is silence and indifference. This may not affect you or your family directly, but it is a threat to all of our collective values.

Go to the Jefferson Memorial and read those final words. Thomas Jefferson knew that for this Nation to be great, we had to pledge to each other an unusual level of commitment. He said that we must mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

There is no honor in this Executive order. We as Americans now must pledge our sacred honor to do all we can to tear this order down so that the truth of America can rise again.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there is a French farmer by the name of Hector St. John de Crevecoeur. He immigrated to the United States from Normandy, France, in 1759, and he settled in the Hudson Valley. He married an American woman. The astounding diversity of those who settled around him, his fellow farmers, was shocking to him. He said: It is "a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans, and Swedes."

There was one family he knew who had an English grandfather, a Dutch grandmother, an Anglo-Saxon son who had a French wife, whose four sons all married women who were from different places of different nationalities. Hector said: "From this promiscuous breed, that race now called Americans has arisen."

He asked: "What then is the American, this new man?"

This farmer who came to America from Normandy in 1759 wrote this:

He is an American, who leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced, the new government he obeys,

and the new rank he holds. The American is the new man who acts upon new principles. . . . Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men.

George Washington told us that the bosom of America is open to the oppressed and the persecuted of all nations and religions.

That great American philosopher, Alexis de Tocqueville, that observer of American life, said in a letter:

Imagine, my dear friend, if you can, a society formed of all the nations of the world . . . people having different languages, beliefs, opinions: in a word, a society without roots, without memories, without prejudices, without routines, without common ideas, without a national character, yet a hundred times happier than our own.

I am not sure if any of those are completely accurate descriptions of what an American was or is or whether those are commensurate with our understanding as to the foundations of this country, but they speak to this founding ideal of America, this place where you could come from any part of the world with any set of beliefs, with any religion, with any skin color, and become something that is uniquely new.

There were people here before those who traveled from far-off lands, but to be an American is in many ways an invention—an invention of the amalgamation of faiths of peoples from all over the world.

Both Hector and de Tocqueville talk about the leaving behind of prejudices when you come to this new country. Inherent in that idea is this belief of new Americans that the discrimination they faced in other places could be washed away upon coming to a country, a land at that time in which everyone was equal, everyone started from the same place. Of course, that has to be true because this country was founded by individuals who were fleeing religious persecution, who thought that America was a place in which they could practice their religion freely. They could be who they knew themselves to be.

The reason why you hear such anxiety and anger and sadness from many in this Chamber and from many people we represent is because what happened on Friday is an abandonment of American originalism. It is a walking back of the faith that we have held since the days in which Scotch and Irish and French and Dutch and German and Swede came to this country believing that they could leave behind prejudices. It feels as if we are shrinking as a country before our eyes.

A young woman from Stamford, CT, wrote me this beautiful letter, and I want to read some of it to you. She encapsulates in modern language what Crevecoeur, Washington, and de Tocqueville were saying centuries ago. She said:

I am the proud descendant of Syrian immigrants. My great-grandparent's sacrifices to resettle in Rhode Island have shaped my entire life. I've grown up very close to my grandfather, the first generation of his family born in America, and I know what my an-

cestors did to be here and how far we've come from them being persecuted and subjected to religious violence in Damascus. I was able to grow up around Syrian culture and appreciate how great-grandparents made it possible for my entire family to be where they are now.

To give you an idea, my grandfather went on to receive a master's degree and was a high school teacher and guidance counselor. He is also heavily involved in the Roman Catholic church and quietly serves communion in hospitals each Sunday. My father, second generation, also received a master's, serves on hospital boards, and has had a successful career in human resources. With their encouragement, I have begun a career as a journalist, one I have dreamed of since I was in high school.

In 2012, on the 100-year anniversary of my family's arrival in the United States, I was the third generation in my family to graduate from high school and enroll in college. . . . I tell you this because this moves me every day when I go to work. How amazing it is that my family has gone from being persecuted for their religion to being able to hold jobs protected by the First Amendment? Surely, this is something my great-grandparents never could've dreamed of when they came here, and I embrace my career with the intention to honor their sacrifices. . . . Recently, my heart broke at the executive order to suspend the entry of refugees, specifically from Syria. I have looked into this extensively and recently worked on a story about the vetting process. . . . Trump's order is nothing but xenophobic and racist. I was preparing to report on a family that was supposed to be coming to a community near me, but it seems that family won't be coming now. How truly American it would've been for the descendant of Syrian immigrants to welcome a new generation of Syrians into this country.

This is for many cataclysmic because everything they thought about this country seems to be disappearing in front of us. I understand that President Trump tries to sell this as something less than it is; that it isn't a ban on all Muslims entering the United States, it is just a ban on Muslims from a select set of countries. But these are countries that encapsulate over 230 million Muslims. That is almost two-thirds of the population of the United States of America, including some of the most populous Muslim nations in the world, and it is directly targeted at people of Muslim faith.

It is simply not credible to say that this isn't a ban on members of one religion from entering the United States because it selects countries that are majority Muslim and then includes a caveat that if you are not of the majority religion, if you are of any religion that is not the majority religion, you can get around the ban and will be given priority to come to the United States.

This is a Muslim ban—a Muslim ban that applies to over 200 million Muslims around the world. It makes us smaller and weaker and less great as a nation. It also makes us weaker from a national security standpoint as well.

Let's step back for a second and understand the context here. This country does face a threat, a serious threat. There are religious extremists around the world who have perverted the religion of Islam and tried to turn it into

a doctrine of violence. They are attempting today to do great violence in the Middle East and in other parts of the world, and they are trying to recruit attackers here on U.S. soil. But you are not likely to be killed in an act of terrorism in this country. In fact, on average, there have been about three Americans killed every year by terrorism.

I am not trying to underplay the threat. People feel fearful. As a body, we need to respond to that fear. They see these awful things happening on TV, and they want us to make sure it will not happen to them. You are more likely to be killed in this country by lightning or by an elevator malfunction than you are by terrorism.

If you really want to talk about securing this Nation, about protecting Americans, then the conversation has to be bigger than just banning individuals from one country but recognizing the real threats that are posed.

Let me guarantee you this: If this ban goes into effect, if President Trump is successful, with the support from the Republican Congress, in sending a message to the world that America is at war with Islam, then that number of three Americans killed by terrorism every year will jump, it will skyrocket. More Americans will be killed by terrorism. Why? Because today ISIS is on its heels. It is in retreat. It has substantially less territory than it ever has before, and that has robbed from it one of its primary rationales for existence, one of its primary arguments to those it is trying to recruit into its fold—the idea that ISIS is forming a caliphate, an area of geographic control in the Middle East.

That argument doesn't work any longer because the supposed caliphate is shrinking. The amount of territory they control is getting smaller and smaller. Most folks can see the writing on the wall, that it is just a matter of time before the Islamic State as a state is gone. But they have this second rationale for existence, this second argument that they proffer to would-be recruits, and that is that there is a war between East and West, that this is really about a long-term struggle between Islam and Christianity. You need to sign up with us because they—the West, America, the Christian world—are coming for us.

We know that is not true, and we have watched Presidents of both parties make it very clear to the world that this is not the fight that we seek to engage in. Famously, immediately following the 9/11 attacks, President Bush said:

The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam.

He said:

That's not what Islam is all about. Islam is peace.

Yet the message that is being sent with this ban on Muslims from these seven countries entering the United States is clear. The message is that the United States is at war with this reli-

gion, that we are at war with people of the Muslim faith.

As we speak, these recruitment bulletin boards are lighting up with arguments being made as to the true nature of America's intent against the Islamic people. One posting on one of these message boards said that Trump's actions "clearly revealed the truth and harsh reality behind the American government and their hatred toward Muslims." Another posting on one of these extremist Web sites hailed Trump as the "best caller to Islam." Another message said that the leader of ISIS, "Al Baghdadi[,] has the right to come out and inform Trump that banning Muslims from entering America is a blessed ban." That is a phrase with very meaningful connotations. To the extent that these messaging boards are calling this ban on Muslims entering from seven countries a "blessed ban," it is rooted in a different phrase, something called the "blessed invasion."

The U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 became the starting point for the very insurgency that we are fighting today. It was that invasion that was called by Al Qaeda, Al Qaeda in Iraq, and the affiliated extremist groups that were drawn into the fight the "blessed invasion." Today on extremist Web sites, the ban on Muslims entering the United States is being called the "blessed ban."

This order is making this country less safe hour by hour. It is giving a pathway to rebirth for the very terrorist organizations that we had made such progress in pushing back and fighting back. In Iran specifically, it will lead to this country and our allies in the Middle East losing the fight against hardliners who pose a threat to the United States, to stability in the Middle East, and to our sacred ally of Israel. In Iran, there is a contest between moderates—and that is a relative term within the Iranian political space—and hardliners who chant "Death to Israel" who don't fear a world war or a conflict with the United States.

With the signing of the Iran nuclear agreement and the lifting of a handful of sanctions on Iran, the moderates won a victory. The population of that country—which is surprisingly pro-American and supported that nuclear agreement—was ascended, potentially foreshadowing a day in which that country would no longer be a provocateur in the region and instead could join in conversations about how to bring stability to the Middle East. Now the hardliners have been handed a gift, a gift which proves that America is an enemy, not just of the Iranian state but of the Iranian people.

Remember, when we think of actions that we take against governments that we don't like, we first try to start with actions that specifically identify individuals in the government, so that we make it clear that it is not about the people of that country but about their leaders. If that isn't strong enough, then we go to sanctions against com-

mercial interests, against the economy writ large. Yes, those sanctions do filter down and hurt real people, but the sanctions are levied at the economy or against commercial actors.

When you enact a specific ban on the people of a country being able to travel to the United States, you are levying that punishment directly on those individuals, who, by and large, bear no ill will toward the United States. You are telling them that it is their fault, and the Iranian people will turn against the United States, will turn toward the hardliners based upon this action.

This ban makes us less safe. It will allow for terrorist groups to rebound. That is not just me saying it. Senators McCain and Graham have said the same thing. National security experts of both stripes have testified as such. Tonight I think back to the moment in which I first heard that Candidate Donald Trump was proposing a ban on all Muslims entering the United States. I remember the universal bipartisan derision that met that announcement. It was almost laughable at that point in time during the campaign. If you remember, Candidate Trump was flailing. He was weak. He needed to reassert himself. He needed to make news, and so he grabbed for the most controversial, most outlandish proposal he could make. Republicans and Democrats here in Congress condemned it.

Speaker RYAN tweeted this:

A religious test for entering our country is not reflective of America's fundamental values. I reject it.

Governor MIKE PENCE said:

Calls to ban Muslims from entering the United States are offensive and unconstitutional.

A religious test for entering this country is not reflective of America's fundamental values. I reject it.

Calls to ban Muslims from entering the United States are offensive and unconstitutional.

I give credit to a small handful of Republicans here in the Senate and a small handful of Republicans in the House who have raised serious concerns about this ban with respect to what it says about American values or what it says about American national security. But there is utter silence from Republican leadership. Republican leadership—who only months ago claimed that if there were a religious test for entering our country, they would reject it—today are quiet. The idea that individuals could come to this country without regard to their religion or their national origin or their set of beliefs has never been a partisan issue. Of all the things that divide us, that idea has been one that unifies us.

My hope is that there is still a chance that both parties can come together and recapture the essence of American originalism, can put this country on firmer national security footing, and can continue the relentless drive against extremist groups like ISIS that now find themselves at a point of potential rebirth.

You have heard a lot of stories on the floor of the Senate today. It is interesting. We have these incredibly compelling stories from real people who are caught today in the middle of this reckless ill-thought-out ban. There are 67,000 refugees who are currently in the pipeline to come to this country right now. This isn't about 100, 200, 300, or 400. This is about tens of thousands of refugees who are fleeing persecution, terror, and torture. This is about the 230 million Muslims who live in those seven countries, who have been told that they are lesser. Frankly, every other Muslim in the world believes the message is being sent to them as well.

These stories that we tell you are—the tip of the iceberg isn't even accurate. This is a pinprick. Fadi Kassir and his family—here are his two girls. They left Syria in 2011 due to the epic levels of violence that Fadi was sure would kill his two little girls if he didn't leave. His family went to the UAE, or the United Arab Emirates. But the way in which the UAE works is that if you have a job, you can stay, but if you don't have a job, you leave. When he lost his job, they were kicked out and that began an epic journey for Fadi and his family.

These girls actually were born in the UAE, as I understand. He was fleeing Syria to protect his family and his future children, yet they were kicked out of the country they went to. Fadi then began a journey to try to find a home for him and his family. He tried to get to Europe via Tunisia, but he was detained and sent back to Turkey. He eventually flew to Brazil. He made his way to the United States by crossing the border with Mexico. Upon entry, he was detained. He was transferred to Miami. He was released and eventually found his way to Connecticut. He applied for asylum that was granted in December of 2015.

Fadi's relatives in Syria were tortured and had been detained by the regime. His neighborhood was dangerous and deadly. Fadi and his family were exactly the kind of people whom this country historically has been able to rescue from war-torn countries, from terror, and from torture. His family had experienced torture. His children were later returned to Syria and would face potential death.

He went through all of the processes that we asked him to go through. He didn't go into the shadows. He didn't hide. He applied for asylum status. It was granted in 2015. He filed forms that would allow for his wife and two daughters to follow. Those visas were issued last Tuesday, on January 24.

Originally, they had a flight that was scheduled to bring his wife and these two little girls to the United States today, but last week, when Fadi learned of the potential for this Executive order, he paid \$1,000 to move their flight up to Friday. His two little girls and his wife got on a flight from Jordan to Kiev, Ukraine, and eventually to the United States. But once in Kiev,

their passports and their visas were taken from them. They were sent to CBP. Their visas were rejected, and they were returned to Jordan.

These two little girls are back in their old apartment, but they got rid of all their furniture. They got rid of all their clothes. Their neighbors have temporarily given them mattresses to sleep on. They don't even know where their suitcases are. Their father, who is ready to greet them at the airport here in the United States, may never see them.

They are scared to death. I have two little boys who are the exact same age. I have an 8-year-old. I have a 5-year-old. I think about what these two little girls went through, getting ready to finally go see their dad who had gone through an epic struggle to try to find someplace in this world where his two little girls could be safe. He found it. He found it in America. He found it in my State of Connecticut.

He found it, just like hundreds of thousands of other people who fled war-ravaged Europe, who fled the bombing in Vietnam, who left Albania and Kosovo to come live a better life just like they found. He was ready to go to the airport to welcome his two little girls, and they were told that they are not leaving. You are not going to see your dad. You are going to go back to Jordan and, potentially, eventually back to Syria.

Imagine what those little girls went through. Imagine millions of other little boys and girls like them who had in their mind this place called America, a place that would welcome them, who would rescue them from the disaster that had become their lives.

Imagine that dream that was literally hours away for these two little girls extinguishing, and extinguishing for millions of others like them all around this planet. It is up to us whether that light which flickered off on Friday relights. It is up to us as to whether we rekindle the American dream, that idea of America from our founding. This is not irreversible. These two little girls, you could bring them here. We could choose to bring them here. It is up to us.

There is legislation on the floor of the Senate right now as we speak that would rescind this order. It is our decision, right? There are 100 of us. There are only 435 down the hall. There are only 535 of us. It is our decision whether these two little girls come to the United States or they go back to their war-ravaged home that their father left. It is up to us. It is not up to the President of the United States alone. He does not get to make these decisions by himself.

Democracy allows for us to make a different decision. It is up to us. I believe we can do it. I believe we can bring these girls here. I believe we can undo the damage that has been done to this country's security. I believe we can get back on a path such that ISIS remains on its heels. I believe we can

recapture that idea of that farmer who came to this country from a far-off land who looked in amazement at the amalgam of cultures and peoples and religions that was America.

I know this sounds like hyperbole. I know there are a lot of people out there who say: Wait a second. This is only temporary. It is only for a few months. It is only for a few countries. But people are listening and watching. Which direction are we heading? Do we really care about the things we have always cared about? Millions upon millions of people, all across this country and all across this world are watching. What do we do?

Is this a partisan issue or can we commit ourselves together to stand up for those basic ideas of America's founding? There are two little girls who are watching most closely, who are watching to see if we can rise above partisanship and deliver to them the promise that has been made real for millions and millions of Americans who call this place home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, so we have had a number, a large number of eloquent speeches about the President's Executive order. While they were going on, of course, we had a Monday night massacre. Sally Yates, a person of great integrity, who follows the law, was fired by the President. She was fired because she would not enact, pursue, the Executive order on the belief that it was illegal, perhaps unconstitutional.

It was a profile in courage. It was a brave act and the right act. I hope the President and his people who are in the White House learned something from this; first, that we are a nation under the rule of law. You cannot just sit down, Twitter something out, and then think: OK. Let's enact it. It is a complicated country. When you do something as major as what the President proposed in his Executive order, you have to think it through. You have to talk to people.

Sally Yates was the Acting Attorney General. Why wasn't she consulted? Maybe they would have known what she felt and maybe they would not have done what they did. Clearly, that lack of consultation went up and down the line. Sally Yates is from a different administration. General Kelly was President Trump's selection.

He learned of this Executive order when he got a phone call from the White House while he saw it being announced on television. How can you run a country like that? I am hearing from my constituents in New York. There are hard-core Trump supporters. They are for him. But they are a small minority of New Yorkers.

There are many progressive, liberal, and pro-immigrant people. Obviously, they are horrified, but I would say this to the President and his minions. There are a lot of people who voted for

President Trump—not the hard core—and they are appalled by the simple ineptitude of this administration. Substantively, even more important, how can you run a country like this? How can you make a major order, major doing, and not check it out with your Homeland Security Secretary, with the Justice Department and the Attorney General?

I will say, if this continues, this country has big trouble. We cannot have a Twitter Presidency. We cannot have a Presidency that thinks: Oh, this sounds good. Let's just go do it and not think the consequences through. Most of all, we cannot have a Presidency that does not understand the beauty and depth of America, in this case when it comes to immigrants.

We have been an amazing country. In the city in which I live there is a big lady in the harbor with a torch. It is a beautiful symbol. Americans revere it and admire it. The world reveres it and admires it. Why? Because it says: America will be a place where people can take refuge if they are persecuted religiously, politically, and then they can build a great life for themselves.

That is a beautiful thing. That moral force of America helps us win wars, helps us win support, helps us be the greatest country in the world that everyone admires.

Of course, we need a strong military. Of course, we need a strong economy. Praise God, America has had both through the decades, but we also have been a moral beacon, "God's noble experiment," as the Founding Fathers called it. In those days, as now, we have welcomed people from distant shores and said: Come be Americans.

Our President is trampling on that, to be honest with you. The idea that immigrants are preponderantly criminals and preponderantly terrorists is absurd. They are the future of America. In my State of New York, 25 percent of the people are foreign born, probably as high as 40 percent if you are either foreign born or had a parent foreign born.

They are great New Yorkers. I was with a Syrian refugee this week. He and his wife and his children had just come. His parents were American citizens. They had come to America in 1970. The parents and Mr. Elias, who lived in the Bronx, came here. He was a tailor. We don't have that many fine tailors in America these days. It is a lost art. So people who do it tend to be immigrants; mainly from Italy is my experience.

But he was a tailor from Syria. He then did what immigrants do in America. He founded a little business. He reupholsters boats, a lot of them in a place in the Bronx called City Island. He built a company. He made America better. He is a Syrian immigrant.

His children and grandchildren were in danger. A suicide bomber had even blown up himself in front of their home nearly killing them. They just got in this month. Had Donald Trump's Exec-

utive order been in effect several weeks earlier, they would not have been able to get here. They might have perished. They might have been hurt.

Similarly, another guy I met is Mohammed. Mohammed knows English. He was so impressed by America, by the lady with the torch, by our values, by what we stand for, that he volunteered to be a translator for our soldiers. He put his life in danger for doing that.

Then he began to get threats from the terrorists in Iraq. He is an Iraqi. His wife was in danger. His children were in danger. He came January 5. Again, had President Trump and his evil order—and that is what it is, it is evil—gone into effect January 1, for all we know Mohammed would have died for helping our soldiers.

Do we have to prevent terrorists from coming into America? Absolutely.

The greatest source of terror are lone wolves. Americans, citizens—ISIS gets its evil ideas in their heads, and they do terrorist things.

JOHN MCCAIN, my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona who is an expert on this stuff, said: This Executive order will encourage and increase the number of lone wolves.

Here is another group that needs tightening, I would suggest to the President and his minions: those available in the Visa Waiver Program. If you are a country that has generally been friendly to us, there is something called the Visa Waiver Program, which means you can come into this country with very few questions asked, very little vetting.

Refugees are vetted for 2 years. That is why not a single refugee from any of the countries that were proscribed by the President has committed an act of terror here—not a single one.

I heard someone defending the President saying: Well, all these people would have come in; the terrorists would have come in had they done it slowly and announced a date.

Well, we have done it like this for 15, 20 years, and we haven't had a single terrorist come in. What kind of absurdity is that?

Anyway, the Visa Waiver Program allows people from, say, France and Belgium to come into this country with few questions asked. We have seen French citizens, Belgian citizens do terrorism. They would be allowed to come into this country to do it here. Why aren't we tightening that up? That is what should be done.

So I am going to conclude. The evening is late.

Sally Yates was a profile in courage, a profile in courage. Maybe some of her courage, her insight, and her wisdom would rub off on the people in the White House. Maybe they will back off and repeal this Executive order, and then we can work together and truly try to tighten up the laws, the actions of the administration to prevent terrorists from coming in.

This Executive order makes us less safe. It was poorly done in a slipshod,

quick way that foretells real trouble in the White House, and, most of all, it has done more to tarnish the great American dream, the great moral force of America that has, in part, made us the greatest country in the world—in 1, 2 days, undoing the work of generations.

Please, Mr. President, reconsider. Really think about this. Don't just tweet. Don't just get mad. Don't just call names. Think about it. Change it. Repeal it.

It is too far gone to change; we have to repeal it. And then maybe we can work together on tightening up some of the areas that I have talked about.

I see my friend from Arizona has come to the floor, and I will not hold him up, so I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

(At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I was unable to cast my vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson to be Secretary of State because I was addressing a joint session of the State legislature in New Mexico. If I had been present, I would have voted no.●

BUDGET RECONCILIATION REPORTING DEADLINE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 2001 of S. Con. Res. 3, the concurrent resolution on the budget Fiscal Year 2017, directs the Committees on Finance and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions to report changes in laws within their respective jurisdictions to reduce the on-budget deficit by not less than \$1 billion each for the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026. Those committees were instructed to submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget no later than January 27, 2017.

For the information of colleagues, the reporting deadline has passed, and the Budget Committee has not received reconciliation recommendations from either committee. While committees have not complied with the deadline, the Senate retains the ability to utilize the instructions contained in section 2001 of S. Con. Res. 3.

TRIBUTE TO GARY SCHNEIDERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor an Iowa teacher who has clearly had a major impact on his students and his community because I was contacted by a number of Iowans regarding their desire to find some way to recognize him. The following is what they told me.

A teacher of 39 years at Columbus High School in Waterloo, IA, Gary Schneiders has been awarded the

McElroy Trust Gold Star Teacher of the Year in the Cedar Valley and Teacher of the Year at Columbus High School.

During his time at Columbus, Gary Schneiders has taught world history, applied economics, current world history and advanced placement European history. Through his world history and European history classes, Mr. Schneiders has taken it upon himself to educate his students about the many sacrifices our military men and women have endured throughout history.

This February, Gary Schneiders will be leading his 12th group of students to France and Belgium for a 12-day trip “To Experience, To Learn, To Honor, To Remember.” This is the theme each year for his AP Euro trip. Mr. Schneiders leads the students along World War I’s Western Front starting in Verdun, France. His students experience the battlefields and trenches of the First World War. They visit some of the great museums and monuments honoring the soldiers who fought in the war. Most importantly, they go to many of the cemeteries and memorials to the many soldiers who fought for the various countries in that Great War. At the American memorials and cemeteries like Flanders Field and the Meuse Argonne, the largest American cemetery in Europe, the students lay flags and roses at each Iowa soldier’s headstone. They also lay a wreath at the memorial itself, where Taps and the National Anthem are played. Because World War I is little remembered these days, the American cemeteries see very few visitors from the United States. The administrators of these memorials and cemeteries are excited to see Mr. Schneiders each year with his fresh class of students.

During the latter part of the AP Euro trip, Mr. Schneiders takes his students to the beaches of Normandy. He shows the students firsthand what difficulties our soldiers had in taking the beaches. On their last day in Europe, Mr. Schneiders takes his students to Omaha Beach and the Normandy American Cemetery. Mr. Schneiders takes his students down to Omaha Beach so they can see the distance our soldiers had to cover while carrying heavy packs and under constant fire. The students then go up to the top of the beach where the Normandy American Cemetery and Memorial is located. The students again put American flags and roses at each soldier from Iowa. They also take the sand they brought from Omaha Beach and wipe it over the name on each headstone so the name of the soldier and the State of Iowa becomes easily visible. The students again lay a wreath and Taps and National Anthem are played throughout the cemetery.

Two weeks after returning home, Gary Schneiders and his students put on a presentation for the local veterans and community. The students set up various multimedia exhibits to share the experiences from their trip. This

has become a great event each year for local veterans and the community.

To conclude, I was told that Gary Schneiders’ dedication to his school, veterans, and his students has been invaluable to his community. If Gary Schneiders has anything to do with it, his students will continue “To Experience, To Learn, To Honor, To Remember” our veterans. So I congratulate Gary Schneiders on his dedication to his school, students, veterans, and community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY CONTEST FINALISTS

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some of the finalist essays written by Vermont high school students as part of the seventh annual State of the Union essay contest conducted by my office.

The material follows:

KEELAN DURHAM, OXBOW HIGH SCHOOL
FRESHMAN (FINALIST)

Climate change is the most important issue facing our nation and the biggest challenge our world has ever faced. It threatens us at the most immediate level—the very land, water and air that we have called home for thousands of years. Addressing climate change will require tremendous policy shifts and changing massive amounts of infrastructure that we have spent many years and billions of dollars making. And it will require people and governments to collaborate at a worldwide level. The United States is the richest most powerful country in the world. We have achieved this position in world politics by being a leading force in creating prosperity and democracy around the world. However, by achieving this, we have wreaked havoc on the environment at the expense of the greater world. Now, we have a moral obligation to lead the world in implementing strong policies toward a renewable future. If we fail to address climate change, both our nation and nations around the globe will suffer tremendous consequences. According to the environmental protection agency’s (EPA) “Climate Impacts on Coastal Areas”, Rising seas alone will cause the United States to lose a projected 28,800 square miles of land. This would submerge large parts of fourteen US cities, displace 25 million people, and destroy billions of dollars worth of real estate. Rising seas would claim beautiful areas all along the coast such as the beaches of Culebra the multi-million dollar condos of Malibu or of the beautiful coast of California. Outside the United States, small island countries that have done very little to cause global warming could be wiped of the face of the planet.

As the richest most powerful country with the oldest, and arguably the strongest, democracy ever we need to take bold action and implement strong policies to stop global warming. There are many things the United States can do to address climate change. We could put a price on carbon pollution; this would create a disincentive to use oil and possibly hurt oil companies profits. We could create strong incentives and grants for renewable energy; this would make it easier and cheaper for individuals and businesses to install renewable energy like solar or wind. A huge step forward would be to ban coal mining and oil extractions from public lands—just this would keep millions of tons of CO₂

out of the atmosphere and greatly help the environment. Merely stopping all new gas and oil infrastructure in its tracks would be a huge step in the fight against climate change. There is more we can do but this would be a start.

Currently the United States has been doing very little to combat global warming. The Paris Agreements were a step in the right direction but oil companies still have many members of congress working for them and with Donald Trump as president progress will likely will be lost and not made. This is why we must fight for this issue, and all issues that we know are important. If we do this, we show the oil companies and corrupt politicians that this government is for “we the people of the United States” and not “we the super huge and super rich corporations of the United States”. Together we can make huge progress towards a renewable energy future and towards protecting our environment for future generations.

MORGEN EDWARDS, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR
(FINALIST)

My fellow Americans, our country spends more on training men and women to go to war than what it does on training our family members and our neighbors to come home. We spend more money on the military as whole, than what we do our veterans. Our veterans deserve more benefits through an increased budget of ten percent, we must reform the VA, and help to put an end to the 22 veterans who commit suicide a day. To help put an end to veteran suicide rates, there should be funding to create a separate organization to solely focus on the mental health of our veterans, readjusting them to civilian life, and acting as a twenty-four hour hotline to help prevent veteran suicide. This should be comprised of experts, and people who can adequately represent them when it comes to congress and budgeting.

In order to save our veterans, we first must provide the VA with a better budget, in order for the VA to provide veterans with access to benefits. The projected budget for the president to spend on the VA as of 2017 is 182.3 billion dollars, and according to the VA this is a “4.9% increase over the 2016 enacted level.” If we increase the budget by ten percent to start out, than the VA could have more money to provide our veterans with better benefits, thus helping to cut down on wait times by employing more qualified individuals, while helping to provide more options for care and help to the men and women who need it. According to Military times “The average wait time across the system as of May 15 was 6.89 days for primary care, 10.15 days for specialty care and 4.4 days for mental health appointments, according to the report.” Wait times should be no more than three to four days, and if at all possible we should try cutting that down even more, to ensure the safety of our veterans.

We must train our veterans on how to readjust to civilian life, help them to find and maintain jobs, help them find housing and teach them about PTSD and mental health awareness. We must train them to not be afraid to speak out about their mental health. Most importantly, we must not send them away when they seek help, telling them to “just forget about it.” If we have the means to train them to go to war, than we must take those same means but apply it to training them to come home. No longer should we send of veterans home to fend for themselves. If we have the resources to send them to boot camp to go to war than we have the resources to send them to boot camp to come home. We should try and expand the Wounded Warriors Project, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, and American Veterans and their efforts to provide transition programs.

REBECCA GREEN, ST. JOHNSBURY ACADEMY
SOPHOMORE (FINALIST)

I believe that one of the most pressing issues that is facing our nation today is the conservative movement to remove federal funding from Planned Parenthood. I think that this is very important, because Planned Parenthood clinics are key providers not only of family planning services, but also preventative care, and other important health care services for low income women and families, and therefore, defunding this organization would negatively impact access to healthcare in these vulnerable socio-economic groups.

The movement to defund Planned Parenthood is centered primarily on ideological and political reasons surrounding the pro-life movement and their argument that tax dollars should not be allowed to support organizations that provide abortions. Yet, Planned Parenthood data demonstrated that only 3% of their budget goes to fund abortion, with the rest of their funds going to contraceptive services (31%), testing and treatment of STD's (45%), other women's health care services (14%), and screening and prevention of cancer (7%). According to a report from the Guttmacher Institute, in 2014, Planned Parenthood prevented 2.2 million unintended pregnancies and averted many cases of sexual transmitted diseases, and cervical and breast cancer through screening PAP smears and mammograms and HPV tests and vaccinations, resulting in a net public savings of \$13.6 billion, or \$7.09 for every public dollar spent. Defunding Planned Parenthood clinics could therefore have a significant negative impact on both these health benefits and the health care savings that come from their services.

An example of the effects of this movement to defund Planned Parenthood can be seen in the case of Texas, where cutting federal funding to this organization led to closure of more than 80 clinics and deprived thousands of low-income women of highly effective contraceptive methods, resulting in a drastic increase in the rate of births covered by Medicaid.

In conclusion, Planned Parenthood has created a nationwide network of clinics that provide a wide breadth of services to low income women and families who often fall in the gap between Medicaid and insurance coverage. Efforts to defund this organization would deprive this vulnerable socio-economic group from important health care services, and cause profound negative impact, not just on preventative care and overall women's health, but on state and national health care spending.

ABIGAIL HALNON, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR
(FINALIST)

My fellow Americans, I am humbled and thrilled to be your president. I believe that the American people are generous, insightful, and accepting. Our nation gains its power, strength, and beauty from its diversity. We strive, as a nation, to be an international leader in perpetuating ideals of freedom and equality. It is my concern that there are many acts in this country that violate these fundamental beliefs.

It is important that the United States is a country recognized as a pioneer of social justice on a worldwide stage. It is our moral duty to uphold the highest standards of equality and acceptance. We have made great steps towards this in recent years. The landmark Supreme Court decision in 2015 of Obergefell v. Hodges upheld the fundamental right to marry, regardless of sex. We must further prove our nation's belief in freedom and opportunity by the legislation that we pass. There is progress yet to be made.

Currently, practicing conversion therapy on gay and bisexual Americans is widely per-

mitted across the U.S. This is a process under which non-heterosexual people are subjected to various means to reverse their sexual orientation. Conversion therapy, based on a scientifically discredited premise, must see an immediate ban. It permits the means to punish and abuse innocent Americans. The vast majority of these victims are minors. This practice perpetuates a false and violent belief system that homosexuality is a mental disease and that a cure must be sought. It is an obscene violation of the basic human rights of gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans. It should not be permitted by law.

Although it receives little public support, only 5 states have banned conversion therapy on minors. These acts of hate and misinformation must be outlawed nationwide. It is an injustice and a crime to subject torture on Americans, most often minors, who have committed no offense. An immediate country-wide ban must take place.

We must work to defy all accounts of prejudice based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The freedom and mobility of transgender and nonbinary Americans is severely limited. Their rights and protection are being eroded by current legislation. A recent law in North Carolina known as the "bathroom bill" allows regulation of bathroom access for transgender individuals. Legislation that regulates bathroom use by transgender Americans is an act of hate and tragic misinformation. Rates of violence or misconduct by transgender individuals in bathrooms are so unprecedented that there are virtually no statistics on it. There is no need for regulation. These laws must immediately be struck down. These are basic and necessary rights and they must not be infringed upon. Discriminatory acts based on sexuality and gender identity have implications outside of their specific goals. The use of U.S. law to marginalize any group perpetuates dangerous and violent beliefs. Our misunderstanding cannot become rejection. Our fear cannot manifest into anger.

Americans will not stand for the perpetuation of hate, fear, and misinformation. We will not reject our neighbors and our friends. Our country must make these necessary steps towards true equality.

KARLEY ZIER, MISSISQUOI VALLEY UNION HIGH
SCHOOL JUNIOR (FINALIST)

Raising the price of minimum wage would benefit everyone differently, but all in a commendable way. This would give people on government assistance more of an incentive to secure a job. It would keep the average family of four from drowning in debt just to buy groceries for the week. According to Sherrod Brown, Senator of Ohio, "Anyone who's tried to pay a heating bill, fill a prescription, or simply buy groceries knows all too well that the current minimum wage does not cut the mustard." Sherrod explains exactly how tough it is to try and survive off from the ongoing minimum wage price.

Minimum wage in Vermont should be raised for a multitude of reasons. One way the state could benefit from this would be the amount of people withdrawing from welfare and other government funded programs. The state could benefit from this act because unemployed rates would go down with more people applying for jobs. Families living off of minimum wage have barely enough money to meet their basic needs per week or per month. Someone making minimum wage at \$9.60 an hour for eight hours a day and five days a week will earn \$384. Therefore, one will make \$1,536 per month without any taxes being taken out. According to USA Today, the average cost of groceries per week for a family of four is \$150-\$200. The average cost of rent in Vermont is \$900 per

month. Being left with \$436, which would be non-existent due to taxes, leaves no room to pay for other needs or necessities. People wouldn't have money to pay for phone bills, transportation expenses, or daycare because one would be working. Someone would not be able to pay for any of these necessities because of the fact they wouldn't be able to afford them living off of minimum wage.

People who are using government assistance programs could benefit from this because there would be a reason for them to want to work. If people make the same amount off of welfare as they are making while working a forty hour job each week, of course they are going to choose welfare, or other government assistance programs. There is no incentive for the people on welfare to want to get a job with the minimum wage being so low and having to pay for expenses they wouldn't need to pay for while being unemployed. The other people in the state could benefit from this by the amount of people withdrawing from the welfare program. The more people who withdraw from the system, the less tax money that one say to pay to fund these types of programs. Overall, those are the reasons why the minimum wage in Vermont should be raised.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the appropriate committees.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7. An act to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

H.R. 589. An act to establish Department of Energy policy for science and energy research and development programs, and reform National Laboratory management and technology transfer programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 600. An act to promote Internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the Internet, and for other purposes.

H.R. 601. An act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January

3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Co-Chairman, Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois, and Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. HOLDING of North Carolina, Chairman, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. LATTA of Ohio, Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Chairman, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE of Kentucky, Mr. COOK of California, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7. An act to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 589. An act to establish Department of Energy policy for science and energy research and development programs, and reform National Laboratory management and technology transfer programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 600. An act to promote Internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 601. An act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ROBERTS,

Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 237. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 238. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28th, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 239. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. REED):

S. 240. A bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that temporarily restricted individuals from certain countries from entering the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 241. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 242. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans to grant access to their records in the databases of the Veterans Benefits Administration to certain designated congressional employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 243. A bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr.

FLAKE, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 244. A bill to repeal the wage requirement of the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 245. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 246. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 247. A bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 248. A bill to block implementation of the Executive Order that restricts individuals from certain countries from entering the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. LEE):

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8, of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Securities Exchange Commission relating to the disclosure of payments by resource extraction issuers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. CORNYN):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by the Secretary of the Interior relating to stream protection; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LEE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HATCH):

S.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to "Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CORNYN):

S.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration relating to the Federal Acquisition Regulation; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. SASSE):

S.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SASSE):

S.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management relating to resource management planning; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 28. A resolution designating January 27, 2017, as "Earned Income Tax Credit Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. Res. 29. A resolution recognizing January 28, 2017, as "National Data Privacy Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 26

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 26, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain can-

didates for the office of the President, and for other purposes.

S. 32

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes.

S. 33

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 33, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes.

S. 87

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 87, a bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

S. 105

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 105, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to transition the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to a 5-member board of directors.

S. 107

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 107, a bill to prohibit voluntary or assessed contributions to the United Nations until the President certifies to Congress that United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 has been repealed.

S. 143

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 152

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 152, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 166, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Muhammad Ali.

S. 176

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 176, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 179

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 179, a bill to expand the use of E-Verify, to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 181

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 181, a bill to ensure that certain Federal public works and infrastructure projects use materials produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 191

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 191, a bill to improve patient choice by allowing States to adopt market-based alternatives to the Affordable Care Act that increase access to affordable health insurance and reduce costs while ensuring important consumer protections and improving patient care.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

S. 202

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 202, a bill to amend the Social Security Act relating to the use of determinations made by the Commissioner.

S. 205

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Georgia

(Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 205, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 207

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 220

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 220, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 223

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 223, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 224

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 224, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 230

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for facilities using a qualified methane conversion technology to provide transportation fuels and chemicals.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to expand opportunity

through greater choice in education, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S.J. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

S.J. RES. 8

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 15, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Mexico City policy should be permanently established.

S. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 18, a resolution reaffirming the United States-Argentina partnership and recognizing Argentina's economic reforms.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr.

MURPHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. REED):

S. 240. A bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that temporarily restricted individuals from certain countries from entering the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor as we have just filed a resolution—a bill actually—with 26 cosponsors that would repeal the immigration ban placed by President Trump. President Trump's Muslim ban is unnecessary, it is unconstitutional, and it is un-American. It should be repealed immediately.

The Executive order prohibits individuals from Iran, Syria, Iraq, Sudan, Somalia, Libya, and Yemen from entering the country. It even bars relatives of Americans from visiting. The order suspends the entire U.S. refugee program, and most egregiously, Syrian refugees are banned indefinitely unless they are Christian. These provisions are not what America is all about.

First, the order is unnecessary. Individuals from the 7 targeted countries and 150 other nations are already thoroughly screened. Visitors fill out visa applications. They submit photographs that run through biometric databases. Their personal information is reviewed, including names, addresses, and dates of birth. They are interviewed at a U.S. consulate. The process could take months to complete and eliminates the need for the travel ban.

In addition, the move to ban refugees has no legitimate national security reason because these refugees undergo an even more thorough screening process that can take up to 2 years to complete. The vast majority of refugees are women and children who have experienced the absolute worst of humanity.

Let's not forget the heart-wrenching image of the small body of Aylan Kurdi, a 3-year-old Syrian boy, washed up on a beach, dead. I will never forget this small boy in his short pants, his shoes, and his socks, lying on that beach. To turn away women and children and men in their time of dire need is not what this Nation is all about.

Let me make this point: The poor execution of this Executive order has resulted in chaos and confusion. It is unclear whether the Justice Department or Homeland Security had any input. There seems to have been a disagreement about whether it would apply to green card holders. There was confusion about whether it applies to

individuals already in transit or approved for travel. Even airport directors—I have spoken directly with the directors of Los Angeles International and San Francisco International, and there was confusion about how it applies. Even airport directors were left in the dark about how many people were detained and who they were.

Sara Yarjani was one Californian caught up in this mess. She is an Iranian national studying at the California Institute for Human Science in San Diego under a valid student visa. After being detained at LAX for 23 hours, she was sent back to Europe, a clear violation of the nationwide stay against the order. What I am saying is that the court stay was actually violated. This is just one of more than 100 stories from the weekend.

I believe this order is also unconstitutional. The First Amendment prohibits government from establishing a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. The order violates this First Amendment by targeting Muslims and favoring Christians. The order may also violate the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which forbids the government from burdening the person's exercise of religion. The law bars any discrimination based on national origin in the issuance of a visa.

Finally, detaining people at airports may violate their Fourth Amendment rights.

This was an ill-considered overreach, as the courts showed over the weekend, and it should be repealed.

So the bill that 27 of us are introducing rescinds the President's Executive order. The text is simple because the message is simple: We won't stand for these types of actions.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I am so proud of the peaceful demonstrations we saw, and I join those who are so passionate about the free exercise of religion and free speech. These are our values, Mr. President, as a nation, and I will be right there with you if anyone tries to violate them.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 245. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce S. 245., the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2017.

Over 10 years ago, Congress passed the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act. This act was a step in the right direction to economic self-sufficiency for Indian tribes and energy independence for our Nation.

It created a process for Indian tribes to govern the development of their energy resources while reducing costly

bureaucratic burdens of Secretarial review, approval, and oversight. But after more than 10 years, the act has not been implemented in a manner beneficial to the tribes or efficient resource development.

Bills have been introduced for the past four Congresses to improve and clarify the process but none of them have been signed into law. It is past time Congress acts and gets this bill across the finish line to be signed into law.

The bill that I am introducing today would improve, clarify, and make predictable the process for tribes to enter energy resource agreements and development. I would like to highlight some of the key provisions in this bill.

The bill provides clarity regarding the specific information and time frames for Secretarial decisions required for tribal energy resource agreements. This bill recognizes the need to engage tribes by requiring more robust technical assistance and consultation with Indian tribes in the planning and development stages for energy resource development.

It would further facilitate the Secretarial approval process for mineral development by allowing Indian tribes and third parties to perform appraisals. This bill also includes renewable energy resource development by authorizing tribal biomass demonstration projects to assist Indian tribes in securing reliable, long-term supplies of woody biomass materials.

I would like to thank Senators BARRASSO, MCCAIN, LANKFORD, MORAN, and HEITKAMP for joining me in cosponsoring this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing this bill and getting it signed into law expeditiously.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. LEE):

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8, of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Securities Exchange Commission relating to the disclosure of payments by resource extraction issuers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are introducing today a CRA that is kind of interesting. This is something that has only been successful one time.

I think everyone knows that during the past 8 years, under the Obama administration, we have seen thousands, literally thousands of regulations that have come through that have been anti-business, many of them anti-certain businesses, such as the oil and gas industries. It is no secret, the fact that we have had a President, in President Obama, who has had a war on fossil fuels.

It is interesting to me that when I go back to my State of Oklahoma—one reason I go back all the time is because I want to be around real, rational peo-

ple. Sometimes I get the feeling there really aren't any around here. They ask questions. They will say: Tell me. Explain this to me. In the United States of America, in order to generate power, 89 percent of the power we are generating is either fossil fuels, coal, oil, gas, or nuclear. If we do away with 89 percent of our generation capability, then how do we run the machine called America?

The answer is that we can't. But we don't get those types of questions here. I am sure most of us who go back find that kind of concern, and it is not confined to Oklahoma.

I chaired the Environment and Public Works Committee during the 8 years—during the time President Obama was in office, and most of the regulations were actually associated with that committee. Many committees have regulations associated with their committees but not nearly as many as Environment and Public Works. An example is the WOTUS regulation. Ask anyone with the American Farm Bureau or anyone who deals with farmers and ranchers, and the No. 1 problem they have, they will tell you, is nothing that is found on the AgNu Committee; it is the overregulation of the EPA. That is one example. The Environment and Public Works Committee is the committee that has the jurisdiction over the EPA—at least we are supposed to.

During the time when WOTUS came through—the water regulation—it has historically always been the States' jurisdiction to handle water issues, not the Federal Government, with the exception of navigable water. I think we all understand that. In fact, there were several liberal Members in the House and Senate who tried to take the word "navigable" out of the regulations, and we defeated them every time. The last two who tried to do that were, in fact, defeated in the polls.

We know that in the State of Oklahoma—I should say our farmers know that if you put the Federal Government in charge of water regulations in the western part of Oklahoma, which is an arid part of the State, it would end up being designated as a wetland. Anyway, that is a major concern they had.

Another example of regulation is President Obama's Clean Power Plan. We all know how that came about. Way back in 1972, I was one of the bad guys who told the truth about what they were referring to as global warming, saying the world was coming to an end. Even though a lot of the Members of this body didn't join in and agree with me, every time, without exception, they came up with a bill that would do something—such as a cap-and-trade bill, for example—we defeated the bill, and it was continually defeated by an even larger margin as time went by.

President Obama came in, and when he couldn't get the legislation he wanted passed, he tried to do it through regulation. That is what he did with the Clean Power Plan—another rule that was rejected.

I only bring up those examples because they are typical regulations that put people out of business that actually came through my committee.

I am here to introduce S.J. Res. 9. This did not come through my committee; it came through a provision that is in the Dodd-Frank bill. Anyone going back to their States and talking to bankers or anyone in the financial industry, when talking about the Dodd-Frank bill, it is an example of the same type of overregulation that takes place on many of the issues that come before my committee.

Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank bill requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to develop a rule that requires companies to report payments made to a foreign government or the U.S. Federal Government relating to the commercial development of oil, natural gas, and minerals. That is a requirement which is not found in our committee, but it is found in the committee that handled the Dodd-Frank bill.

While that may not sound all that significant, it strikes at the heart of American competitiveness. It makes public the information of our very best companies on how to win oil and gas deals. It requires companies to disclose and make public highly confidential and commercially sensitive information, and this is information that foreign competitors don't have to provide. Under this regulation, we would be required to provide it. That means that American companies would have to disclose all of the background and sensitive information that companies develop in competing for contracts of some kind having to do with oil and gasoline. It could be with another country, like Iran. It could be with individuals over there who are not friendly to the United States. Countries that don't wish to disclose the details of their commercial deals would now have a strong incentive to go with companies in countries that don't have that burdensome requirement. That is only natural.

To make matters worse, the SEC's rule lacks an exemption for circumstances in which disclosure under 1504 would violate the laws of a country where a U.S. company is operating. So it leaves U.S. companies with a choice of complying with U.S. laws or the laws of foreign countries. That is an impossible position to be in and could put U.S. employees at risk of criminal prosecution abroad for facilitating the release of this information.

If that weren't enough, the cost of complying with this regulation is enormous. American companies would have to comply, and it could cost millions of dollars. The SEC's estimate of the total compliance cost initially would be up to \$700 million. The ongoing compliance costs would be as much as \$581 million annually. Those costs would be borne by U.S. companies, and our competition would not have to do that.

The courts already struck down this rule when it was first developed in Au-

gust 2012. The DC Federal district court struck down the rule in 2013 because of two substantial errors. Specifically, the Commission had "misread section 1504 to mandate public disclosure of the reports" and had arbitrarily declined to provide an exemption for countries that prohibit disclosure.

The new rule, finalized in June of 2016, doesn't look any different. It is the same rule. Even though the SEC was told by the courts that the rule did not reflect congressional intent, they continued to put out a new rule that had the exact same problems as the one the court had vacated. It is the same rule. It is as if the Obama administration was rushing this rule out in hopes that there wouldn't be time or an opportunity for a court or Congress to overturn it. But here we are in the process of overturning it.

Last week President Trump issued an Executive order to reduce the regulatory impact on American businesses. With this CRA, we have an opportunity to effectively participate in that. Our focus should always be America first. As the Congress looks at the competitiveness of American companies, we should not be subjecting our own citizens to lawsuits, and that is exactly what this regulation would do.

By the way, I think we are going to get a lot of CRAs going forward, and I think it is important for people to understand what the CRA is. The CRA is the Congressional Review Act.

There are a lot of liberal people who like to have power concentrated in Washington—like with the WOTUS rule. They would rather have the jurisdiction of the waters of the United States with the Federal Government instead of with State governments. That is human nature. That is not something up for debate. Everybody knows that.

When individuals who are trying to centralize power in Washington go home and hear complaints from people in their States about regulations and overregulation in our society, their response is, well, that is not us, that is some unelected bureaucrat. A CRA forces Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to be held accountable to the people by having to take a position so that they can't go home and say: No, the regulators are doing this. It is interesting because it puts them in a position where, if we pass a CRA—and we are going to pass S.J. Res. 9—this will come before this body and we will have to say yes or no. Should we do away with this rule that everyone back home is opposed to? It forces them to be honest.

I think this is one CRA that many Democrats should be sponsoring and voting for, and I wouldn't be surprised if we are able to get some cosponsors.

Let me add one last point to outline what this is about. Within the Dodd-Frank bill, section 1504 is a requirement on U.S. companies competing for oil and gas deals throughout the world to disclose to their competition what

goes into their bid and how they are putting it together, even when the other side doesn't have to do that.

I look forward to having the opportunity to bring this to the floor as soon as we get our initial 30 signatures on here. Senators will see and have an opportunity to support this first CRA that I am very excited about.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. CORNYN):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by the Secretary of the Interior relating to stream protection; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 10

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the final rule submitted by the Secretary of the Interior relating to stream protection (81 Fed. Reg. 93066 (December 20, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, the last 6 years have been devastating to local economies across coal country. The Mine Safety and Health Administration has estimated that at least 60,000 coal jobs have been lost since 2011, and thousands of these jobs have been in my home State of West Virginia.

Excessive government regulation and other factors have done more than cost jobs. These policies have imperiled our coal miner retirement benefits, and they have left local governments struggling to keep up to pay for education, to pay for public works, and to pay for law enforcement. I can tell my colleagues story after story I have seen in our newspapers about this very thing.

In October, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee heard testimony from Wayne County, West Virginia commissioner Robert Pasley. He said that the coal severance tax revenues in Wayne County in West Virginia—his county—dropped by 88 percent in 2013 and 2016. This drop left the county without a vital funding source that traditionally helped to pay for local volunteer fire departments, senior citizens programs, and education.

West Virginia University economist John Deskins told the Senate Energy

and Natural Resources Committee in August that six West Virginia counties were suffering a depression—a depression—because of the coal downturn. And just last week, the State of West Virginia projected that its annual State budget faces a \$500 million shortfall.

So what was the response of President Obama's administration in its last days in power? Yet another job-killing and anti-coal regulation that would make a bad situation in my State worse.

The Department of the Interior published its stream protection rule on December 20, 2016, and it made the rule effective on January 19, 2017—just 1 day before President Obama left office. There is a lot of irony here, and I don't think it is by chance. According to a National Mining Association Study, one-third of remaining coal jobs could be placed at risk by the rule.

Today I am proud to join Leader MCCONNELL as he introduces the Stream Protection Congressional Review Act. We are also joined by my colleagues in the West Virginia congressional delegation, including Congressman DAVID MCKINLEY and Congressman EVAN JENKINS, and others. We are going to be introducing a resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act, blocking the Obama administration's stream protection rule.

Once this resolution of disapproval is passed by Congress—and I believe that it will be, and signed by President Trump, which I believe that it will be—I am confident that both things will happen: The stream protection rule will be nullified, and the Department of the Interior will be prohibited from imposing a similar rule without permission from Congress.

The stream protection rule deserves to be eliminated through the Congressional Review Act process. Despite its title—because why would we get rid of something called the stream protection rule—this rule will do little to actually protect our streams, but if left in place, this rule would cost even more coal jobs in my State and across the country that have already been devastated.

West Virginia's former Department of Environmental Protection secretary Randy Huffman told the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, on which I served last Congress, that the proposed version of the stream protection rule was “an unnecessary, uncalled for political gesture.”

I would like to say that Secretary Huffman was serving under a Democratic Governor in my State.

The stream protection rule is the result of an incredibly flawed regulatory process that excluded State officials. Of the 10 States that began the regulatory process—people were asked to join together to begin this process—working with the Department of the Interior's Office of Surface Mining, eight of those States eventually removed themselves from the process be-

cause of the Department's unwillingness to actually seriously consider their input. In other words, they were just there for window dressing.

Ohio's chief of Mineral Resources Management Larry Erdos told the Environment and Public Works Committee last February that “OSM has not provided for meaningful participation with the cooperating or commenting agency states.”

Congress took action to instruct the Department of the Interior to reengage with the States, realizing what was happening here, before moving forward with this rulemaking process. However, despite this direction from lawmakers in the Congress, the Department failed to address the State concerns.

Wyoming director of Environmental Quality, Todd Parfitt, told the Energy and Natural Resources Committee that “the failure to engage cooperating agencies throughout this process is reflected in the poor quality of the proposed rule.” He called on the Office of Surface Mining to withdraw the rule and reengage with States and other stakeholders.

Last week, West Virginia's newly appointed secretary of Environmental Protection—again under a new Democratic Governor—Austin Caperton wrote to congressional leaders detailing our State's concerns with the stream protection rule. Secretary Caperton gave three main reasons for West Virginia's opposition to this rule.

First, he said that the rule upsets the statutory balance between environmental protection and allowing coal mining to take place in the first place. Second, the rule conflicts with the congressionally directed role of the States to be the exclusive regulators of mining activities. And third, the rule conflicts with the Federal Clean Water Act and State water quality standards—pretty broad-ranging concerns.

The concerns from environmental regulators in mining States across the country explain why 14 States, including the State of West Virginia, have already filed lawsuits to stop this stream protection rule. Fifteen State attorneys general, led by West Virginia's attorney general Patrick Morrisey, have written to Congress asking that this rule be blocked using the Congressional Review Act.

State environmental regulators are not alone in their opposition to this rule. Cecil Roberts, who is the president of the United Mine Workers of America, wrote just last week in support of this resolution of disapproval. He said that “the last thing America's coal-producing regions need at this time is another regulation that will have the effect of reducing employment even more and further stifling economic development.”

West Virginia cannot afford another job-killing regulation that once again inserts Washington and their one-size-fits-all standard into a regulatory process that is supposed to be effectively managed—and is effectively managed—by our State agencies.

The stream protection rule is a flawed policy that was born out of a flawed process.

The rule deserves to be eliminated promptly, and I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor the McConnell-Capito resolution of disapproval and to vote to block the rule in the coming days.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. SASSE):

S.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the resolution of disapproval I am introducing today via the Congressional Review Act repeals a Social Security regulation that unfairly stigmatizes people with disabilities. It also violates the fundamental nature of the Second Amendment.

The Second Amendment recognizes the God-given right to self-defense. In order to take away that right, the government must have a compelling interest. Furthermore, the law of regulation to achieve that compelling interest must be narrowly tailored. In other words, the government better have one heck of a good reason for going against the Second Amendment.

The Justice Department, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Social Security Administration have not protected Second Amendment rights adequately under the previous administration. Our fundamental Second Amendment rights were constantly under attack.

For example, hundreds of thousands of veterans have been reported to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System without due process. Of course, that system amounts to a national gun ban list for those reported erroneously. Veterans were reported without first having a neutral authority find them to be a danger to self or others and thus have a legitimate right to deny them their Second Amendment rights. According to the government, the veterans needed a fiduciary to manage benefit payments. That is not a sufficient reason under the law. Needing help with your finances—simply needing that help—should not mean you have surrendered your fundamental right of self-defense, and it doesn't mean that you are a danger to the public.

On May 17, 2016, Senator DURBIN and I debated my amendment that would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to first find veterans to be a danger before reporting their name to the

gun ban list. During the course of that debate, Senator DURBIN admitted that the list was broader than it should have been. Senator DURBIN said: "Let me just concede at the outset, reporting 174,000 names goes too far, but eliminating 174,000 names goes too far."

For the record, there were 260,381 names from the Veterans' Administration sent to the gun ban list for allegedly being in the "mental defective" category. Now, it just happens that this was 98.8 percent of all the names in that category. So the Veterans' Administration reported more names by far than any other agency.

Senator DURBIN's staff and mine have met over these issues since that debate. I appreciate and thank Senator DURBIN for that outreach, and I want to work together with him to solve these problems for the VA. But now, the Social Security Administration is about to make the same mistake as the Veterans' Administration; that is, unless we stop them right here and right now with this resolution of disapproval. If we don't stop this, it could lead to hundreds of thousands of Social Security recipients being improperly reported to the gun ban list.

At its core, Social Security's new regulation allows the agency to report people to the gun ban list under two circumstances. First, the beneficiary needs to have someone designated to help manage benefit payments. That sounds like the VA; right?

Two, the beneficiary has an affliction based on a broad "disorders list." But the process for designating someone to help a recipient manage Social Security benefits is not a process that is very objective. But the process for designating someone to help a recipient manage their Social Security benefit should be objective.

The former Social Security Administration inspector general said the following last year in testimony about this process that offends us here in the Senate and is the reason of this resolution: "It's not a scientific decision, it's more of a personal opinion."

This "personal opinion" of a bureaucrat cannot be the basis for taking away a person's fundamental Second Amendment right to bear arms.

Further, the second element—the so-called "disorders list"—is a convoluted mess of afflictions that may or may not cause someone to be considered dangerous. Many of the listed disorders also do not impact gun safety at all. For example, some afflictions deal with anxiety disorders, fear of large crowds, or a lack of self-esteem. The list is complex, the list is long, and the list is not designed to regulate firearms. Rather, the list is designed to regulate whether a person can manage his or her beneficiary payments—in other words, can they handle money.

But here is the essential question that the Federal Government is incapable of answering. If they aren't dangerous, why does the Social Security

Administration, like the VA, want to take away their guns?

The National Council on Disability, a nonpartisan and independent Federal agency, has come out against the Social Security Administration's rule and in favor of the repeal that this resolution of disapproval will accomplish. The Council has repeatedly stated its concerns about the agency failing to determine that people are dangerous before reporting their names to the gun ban list.

It has been the National Council on Disability's "long-held position that restrictions on gun possession and ownership based on psychiatric or intellectual disability must be based on a verifiable concern as to whether the individual poses a heightened risk of danger to themselves or others."

The Council has also stated that the rule "unnecessarily and unreasonably deprives individuals with disabilities of a constitutional right, it increases the stigma for those who, due to their disabilities, may need a representative payee."

Another organization, the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, a coalition of 100 national disability groups, shares the same concerns about the regulation about which we are having this resolution of disapproval: "The current public dialogue is replete with inaccurate stereotyping of people with mental disabilities as violent and dangerous, and there is a real concern that the kind of policy change encompassed by this rule will reinforce those unfounded assumptions."

With that being said, even the ACLU wrote a letter in opposition to the agency regulation. I ask unanimous consent that these letters, as well as others, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Simply stated, the agency rule uses a massive regulatory net that captures innocent individuals who should be left alone. Just because a person is assigned a fiduciary does not make that person or those persons dangerous. Whenever the government tries to eliminate fundamental constitutional rights, it is required to narrowly tailor its regulatory action so that innocent people are not impacted. The Social Security regulation fails in that regard.

That is why both the National Council on Disability and the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities have called specifically for using the Congressional Review Act to repeal the final rule. That is what our introduction of resolution will accomplish.

Constitutional due process is wholly lacking. For example, the agency does not afford a beneficiary a formal hearing before his or her name is reported to the gun ban list.

Now, think about that. The Second Amendment, which recognizes a fundamental constitutional right, is being simply ripped away without a formal dispute process to initially challenge the action. Instead, the beneficiary

must wait until their name is already on the gun ban list, and only then can the beneficiary appeal the decision by the grace of the government. This process effectively reverses what should be a burden on the government. The government should not be able to strip a fundamental constitutional right without due process and then place the burden on the citizen to try to restore it.

A hearing should be afforded before the infringement of a fundamental right, not afterward. The burden must be on the government to prove its case. That simply is the American way—our Constitution's way.

The Social Security Administration regulation falsely claims that it requires an adjudication before reporting names to the gun ban list, but there is no hearing afforded to the Social Security recipient before placing a name on the gun ban list. Of course, without a hearing, that process cannot honestly be called an adjudication. In other words, the Social Security Administration is blowing blue smoke when they say that. Without an adjudication, the process violates Federal law.

Here is the kicker. In order for beneficiaries to remove their names from the gun ban list, they have to prove they are not dangerous. Guilty until proven innocent, and the burden is on you to prove your innocence. Any way you look at it, that is totally unfair, a violation of the Constitution, but common sense ought to tell everybody it is just plain wrong.

The Federal Government, under the Obama administration, treated Social Security recipients with contempt and disregard when this rule was put out. With our resolution of disapproval, we can effectively terminate this unconstitutional government regulation, which the new Trump Administration supports. I encourage all of my colleagues to support our efforts.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND SPEAKER RYAN: I write on behalf of the National Council on Disability (NCD) regarding the final rule the Social Security Administration (SSA) released on December 19th, 2016, implementing provisions of the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) Improvement Amendments Act of 2007, 81 FR 91702. In accordance with our mandate to advise the President, Congress, and other federal agencies regarding policies, programs, practices, and procedures that affect people with disabilities, NCD submitted comments to SSA on the proposed rule on June 30th, 2016. In our comments, we cautioned against implementation of the proposed rule because:

[t]here is, simply put, no nexus between the inability to manage money and the ability to safely and responsibly own, possess or use a firearm. This arbitrary linkage not

only unnecessarily and unreasonably deprives individuals with disabilities of a constitutional right, it increases the stigma for those who, due to their disabilities, may need a representative payee.]

Despite our objections and that of many other individuals and organizations received by SSA regarding the proposed rule, the final rule released in late December was largely unchanged. Because of the importance of the constitutional right at stake and the very real stigma that this rule legitimizes, NCD recommends that Congress consider utilizing the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to repeal this rule.

NCD is a nonpartisan, independent federal agency with no stated position with respect to gun-ownership or gun-control other than our long-held position that restrictions on gun possession or ownership based on psychiatric or intellectual disability must be based on a verifiable concern as to whether the individual poses a heightened risk of danger to themselves or others if they are in possession of a weapon. Additionally, it is critically important that any restriction on gun possession or ownership on this basis is imposed only after the individual has been afforded due process and given an opportunity to respond to allegations that they are not able to safely possess or own a firearm due to his or her disability. NCD believes that SSA's final rule falls far short of meeting these criteria.

Additionally, as NCD also cautioned SSA in our comments on the proposed rule, we have concerns regarding the ability of SSA to fairly and effectively implement this rule—assuming it would be possible to do so—given the long-standing issues SSA already has regarding long delays in adjudication and difficulty in providing consistent, prompt service to beneficiaries with respect to its core mission. This rule creates an entirely new function for an agency that has long noted that it has not been given sufficient resources to do the important work it is already charged with doing. With all due respect to SSA, our federal partner, this rule is simply a bridge too far. In fact, it is conceivable that attempts to implement this rule may strain the already scarce administrative resources available to the agency, further impairing its ability to carry out its core mission.

The CRA is a powerful mechanism for controlling regulatory overreach, and NCD urges its use advisedly and cautiously. In this particular case, the potential for real harm to the constitutional rights of people with psychiatric and intellectual disabilities is grave as is the potential to undermine the essential mission of an agency that millions of people with and without disabilities rely upon to meet their basic needs. Therefore, in this instance, NCD feels that utilizing the CRA to repeal the final rule is not only warranted, but necessary.

Regards,

CLYDE E. TERRY,
Chair.

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS
WITH DISABILITIES,
January 26, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: The Co-Chairs of the Rights Task Force of the Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) urge you to support a Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution to disapprove the Final Rule issued by the Social Security Administration

(SSA) on December 19, 2016, "Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007." This rule would require the Social Security Administration to forward the names of all Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefit recipients who use a representative payee to help manage their benefits due to a mental impairment to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) is the largest coalition of national organizations working together to advocate for Federal public policy that ensures the self-determination, independence, empowerment, integration and inclusion of children and adults with disabilities in all aspects of society.

Prior to the issuance of the Final Rule, the CCD Rights Task Force conveyed its opposition to the rule through a letter to the Obama Administration and through the public comment process. We—and many other members of CCD—opposed the rule for a number of reasons, including:

The damaging message that may be sent by a SSA policy change, which focused on reporting individuals who receive assistance from representative payees in managing their benefits to the NICS gun database. The current public dialogue is replete with inaccurate stereotyping of people with mental disabilities as violent and dangerous, and there is a real concern that the kind of policy change encompassed by this rule will reinforce those unfounded assumptions.

The absence of any data suggesting that there is any connection between the need for a representative payee to manage one's Social Security disability benefits and a propensity toward gun violence.

The absence of any meaningful due process protections prior to the SSA's transmittal of names to the NICS database. Although the NICS Improvements Act of 2007 allows agencies to transmit the names of individuals who have been "adjudicated" to lack the capacity to manage their own affairs, SSA's process does not constitute an adjudication and does not include a finding that individuals are broadly unable to manage their own affairs.

Based on similar concerns, the National Council on Disability an independent federal agency charged with advising the President, Congress, and other federal agencies regarding disability policy, has urged Congress to use the Congressional Review Act to repeal this rule.

We urge Congress to act, through the CRA process, to disapprove this new rule and prevent the damage that it inflicts on the disability community.

On behalf of the CCD Rights Task Force, the undersigned Co-Chairs,

DARA BALDWIN,
National Disability
Rights Network.

SAMANTHA CRANE,
Autistic Self-Advocacy
Network.

SANDY FINUCANE,
Epilepsy Foundation
Law.

JENNIFER MATHIS,
Bazelon Center for
Mental Health.

MARK RICHERT,
American Foundation
for the Blind.

THE JUDGE DAVID L. BAZELON CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH LAW,

January 30, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Dear MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: The Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law urges you to support a Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution to disapprove the Final Rule issued by the Social Security Administration (SSA) on December 19, 2016, "Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007." The Center is a national legal advocacy organization that protects and advances the rights of adults and children with mental disabilities.

This rule would require the Social Security Administration to forward the names of Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefit recipients who use a representative payee to help manage their benefits due to a mental impairment to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

The rule is inconsistent with the statute it implements, has no evidentiary justification, would wrongly perpetuate inaccurate stereotypes of individuals with mental disabilities as dangerous, and would divert already too-scarce SSA resources away from efforts to address the agency's longstanding backlog of unprocessed benefits applications toward a mission in which the agency has little expertise.

First, there is no statutory basis for the rule. The National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) statute authorizes the reporting of an individual to the NICS database on the basis of a determination that the person "lacks the capacity to contract or manage his own affairs" as a result of "marked subnormal intelligence, or mental illness, incompetency, condition or disease." The appointment of a representative payee simply does not meet this standard. It indicates only that the individual needs help managing benefits received from SSA.

Second, the rule puts in place an ineffective strategy to address gun violence, devoid of any evidentiary basis, targeting individuals with representative payees and mental impairments as potential perpetrators of gun violence. In doing so, it also creates a false sense that meaningful action has been taken to address gun violence and detracts from potential prevention efforts targeting actual risks for gun violence.

Third, the rule perpetuates the prevalent false association of mental disabilities with violence and undermines important efforts to promote community integration and employment of people with disabilities. The rule may also dissuade people with mental impairments from seeking appropriate treatment or services, or from applying for financial and medical assistance programs.

Finally, the rule creates enormous new burdens on SSA without providing any additional resources. Implementation of the rule will divert scarce resources away from the core work of the SSA at a time when the agency is struggling to overcome record backlogs and prospective beneficiaries are waiting for months and years for determinations of their benefits eligibility. Moreover, SSA lacks the expertise to make the determinations about safety that it would be called upon to make as part of the relief process established by the rule.

Based on similar concerns, the National Council on Disability, an independent federal agency charged with advising the President,

Congress, and other federal agencies regarding disability policy, has urged Congress to use the Congressional Review Act to repeal this rule. We urge Congress to act, through the CRA process, to disapprove this new rule and prevent the damage that it inflicts on the disability community.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER MATHIS,
Director of Policy and Legal Advocacy.

AAPD,
January 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Democratic Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: The American Association of People with Disabilities (AAPD) urges you to support a Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution to disapprove the Final Rule issued by the Social Security Administration (SSA) on December 19, 2016, "Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007." This rule would require the Social Security Administration to forward the names of all Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefit recipients who use a representative payee to help manage their benefits due to a mental impairment to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

AAPD is a national disability rights organization that works to improve the lives of people with disabilities by acting as a convener, connector, and catalyst for change, increasing the economic and political power of people with disabilities.

Prior to the issuance of the Final Rule, AAPD conveyed its opposition to the rule to the Obama Administration. We, and many other disability rights organizations, opposed the rule for a number of reasons, including:

The damaging message that may be sent by a SSA policy change, which focused on reporting individuals who receive assistance from representative payees in managing their benefits to the NICS gun database. The current public dialogue is replete with inaccurate stereotyping of people with mental disabilities as violent and dangerous, and there is a real concern that the kind of policy change encompassed by this rule will reinforce those unfounded assumptions.

The absence of any data suggesting that there is any connection between the need for a representative payee to manage one's Social Security disability benefits and a propensity toward gun violence.

The absence of any meaningful due process protections prior to the SSA's transmittal of names to the NICS database. Although the NICS Improvements Act of 2007 allows agencies to transmit the names of individuals who have been "adjudicated" to lack the capacity to manage their own affairs, SSA's process does not constitute an adjudication and does not include a finding that individuals are broadly unable to manage their own affairs.

AAPD urges Congress to act, through the CRA process, to disapprove this new rule to prevent the damage that it inflicts on the disability community and the extraordinarily damaging message it sends to society that people with mental impairments could should be feared and shunned.

Thank you for taking our position into consideration. If you have any questions or

concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 521-4315 or at hberger@aapd.com.

Yours truly,

HELENA R. BERGER,
President & CEO.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 28—DESIGNATING JANUARY 27, 2017, AS "EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT AWARENESS DAY"

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 28

Whereas the earned income tax credit is a refundable Federal tax credit available to low- and moderate-income working families and individuals;

Whereas the earned income tax credit encourages and rewards work;

Whereas, in 2015, the earned income tax credit lifted approximately 6,500,000 people out of poverty, including approximately 3,300,000 children;

Whereas the earned income tax credit provides substantial economic benefit to local economies; and

Whereas an estimated 20 percent of eligible workers do not claim the earned income tax credit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates Friday, January 27, 2017, as "Earned Income Tax Credit Awareness Day"; and

(2) calls on Federal, State, and local agencies, community organizations, nonprofit organizations, employers, and other partners to help increase awareness about the earned income tax credit and other refundable tax credits to ensure that all eligible workers have access to the full benefits of the credits.

SENATE RESOLUTION 29—RECOGNIZING JANUARY 28, 2017, AS "NATIONAL DATA PRIVACY DAY"

Mr. DAINES submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as an engineer who worked at a cloud computing company for 13 years, I have seen firsthand how technology has become an integral part of our everyday lives. Innovative products and services have made it easier than ever to learn, communicate, and to share our data with others.

Personal data has become a form of currency, and the sharing of personal information may compromise privacy if appropriate protective action is not taken. That is why I am proud to recognize January 28, 2017; as National Data Privacy Day. Each year, our Nation recognizes this day as an opportunity for private organizations, governments, and individuals to work together to raise awareness and promote privacy and data protection best practices.

I am pleased to recognize this day and am committed to working with my colleagues to ensure the privacy of individuals is protected.

S. RES. 29

Whereas, on January 28, 2017, National Data Privacy Day is recognized;

Whereas technology has enhanced our ability to communicate, learn, and work and is now a part of our everyday lives;

Whereas personal information has become a form of currency;

Whereas it is easier now than ever before to share personal information with friends, colleagues, and companies;

Whereas the sharing of personal information may compromise the privacy of individuals if appropriate protective action is not taken;

Whereas governments, corporations, and individuals have a role in protecting the privacy of individuals; and

Whereas National Data Privacy Day constitutes a nationwide effort to educate and raise awareness about respecting privacy and safeguarding data: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes January 28, 2017, as "National Data Privacy Day"; and

(2) encourages governments, individuals, privacy professionals, educators, corporations, and other relevant organizations to take steps to protect the privacy of individuals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

PROGRAM

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, the Senate is about to adjourn.

Under the standing order, we will convene at 12 noon tomorrow. Following the prayer and pledge, we will proceed to the consideration of the Chao nomination under the previous order. Following disposition of the Chao nomination, we will continue consideration of the Tillerson nomination postcloture.

VOTE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. FLAKE. I move to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:48 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 31, 2017, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICK MULVANEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE SHAUN L. S. DONOVAN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MS. ELIZABETH BASILE

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Representative HUFFMAN, rise today to honor Ms. Elizabeth Basile and her extraordinary life devoted to education and activism. Her family and friends are gathered with her today in Santa Rosa, California to honor her years of dedicated service to our community.

Ms. Basile is a native of Stockton, California, and spent much of her early childhood in Brooklyn, New York. At sixteen, her family returned to California, and she spent the rest of her adolescence in Los Angeles. After marrying and starting a family of her own, Ms. Basile enrolled in college at the age of thirty and earned her Bachelor's Degree in English and History and her Master's Degree in Reading Specialization at California State University, Los Angeles.

Ms. Basile began teaching in East Los Angeles at El Sereno Junior High School. After her family moved to Sonoma County, she continued her teaching career at Casa Grande High School until she retired in 1992. The California Teachers Association recruited Ms. Basile during her first year of teaching, and she rose through the ranks to become Chapter President of the Association of Petaluma Teachers.

In addition to Ms. Basile's dedication to education, she displayed an exceptional commitment to the Girl Scouts youth organization in our community. She served as her daughter's troop leader for a decade, and worked as a Camp Counselor for Kamp Konocti, a Girl Scout Council's established camp, and volunteered at the Girl Scouts Day Camp in the Whittier area. She proudly maintains her lifetime Girl Scouts membership to this day.

President John F. Kennedy inspired Ms. Basile to engage in politics. She became a Precinct Captain during his 1960 presidential campaign, and she coordinated with several leaders across California to organize canvasses and phone banks. Ms. Basile has since been involved in every presidential election to register Democrats and get voters to the polls, and she is one of the best known figures in our Sonoma County political community.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Basile has dedicated her life to local activism and the betterment of children through education and volunteer work in our community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Friday we commemorate Holocaust Remem-

brance Day. A day that was established by the Israeli Parliament in 1951, to coincide with the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.

This is a time we mourn the loss of more than 6 million Jews and the many other victims of the Holocaust. It serves as an annual reminder to Americans, and indeed to all humanity, that we must never forget the evil that mankind has visited upon itself.

History must serve as a template to right the wrongs that humankind has committed. Famously said, those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

This week we must reflect on grave consequences of which vilifying individuals, based on race, religion, ideology or sexual orientation, could yield.

I encourage all those in Western New York and across the country to join in memorializing the victims of the Holocaust, in hope that a tragedy of this scale is never committed again.

CONGRATULATING THE WEST ORANGE-STARK MUSTANGS FOR THEIR STATE CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY

HON. BRIAN BABIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the West Orange-Stark Mustangs for winning back to back football state championships, along with their fourth state title in school history on December 16, 2016 at AT&T Stadium in Arlington, Texas. The task of winning repeating championships and maintaining a twenty-seven game winning streak is extremely difficult in Texas football. Not to mention, West Orange-Stark is currently the twenty-third high school team in Texas history to score over eight hundred points in a season. These young men have shown incredible persistence, hard work, passion and commitment to accomplish this feat and I applaud each and every one of them. I would like to personally recognize each one of them and their coaches.

Players: Keyshawn Holman, Jackson Dallas, Kentavious Miller, Dominique Tezeno, Justin Brown, Malick Phillips, Mandel Turner-King, Chaka Watson, Jarron Morris, Kaleb Ramsey, Davien Teate, Ronald Carter, Jeremiah Shaw, Kayven Cooper, Jay'len Matthews, Teshau Teel, Keion Hancock, Ja'Vonn Ross, Mark Thibodeaux, Demorris Thibodeaux, Tyshon Watkins, Ryan Baham-Heisser, Cory Skinner, Paulino Santos, Justin Sibley, Chad Dallas, Ryan Ragsdale, Jalen Powderill, Ja'Qualan Coleman, Te'ron Brown, Paul Ivory, Jerrick Spencer, Ja'Corry Brady, Morris Joseph, Bobby Rash, Chris Griffin, Adrik Mims, Rufus Joseph, Anthony Griffin, and Blake Robinson; Superintendent: Rickie Harris; Principal: Rod Anderson; Athletic Director/Head Coach: Cornel Thompson; Defensive Coordinator: Mike Pierce; Offensive Coordinator: Ed Dyer; Assistant Coaches: Del Basinger, Terry Joe

Ramsey, Joseph Viator, Hiawatha Hickman, Justin Trahan, Rick Butler, Russell Bottley and Depauldrick Garrett; Athletic Trainer: Nic Tanner

I wish each one of them continued success on and off the football field. Go Mustangs!

THE SWEARING IN OF SAN FRANCISCO POLICE CHIEF WILLIAM "BILL" SCOTT

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Chief William "Bill" Scott on his swearing in as San Francisco Chief of Police on January 17, 2017.

Chief Scott spent much of his career in law enforcement in the Los Angeles Police Department. He was first appointed to the Department in 1989, and has worked assignments across the spectrum of police work, from patrol to detective to gang intervention. He has served LAPD in the Operations West Bureau, Internal Affairs, Professional Standards Bureau, the Office of Operations, and as Patrol Commanding Officer and Area Commanding Officer.

He was promoted to the rank of Commander in 2012, and was assigned as the Assistant Commanding Officer, Operations in the West Bureau. Prior to his selection as San Francisco Chief of Police, Chief Scott served as the Assistant Commanding Officer for Operations in the South Bureau, which covers much of my district.

He brings a wealth of experience to his new role, including his service during periods when the LAPD was under significant public scrutiny. Chief Scott is a graduate of the Senior Management Institute of Policing (SMIP), and has a Bachelor of Science degree in accounting.

I appreciate Chief Scott's commitment to public service and his focus on community. As he embarks on a new phase of service to the City of San Francisco, I would like to thank him for his work here and wish him all the best as he undertakes his new responsibilities.

IN RECOGNITION OF LAWRENCE C. MALSKI, RECIPIENT OF THE 2017 NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA EMINENT EAGLE AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lawrence C. Malski, who on January 27 received the Eminent Eagle Award from the Northeastern Pennsylvania Council

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

Boy Scouts of America. The Eminent Eagle Award recognizes an Eagle Scout from Northeastern Pennsylvania who is a role model for all Scouts who aspire to achieve the rank of Eagle.

An Eagle Scout since 1966, Larry has long been a leader in his community. Throughout his life, he has been devoted to service and committed to excellence. In 1972, Larry graduated with the highest honors from Penn State University with a degree in Transportation/Traffic Management and Labor-Management Relations. He received his Juris Doctorate from the Temple University School of Law in 1977. Larry is admitted to the Pennsylvania Bar, New York Bar, and admitted to practice before the District Court in Eastern Pennsylvania and Northern New York.

Larry is the President of the Pennsylvania Northeast Regional Railroad Authority, which manages the region's 100-mile railroad system. Formed in 2006, the Pennsylvania Northeast Regional Railroad Authority was established by the merger of Lackawanna and Monroe Counties' Rail Authorities. Before the merger, Larry served as Lackawanna County Railroad Authority's Executive Director and General Counsel for twenty-two years. He also consulted with the Monroe County Railroad Authority, advising them on transportation funding, policy, and administration. Throughout his career, Larry has been a leading figure in the effort to reinstate commuter rail in between northern New Jersey/New York City and the Poconos and greater Scranton/Wilkes-Barre.

Larry has a long record of service to his community. He is one of fifteen members of the Surface Transportation Board (STB) Railroad-Shipper Transportation Advisory Council. The Council often advises the Secretary of Transportation, Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and the STB Chairman on matters of regulation, policy, and legislation. Larry currently serves as Chairman of the Pennsylvania Rail Freight Advisory Committee. Appointed by Governor Casey in 1989, Larry has helped that statewide committee advise the governor, legislature, and PennDOT on rail freight preservation and development in Pennsylvania. He has also served on the boards of the County of Lackawanna Transit System, the Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce Transportation subcommittee, the Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Company, the PennDOT Lackawanna/Luzerne Transportation Study Committee, the Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania, the Bi-State Rail Project Technical Committee, and Penn's Northeast industrial development corporation.

It is an honor to recognize Larry Malski for upholding the values of the Boy Scouts of America. I extend my warmest congratulations to him for receiving the Eminent Eagle Award for 2017.

IN RECOGNITION OF ASIAN RESOURCES INC.'S 15TH ANNUAL LUNAR DINNER

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Asian Resources, Inc. as they cele-

brate their 15th Annual Lunar Dinner and tonight's honorees. As the members of Asian Resources, Inc. mark this momentous occasion, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring them for their long history of service to youth, immigrants, and refugees in our community.

Since 1980, Asian Resources, Inc. has served as an invaluable organization for members of disenfranchised communities in our region. Their work providing social services has empowered countless individuals and families in our region who have turned to them for support. Asian Resources, Inc. has helped individuals obtain jobs, improve their language skills, and become pro-active citizens. I am incredibly grateful to have a community partner like Asian Resources.

Tonight, Asian Resources, Inc. will also recognize community members and leaders who have contributed to the mission of Asian Resources. I would like to offer my congratulations to Elaine Abelaye-Mateo, who is receiving the May O. Lee Award for her work with Asian Resources and as one of the Founding Committee members of their RISE fund. I would also like to say congratulations to Marielle Tsukamoto, who is receiving the Community Impact Award. As the past president of JAFL, Florin Chapter, Murielle has been a strong leader, a dedicated educator, and a community advocate. Finally, I would like to offer my congratulations to Sacramento County Supervisor, Patrick Kennedy who is receiving the Community Partners Award for his work with Asian Resources, Inc. Each of these leaders truly makes a difference in our community every single day.

Mr. Speaker, as the members of Asian Resources, Inc. celebrate their 15th Annual Lunar Dinner and honor tonight's awards recipients, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring them for their dedication to serving new Americans and established citizens in the Sacramento area.

HONORING DR. AARON THORNTON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Aaron Thornton, whom the Napa and Solano County Medical Societies have nominated for its Physician of the Year Award. Dr. Thornton has worked in our community for over 25 years. He previously worked in the Vallejo Medical Center as a hospitalist, and now works as a general internist in the Permanente Medical Group.

The Napa County Medical Society has named Dr. Thornton as the Napa County Physician of the Year based on his tireless dedication to patients and the advancement of the medical profession. Dr. Thornton exemplifies these attributes and is very deserving of this award and recognition.

In addition to his service to our community as a medical health professional, Dr. Thornton is a prolific volunteer in our community. Every year, he can be found assisting runners in the Napa Marathon medical area. He has served as a local scout master and instructor with the Boy Scouts of America. Dr. Thornton works with Napa County's Managing Pain Safely

Project, which ensures that clinicians prescribe opioids safely and appropriately.

Dr. Thornton also regularly volunteers abroad. For the past 15 years, he has partnered with missions in Haiti to care for hundreds of people who live in cities without access to hospital services. Dr. Thornton even enlists volunteers to accompany him on these trips and collects supplies needed to provide important medical services to Haitians. Recently, Dr. Thornton also traveled to Kenya to provide medical training to local students.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thornton has dedicated his time and knowledge to the medical field and some of the most vulnerable people in our community and across the world. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today and congratulate him on this well-deserved award.

DAZZLERS AND JV CHARMS
DANCE AT BLACK TIE AND
BOOTS INAUGURAL GALA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the lessons learned through the advice of a mentor or coach is often invaluable. For those involved in dance, a director's guidance reaches far beyond the performance. The leadership of a director not only improves a dancer's performance but works to instill values of hard work and discipline. I would like to honor identical twins from Baytown, Texas, Marisa and Larisa Coy, for representing the state of Texas and our country, with honor and dignity during the Black Tie and Boots Inaugural Gala in Washington, D.C. on January 19, 2017.

Under the sisters' direction, all state dancer Jailene Marquez, was selected and performed at the Black Tie and Boots Inaugural Gala. Jailene is the captain of the Goose Creek Memorial High School Dazzlers. Marisa and Larisa are the co-directors of the Dazzlers and JV Charms. They prepared Jailene for her performance and helped fund this once in a lifetime trip. Their support says volumes about their generosity and spirit.

Marisa and Larisa graduated from Ross Sterling High School in Baytown. They continued their education at Lee Community College then transferred to the University of Houston where they both earned a bachelor's degree in education. After college, they returned to their hometown to teach math at Goose Creek Consolidated Independent School District.

While attending college, the sisters decided to try out for the Houston Texans cheerleading squad. They both made the squad! Through hard work and determination they juggled appearances, community events, charity functions, and team practices for the next five years. During this time, they had the opportunity to go overseas to visit our troops in Iraq. Being from a patriotic family the sisters were honored that the National Football League included them in this tour.

I commend these remarkable women for their exemplary service and dedication to teaching our nation's youth and for aspiring dancers to follow their dreams. I wish them both the best of luck as they continue on their journey. I am always proud to see fellow Texans succeed.

RECOGNIZING MR. SCOTT GRAVES

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Scott Graves, staff director of the House Agriculture Committee. After ten years of service on the Hill, Scott is leaving his post at the committee.

I met Scott four years ago when I was a freshman member of the committee and he was Chief of Staff for Chairman CONAWAY. Our staffs worked together closely, and Scott became a trusted advisor to our team as we navigated passage of the Farm Bill. When Mr. CONAWAY became chairman of the committee, I was pleased that he elevated Scott to staff director. Scott has gone above and beyond to make the Agriculture Committee one of the best run committees in the House. Under his leadership, Chairman CONAWAY has passed every bill up for reauthorization and held an unprecedented number of hearings in his first two years. I am grateful to have worked with Scott as a Subcommittee Chairman during the last two years and to be part of this dynamic team.

I wish Scott and his family well as he pursues the next chapter in his career and look forward to seeing the work he will continue to do on behalf of our country's farmers. Good luck Scott and thank you for your service to the House.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF BEN
RUSSO**HON. JACKIE WALORSKI**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Ben Russo. When Ben passed away one year ago today, Elkhart lost a devoted member of the community, and I lost a good friend.

Ben found great success in the private sector, working in various sales and management positions, including as vice president of E.J. Nagy and Associates. In retirement, Ben became quite active in the community, being elected to the Osolo Township Board and later becoming the Trustee of Osolo Township. He sat on the boards of The Boys and Girls Club of Elkhart, Council of Aging, and Riverview Adult Day Care Center. Finally, he was vice president of Elkhart Vintage Auto Club and president of Glenwood Park Civic Association, as well as an active member of Elkhart Trinity United Methodist Church.

Always looking to give back to the community that he loved, Ben became a household name in Elkhart as someone who would do his best to help those in need. In the Trustee's office, he worked tirelessly on behalf of Osolo Township residents, and was determined to treat everyone with respect. Even when out with his beloved family, he would find people he knew and could help, and he would drop everything to see that their needs were met.

As a recognition of his service to the community, Ben was honored with the prestigious Sagamore of the Wabash Award, the highest

civilian honor bestowed by the State of Indiana. Despite his distinguished career and place in the community, Ben was a humble and kind man. Today Elkhart is better for his public service, and his legacy of hard work and giving back to the community will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the life of Ben Russo and his service to the northern Indiana community. His passion for helping others strengthened Elkhart and improved the lives of everyone he knew. I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating his life and recognizing his outstanding public service.

RECOGNIZING MS. LACEY BROWN
AS THE 2016-2017 ESCAMBIA
COUNTY TEACHER OF THE YEAR**HON. MATT GAETZ**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Lacey Brown as the 2016-2017 Escambia County Teacher of the Year. For four years, Ms. Brown has served the Escambia County School District with exceptional passion and an unwavering commitment to serving others.

In Northwest Florida, we are fortunate to have some of the best teachers in the Nation. It is recognized that the teaching profession is one of the most difficult yet rewarding professions in existence. Ms. Brown has exceptionally performed her teaching duties, while also striving to be an active and supportive member of her community.

Ms. Brown is revered by her principal and colleagues at Jim Allen Elementary in Cantonment, Florida. She was chosen to receive this honor because of her exemplary classroom management, thoughtful employment of unique teaching techniques, and her effective engagement of students through the use of technology in the classroom. Her support and outreach extends far beyond the walls of her third grade classroom through her willingness to serve as a supervising teacher to University of West Florida Student Teachers. Through her position as grade level chair, Ms. Brown has also displayed remarkable leadership and dedicated teamwork. I commend her for her steadfast willingness to serve those that matter most, the students and youth of our Nation.

For all of her admirable contributions, I am truly proud to have Ms. Brown as a constituent in Florida's First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Ms. Lacey Brown for her accomplishments and her commitment to excellence in the Escambia County School District. I thank her for her service and wish her all the best for continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF CRISPY'S BAR
AND GRILL**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Crispy's Bar and Grill for their serv-

ice and contributions to our community. I would like to congratulate owner Greg Helmandollar on the success of the restaurant and its upcoming inclusion on the Travel Channel's Food Paradise, a show which highlights some of the most unique restaurants in the country.

Located in Kannapolis, North Carolina, Crispy's is a local favorite that features a twist on traditional southern comfort foods and isn't for the faint of heart. Almost everything on its legendary menu is wrapped, covered, or topped with crispy bacon. Since Crispy's opened in 2015, it has been a popular spot for people to gather to connect and share in their love of bacon.

Mr. Helmandollar first began pushing the limits of bacon in 2013 when he created the MasterBacon food truck. After receiving an overwhelming response from the community, he opened Crispy's to expand his offerings and push the boundaries on how many things he could possibly pair with bacon. The menu now contains almost every treat imaginable including bacon wrapped pecan pie, lasagna, and even ice cream sprinkled with bacon.

By following his passion, Mr. Helmandollar has created a brand and achieved success. More importantly, he is a shining example of the American spirit and the type of small business owner that makes our community special. His innovative approach should be an example to others to follow their dreams and pursue what makes them happy. I look forward to joining the nation in watching Food Paradise when their episode airs.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Mr. Helmandollar and his staff on their continued success and wishing them well in the new year.

HONORING DR. EDWARD MARTIN

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Edward Martin, whom the Napa and Solano County Medical Societies have awarded the honor of Professor Emeritus for his years of work as a pediatrician and an educator.

Dr. Martin has worked with the Permanente Medical Group for 16 years. He has served as both Chair of Pediatrics for Napa and Solano and Chair of the Chiefs of Pediatrics for the Northern California region.

The Napa and Solano County Medical Societies award this distinction to medical professionals who have a demonstrated commitment to service and teaching. Dr. Martin exemplifies these attributes and is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Dr. Ed Martin graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles School of Medicine in 1980. He completed a residency in Pediatrics in 1983 and has been certified by the American Board of Pediatrics since 1986. He served as an Adjunct Clinical Professor of Pediatrics for Touro University, where both his students and colleagues recognize him as an excellent teacher and leader within their institution.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Martin has demonstrated an incredible commitment to his students and

the medical profession in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today and congratulate him on this well-deserved award.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAMES
KELLEHER AND A RECORD OF
COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mr. James Kelleher. He is a United States Marine, an Olympic contender, and a champion boxer, but today I take note of his service and a tradition of goodwill that inspired his path. A resident of Scranton, Pennsylvania, James is a role model for the young people of my district. James started boxing when he was nine years old. As a youth, he found encouragement through the United Way of the Lehigh Valley's TeenWorks program, which sponsored his wish to improve a boxing club serving over 100 at-risk children in the heart of an area known for gang activity. For him, the club provided discipline, focus, and a safe place to grow and develop.

For many Americans, being a good citizen is defined by a willingness to do for others. They recognize that some of the greatest rewards in life come when we give our time and talents to improve our communities. There are many programs in our country providing opportunities to be a mentor and model a spirit of giving. I hope others will be inspired by James Kelleher's focus and his charity and ask themselves: What more can I do for others?

HONORING SCOTT GRAVES

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Scott Graves is a proud alumnus of my alma mater, Texas Tech University, and has championed West Texas and agriculture production since he arrived in Washington twelve years ago.

Beginning in his early days with Chairman CONAWAY, Scott worked hard to meet and listen to agriculture producers across the state to learn about their everyday operations and develop policy solutions for the industry.

As Scott grew in his policy expertise and legislative advocacy, he gained the trust and confidence of the agriculture industry and his colleagues on the Hill.

Scott rose quickly as a leader among his peers. Chairman CONAWAY recognized his value and leadership when he promoted him to Chief of Staff and then ultimately Staff Director of the House Agriculture Committee where he has been instrumental in laying the foundation for the 2018 Farm Bill.

I know it will be hard to replace a champion for West Texas and Rural America like Scott. Our region and country have been profoundly blessed by the contributions of Scott C. Graves.

God bless you, Scott, and your family as you step off the Hill to start the next chapter

of your life. And, welcome back to the great state of Texas.

IN RECOGNITION OF SAC-
RAMENTO'S BUSINESS LEADERS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the exceptional honorees of the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce's 122nd Annual Dinner and Business Awards Ceremony. These business leaders have shown an exemplary commitment to the economic growth and advancement of the Sacramento Region. As members of the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, honorees, and guests gather in celebration of a year of successes, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these outstanding community members.

Kevin Johnson, former Mayor of Sacramento, is Sacramentan of the Year. A distinguished member of our community, Mr. Johnson proudly served as our mayor for the past eight years. During his tenure he did much to move our city forward and most notably, he was instrumental in keeping our beloved Sacramento Kings, partnering with the Kings ownership to get the Golden 1 Center built. For many years, Mr. Johnson's vision and philanthropy has benefited the citizens of our community.

Ann Madden Rice, Chief Executive Officer of UC Davis Medical Center, is Businesswoman of the Year. Ms. Rice is a true leader in our region's health care system. Under her leadership, the UC Davis Medical Center was one of the hospitals at the forefront of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act in Sacramento.

Chris Granger, President of the Sacramento Kings, is Businessman of the Year. Joining the Sacramento Kings in 2013, Mr. Granger was instrumental in developing the new Golden 1 Center. The arena opened its doors in October 2016 to rave reviews and sold out concerts. Chris' vision is helping to revive Sacramento's urban care.

American Red Cross and Sacramento City College are being inducted into the Centennial Business Hall of Fame. American Red Cross, their staff, and their many volunteers have been the cornerstone of our region's emergency response community for many years. The work they do to provide training and assistance is critical to our region. Too often we do not realize just how important their hard work is until disaster strikes. Sacramento City College has been a leader in our region's education community for more than one hundred years. Their longevity is a testament to the high quality education and experiences that Sacramento City College faculty and staff help create for students.

Relles Florist and Visit Sacramento are being inducted into the Business Hall of Fame. Relles Florist has provided beautiful floral arrangements, as well as being a leader in the Sacramento community, for the past 70 years. As the lead promoter of tourism for the region, Visit Sacramento has done a tremendous job growing as an organization and supporting landmark campaigns, including Sacramento's

farm-to-fork initiatives and the iconic Tower Bridge Dinner. Visit Sacramento is instrumental in shaping Sacramento's identity and highlights the many things that make Sacramento the great place it is to live, work and play. These two enterprises are certainly worthy of this honor, and have played major roles in the development of Sacramento's economy over their numerous decades of operation.

Fleet Feet Sacramento, the original store of the Fleet Feet franchise, opened in midtown Sacramento in 1976 and since that time has fostered a culture of exercise and fitness. A staple in the community, Fleet Feet Sacramento continues to sponsor community events and get Sacramentans outside and active, and is the well-deserved recipient of the Small Business of the Year Award.

Phil Tretheway, Creative Director of Position Interactive, is this year's Young Professional of the Year. Mr. Tretheway is a third generation Sacramentan and has been involved in Metro EDGE since its inception. He helped chair the 2015 Emerge Summit and has been instrumental in shaping downtown's culture.

This year's Al Geiger Memorial Award is going to Chet Hewitt of Sierra Health Foundation and Dennis Mangers. Mr. Hewitt is a true treasure for our region. Under his leadership, Sierra Health Foundation has helped transform our region into a place that is healthier and more equitable for everyone. As a true trailblazer, Mr. Mangers has served as a role model and mentor to hundreds in the Sacramento community and throughout the State of California. He has spent the better part of the last half century championing equal rights for all California citizens. These two individuals carry on Mr. Geiger's legacy by serving as role models who help inspire others to serve our community. Sacramento is a better place because of their tireless efforts.

Carol Garcia receives the Peter McCuen Award for Civic Entrepreneurs. Ms. Garcia is Senior Vice President of Marketing and Business Development at Community 1st Bank and has helped people with their banking for over 20 years. She has been active in local non-profits and service organizations, benefiting our community for many years.

Jim Alves from SMUD and Holly Harper from Sutter Health are the recipients of the Volunteer of the Year award. Mr. Alves heads Sacramento Municipal Utility District's Economic Development Department. More impressively, he serves on numerous Boards and community organizations, making a significant impact on everyday Sacramentan lives. Ms. Harper is truly an expert in her field and her work at Sutter Health and in our community has helped change people's lives for the better. She is a driving force at Sutter Health, pushing towards greater health care quality in our region and beyond.

Finally, Karlee Cemo-McIntosh is Ambassador of the Year. Ms. Cemo-McIntosh has served in a variety of roles for Metro EDGE, the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, WEAVE, Inc., the American Cancer Society, and the American Heart Association. Working as the Marketing Director for Visit Sacramento, she helps put the region's best foot forward and attract numerous visitors to Sacramento.

IN HONOR OF ARMY SPECIALIST 4
ANTHONY JOSEPH DIXON

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Army Specialist 4 Anthony Joseph Dixon of Lindenwold, New Jersey who died at the young age of twenty on August 1, 2004 in Samarra, Iraq in a roadside bombing.

Mr. Dixon is remembered by his family and friends as an adventurous young man who loved to race his car around town, once climbed a tall cell phone tower on a dare and went to Florida after his high school graduation with no firm plans and only \$20 in his pocket.

As a student, Mr. Dixon was involved in athletics, including soccer, baseball and wrestling. After his high school graduation, and bouncing around from job to job for a while, he enlisted in the United States Army and was proud to serve his country.

His family recalls him being excited to share his battle stories with them. He enjoyed his time defending our country because it was adventurous and the right thing to do.

Mr. Dixon was the youngest of five children. He left behind his parents, Alexander and Jacquelyn, his brother Alexander, Jr., sisters Kim (Derek), Celesta (Gerald), Mary (Michael), his grandmother Sara, his fiancée Elis Deniz and countless nieces, nephews, aunts and uncles.

Joining the United States Army provided the focus and drive that Mr. Dixon needed to move forward with his life. We appreciate his service and commitment to our country and honor him for the ultimate sacrifice he made to keep us safe. I also am honored to thank his family for their sacrifices as well.

HONORING DR. RICHARD BERNINI

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Richard Bernini, whom the Napa and Solano County Medical Societies have awarded the honor of Professor Emeritus. Dr. Bernini served as an emergency room physician at Queen of the Valley Medical Center for 38 years until his retirement in 2015.

The Napa and Solano County Medical Societies award this distinction to medical professionals who have a demonstrated commitment to service and teaching. Dr. Bernini exemplifies these attributes and is very deserving of this award and recognition.

Dr. Bernini graduated from Thomas Jefferson University's Jefferson Medical College in 1970, and was certified by the American Board of Emergency Medicine in 1976. He is active in supporting and mentoring the medical students at his alma mater.

During his time at Queen of the Valley Medical Center, Dr. Bernini served in many leadership positions. He helped design the Napa Valley Emergency Medical Group, which provides high quality emergency medical care to

our community. Dr. Bernini created an advanced Quality of Assurance Program to ensure proper medical care for patients. He is known in our community for his willingness to mentor and befriend the next generation of medical health professionals.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bernini has demonstrated an incredible commitment to his students and the medical profession in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today and congratulate him on this well-deserved award.

IN RECOGNITION OF SCOTT
GRAVES

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Scott Graves, who is departing the House Committee on Agriculture.

In my time in public office, I quickly realized how truly indispensable good staff is. Scott Graves certainly fits the bill of good staff.

Scott most recently served as the staff director of the House Committee on Agriculture, where he developed the strategic vision of the committee and its 45 members. He has worked closely on agriculture policy for his 12 years on the Hill, including the 2008 and 2014 Farm Bills.

With Scott's steadfast leadership as staff director, Chairman CONAWAY and committee members were able to stick to an impressive timeline, passing reauthorization bills for all programs under the committee's jurisdiction last Congress. Scott and Chairman CONAWAY always made it a priority to fully equip and educate members of the Committee and conference on issues important to American agriculture.

On behalf of Southern Illinois producers, I wish Scott the best in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE DISTINGUISHED
SERVICE OF SCOTT CHESTER
GRAVES

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank a long-term member of my staff, Scott Graves, for his 12 years of service on Capitol Hill. Scott has worked in numerous capacities—starting as an agriculture legislative assistant and legislative director, then as my chief of staff and most recently as staff director at the House Committee on Agriculture. He is a well-respected and accomplished leader, and though he is moving on, I know he will continue to accomplish great things for American agriculture.

Scott has been my right-hand man for many years, helping me navigate the complexities of the 2008 and 2014 farm bills, serving as an advisor when I chaired the House Committee on Ethics, and keeping the wheels running in both my personal office and the Agriculture Committee. Though much of his work was done behind the scenes, my colleagues and I

knew we could rely on Scott to produce results.

Beyond his many professional attributes, I will certainly miss his humor and wit. I am proud of him, I wish him, Haley, Bronte, and a unit to be named this summer the very best. I want to thank him for his loyalty and dedication to public service and I wish him Godspeed in the next chapter of his life.

RECOGNIZING THE MOYER FOUNDATION AND CAMP MARIPOSA

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Moyer Foundation and its Camp Mariposa. Since 2000, the Moyer Foundation has reached thousands of children impacted by grief or addiction in their families. Among other successful endeavors, the Foundation started Camp Mariposa, a free weekend camp focused on mentoring and addiction prevention for youth impacted by the substance abuse of a family member. In 2015, Camp Mariposa helped over 960 students ages 9 through 12 have fewer feelings of isolation and guilt, understand the reality of addiction as a disease, and make positive life choices. Just last week, the Addiction Policy Forum recognized Camp Mariposa in their "Focus on Innovation" program.

Sadly, the children of eastern Kentucky have been at the very heart of a nationwide opioid abuse epidemic that has claimed more than 165,000 lives since 1999. They've borne witness to a generation of addiction and overdose, often times among those on whom they rely for financial, educational, and emotional support. I am proud that Camp Mariposa will open its twelfth location next month in Buchhorn, Kentucky, its first rural location, and continue spreading awareness and hope to our region.

I thank the Moyer Foundation and its local partner Buchhorn Children & Family Services for their dedication to changing the lives of America's at-risk youth. With their continued help, we can break the cycle of addiction and instill newfound hope in our communities.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER
GOVERNOR ALBERT BREWER

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, there are few people who leave such a profound impact on the lives of so many as former Alabama Governor Albert Brewer did. Albert Brewer was more than just a Governor. He was a dedicated public servant committed to the betterment of our state and our people.

His unfailing commitment to the state of Alabama was apparent in his early years. After attending The University of Alabama, Gov. Brewer served three terms in the Alabama House of Representatives, and during the last of these terms, was elected by his colleagues as the youngest person in Alabama's history to serve as the Speaker.

After his time as Speaker, Brewer would go on to serve as Lieutenant Governor before being elevated to the position of Governor after the death of Lurleen Wallace in 1968. When he ran for a full term in 1970, he exhibited his compassion for the people of Alabama and his bravery in fundamentally changing how gubernatorial candidates organized their respective campaigns by including African Americans. In his platform, Brewer fought for education funding, an ethics commission, and a commission to revise Alabama's 1901 state constitution.

Governor Brewer sought to help those who were disenfranchised and in poverty throughout Alabama and to include newly registered African American voters. His dedication to the disenfranchised speaks volumes for his character and his commitment to selfless public service. Albert Brewer raised the bar for public service in Alabama.

After leaving office, Governor Brewer followed his passion for education and became a distinguished professor at Cumberland School of Law, where he taught courses on ethics and constitutional law. His expertise, impact on students, and passion were recognized by Cumberland School of Law with the dedication of the Martha F. and Albert P. Brewer Plaza on April 4, 2008.

Sadly, Governor Brewer passed away on January 2, 2017 at the age of 88. His integrity and dedication to public service have made a positive mark that cannot be undone. His legacy will be one of compassion, selfless public service, and an unflinching dedication to his family and the people of Alabama.

I consider it an honor to have known Albert Brewer and worked with him over the years. On behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District, I want to share my deepest condolences with his family, friends, and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, Albert Brewer was one of the best governors in our state's history, and there is no doubt Alabama is a better state because of his service and sacrifice.

IN RECOGNITION OF MITCH
KORNFELD FOR HIS SERVICE AS
PRESIDENT OF THE JEWISH
COMMUNITY ALLIANCE

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mitch Kornfeld, a local business owner and outgoing President of the Jewish Community Alliance of Northeastern Pennsylvania. He is a force for change in the local Jewish community, and professionally, Mr. Kornfeld is the Owner and Vice President of Operations at The Woodlands Inn, one of the premier hotels in the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton Area.

Mr. Kornfeld is a South Wilkes-Barre native and graduate of E.L. Myers High School. In 1969, his father and uncle opened The Woodlands, and Mr. Kornfeld grew up in and around the family business. A graduate of the University of Pittsburgh, he earned a degree in economics and communications. After college, Mr. Kornfeld returned to Wilkes-Barre to play a vital role in his family's business.

Mr. Kornfeld grew up in a Jewish family, and today, he gives back as an active mem-

ber of the Jewish Community Alliance of Northeastern Pennsylvania. The JCA seeks to create a community for Jews to connect to each other and to their faith through services and programming. As president, he has been instrumental in expanding the Jewish Community Center, currently located in Wilkes-Barre, to the new Center for Jewish Life in Kingston. The 60,000 square foot space will feature a fitness center, a library, class rooms, and a resource room to serve and support the Jewish population of the Wyoming Valley and the general public.

Mr. Kornfeld combines business acumen with an altruistic spirit. He is committed to supporting and reenergizing the Jewish population in Northeast Pennsylvania with projects such as the Center for Jewish Life.

It is an honor to recognize Mitch Kornfeld and his exceptional work as President of the Jewish Community Alliance. He has left a remarkable legacy by taking a leadership role in the development of the Center for Jewish Life. I look forward to watching the final realization of this ambitious project, and I wish him the very best in the future.

ANOTHER POE FROM TEXAS:
GEORGE WASHINGTON POE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I honor another Poe from Texas and an unsung patriot during our Revolution, George Washington Poe. The Legacy of Texas States: "Born in Ohio, he and his wife, Frances, traveled to Texas as quickly as they could. It was in Texas that he found success in the military, building up the young Army's artillery and seeing to the needs of the men fighting for the Revolution's cause.

We all know the legendary story of Sam Houston and his role in our state's history. It was on this day in 1836 that Houston referred to Poe as a major, no doubt a reference to his volunteer rank since he was officially a third lieutenant in the fledgling regular army. Records show that while the political leaders of Texas wrestled with who should lead the Army in early 1836, Poe remained fiercely loyal to Houston. In a letter to Houston, Poe declared that he and his company "do not nor will not know any other General than Sam Houston."

Poe's strong sense of loyalty proved to be fruitful for his military career. He soon was appointed assistant Inspector General of the Army, and was in charge of a 120-man garrison at Velasco. When the General Council assembled and established an official army for the Republic of Texas in March of 1836, Poe was appointed captain of the artillery.

That appointment seemed like a demotion to Poe. In a letter to Thomas J. Rusk, he protested saying he deserved to be a major. In mid-March, Poe and his artillery unit departed Velasco to join Sam Houston again, where it is documented that he later participated in the Battle of San Jacinto. Poe experienced two significant ceremonial milestones in his career that speak to the high regard in which he was held. Poe commanded the artillery piece that fired a salute over the remains of Fannin's

men near the mission of La Bahia and later served as marshal of the funeral procession for Stephen F. Austin.

After leaving the military, Poe settled in Houston where he worked in land speculation. Houston remained loyal to his faithful supporter, and nominated Poe to be stock commissioner of the new Republic. Poe died on Texas soil, and although his name has failed to become as legendary as Houston, Bowie, or Travis; his contributions to our history and the success of Texas are worthy of remembrance."

It is always interesting to hear the history of bygone days of the Texas Revolution, especially about another Poe from Texas.

And that's just the way it is.

THE PASSING OF ONEIL MARION
CANNON

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the life and memory of my friend and mentor, Oneil Marion Cannon, who passed away on January 20, days before his 100th birthday.

Oneil was born in Louisiana on January 28, 1917. He began early to fight against injustice. As a young insurance agent in New Orleans, he joined an office workers union, and he defied miscegenation laws to associate with white students at Tulane and Dillard Universities. He served honorably in the Pacific Theatre during World War II and settled with his wife and children in Los Angeles after his discharge. There he learned the printing trade on the GI Bill. He believed all his life in collective action, and fought to become the first African American member of the Printer's Union in Los Angeles.

Union membership, however, did not guarantee him work in that segregated industry, so he started his own print shop in the basement of the progressive Black newspaper The Eagle. Fidelity Educational Press became known as the "union printer to the left," producing leaflets, journals, and brochures for community groups, activists and churches. Oneil taught the printing trade to generations of printers in South Los Angeles. His passion for education further led him to fight for "Negro History Week" in L.A. schools, and to take an active part in the multi-year struggle for a junior college in South L.A. That battle culminated in the opening of L.A. Southwest College in 1967.

In 1985 he co-founded the Paul Robeson Center, which quickly became a community hub. For years it pursued its mission of seeking interracial and intercultural understanding. Oneil was instrumental in supporting my own work as a community organizer early in my life, and without his help my life would have taken a very different path.

Deeply involved in politics, Oneil belonged to the Independent Progressive Party and campaigned to put Henry Wallace on the ballot in the late 1940s. As part of the IPP, he used economic power to force employers to hire Black and Mexican American workers, using the slogan "don't bank or buy where you can't work." He worked for decades to elect

representatives of color to office, including Tom Bradley, Ed Roybal, and even campaigning at age 90 for Barack Obama.

I would like to salute Oneil Cannon for his longstanding commitment to serving and uplifting others, and for a century of fighting to make the world a better place.

HONORING THE NEW TECHNOLOGY
HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor New Technology High School, which is celebrating its 20th Anniversary of providing innovative educational and career opportunities to students in Napa, California.

New Technology High was established in 1996 by local business people and community educational leaders as a place where students would learn the skills necessary to compete in the changing technological and global economy. This vision has been achieved and expanded over the past 20 years, resulting in an innovative, award-winning educational community. New Technology High School is recognized as a California Distinguished School, a California Gold Ribbon School and a New Tech Network National Demonstration Site.

The school offers a curriculum using innovative administrative and educational models including project and problem-based learning, easy access to technology resources and a focus on student-centered culture and outcomes. Students regularly work in teams to prepare for real life collaborative projects in the technology sector. New Technology High is providing students the important skill set that they will use to tackle the cyber, climate, business and global challenges we face.

In addition to providing exceptional educational opportunities to their own student body, New Technology High offers programs serving 13 schools in the Napa Valley Unified School District. This outreach has led to the creation of the New Tech Network, which helps 180 schools across the country implement innovative models.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years, New Technology High School has been a leader in education reform in the Napa Valley, Northern California, the United States, and globally. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor the school here today.

COMMEMORATING THE 2017 NA-
TIONAL CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
WEEK

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize Catholic schools and parishes in our nation as we celebrate National Catholic Schools Week. As we approach this celebration, I am excited to announce that this year's theme is "Catholic School: Communities of Faith, Knowledge, and Service," which resonates

with my District that is home to twenty-eight Catholic schools. Parochial education strives to instill faith, community involvement, and commitment in the classroom to shape each generation of students into well-educated, compassionate members of our communities. For forty-three years, Catholic schools have taken part in this tradition, which provides a time to reflect on and commemorate their contributions to education.

There are over two million students enrolled in the 6,525 Catholic schools across the United States that serve urban, suburban, rural, and inner-city communities. This past year, 37 Catholic schools were designated the Blue Ribbon from the U.S. Department of Education, exceeding academic standards, closing achievement gaps, and establishing progressive teaching methods. In addition to this prestigious award, Catholic schools exceed graduation rates throughout the country and extensively focus on college preparatory classes with 85.7 percent of their students attending a four-year college after graduation.

As a proud graduate of St. Anne Grade School in East Moline, Illinois and Spalding Catholic High School in Peoria, Illinois, I am honored to co-sponsor legislation supporting National Catholic Schools Week. The religious values and foundation of faith instilled through Catholic schools has strengthened my relationship with God and informed my daily life with lessons of faith. I am also thankful that our three sons have the opportunity to attend Catholic schools and become immersed in the Catholic faith, quality education, and community service that they provide.

This week is a time to reflect on and celebrate all the contributions of the National Catholic Education Association and the impact their schools provide to our communities. I look forward to continuing to support Catholic schools and carrying out God's mission of faith, service, and knowledge. During National Catholic Schools Week, I extend my sincere blessings to the Catholic schools across the nation and I am honored to promote their successes.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTH-
DAY OF MRS. LARLIE HENRY
DIXON

HON. ADRIANO ESPAILLAT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the celebration of Mrs. Larlie Henry Dixon's 100th birthday. With nearly a century passing, Ms. Dixon has dedicated her life to Second St. John Baptist Church, the City of New York, and her lifelong contribution to her community.

Mrs. Larlie Henry Dixon, the third eldest of eight siblings, was born on January 28, 1917 to Lloyd & Sarah Henry in Dawson, GA. The family later moved to Largo, Florida where many of her family still reside.

She married Boisey Dixon on November 17, 1935. They were the parents of one daughter, Larlie Jean, who regrettably predeceased her. The family migrated to New York in search of better opportunities in the mid-forties when Larlie entered the work force.

Larlie, known for her candor and directness, had a strong work ethic and always worked

hard to support herself, her daughter and ultimately a granddaughter. She was the housekeeper for a prominent lower Manhattan family for decades. She is still to this day in touch with the family whose son and daughter credit Larlie with helping raise them and are effusive in their genuine love and affection for her.

Mrs. Dixon has been a member of the Second St. John Baptist Church since 1970. A great financial supporter of the church through the years, she proudly served on the Mother's Board where she enjoys mentoring and guiding the young women of the church. She also loved attending Sunday Church School until her later years, but continues to attend the 11 am Worship Service practically every Sunday.

Larlie Dixon is surrounded by family and friends who love and help care for her. She has two granddaughters, Jackie and Jazmine (both of Atlanta); many, many nieces and nephews, grandnieces and grandnephews, spiritual daughter, Berlina Whitaker; Pastor and his wife Reverend Robert and Mrs. Dorothy Jones; Harvey and Dr. Margaret Walker, neighbors; her entire Second St. John Baptist Church family and her three caregivers, Carmelle, Margaret & Antoinette.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the time to recognize and celebrate the tremendous life of Mrs. Larlie Henry Dixon and her 100th birthday celebration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 66.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR
ABORTION AND ABORTION IN-
SURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE
ACT OF 2017

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, a bill that makes it harder for women to access comprehensive reproductive health care, including safe and legal abortion. It is outrageous that, in 2017, women still have to fight for our right to make basic health care decisions.

Under the Hyde and Helms Amendments, no federal dollars fund abortion. H.R. 7 would codify these unjust limitations and in fact goes much further by restricting women's access to comprehensive health care even when no federal funding is involved.

Most egregiously, H.R. 7 provides no exception for abortion in cases where a woman's health is at risk. By providing no "health of the mother" exception, this legislation callously disregards the well-being of American women.

H.R. 7 makes it impossible for women, especially low and moderate-income women, to access comprehensive health care on Healthcare.gov or state insurance exchanges.

This would deny access to safe and legal abortion to American women.

This legislation prevents women serving our country in the military from receiving comprehensive health care through their military or veterans' health care.

H.R. 7 punishes small business owners who offer comprehensive health care to their female employees, even when it comes entirely from private funds.

Finally, this legislation directly attacks the rights of women in the District of Columbia by making it harder for them to access safe and legal abortion.

Every woman should be able to make her own decision about her health care without interference from either the government or her employer. Regardless of her income or her insurance policy, each woman should be able to access quality health care services that are right for her and her family.

Instead of restricting access to critical health services and threatening the health and economic security of women and families, President Trump and Congressional Republicans should be supporting affordable, quality health care as a basic right for all Americans.

This past weekend, I stood with millions of women across the United States, including 100,000 in Minnesota, marching to demand our voices be heard and our health care be protected. My constituents can count on me to keep standing up and speaking out against President Trump and Republicans' attacks on women's rights and women's health.

LEGISLATION TO STOP TRUMP ADMINISTRATION FROM DENYING HUMANITARIAN RELIEF TO REFUGEES WHO ARE LAWFULLY ENTITLED TO ENTER THE UNITED STATES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I, a senior member of the House Homeland Security and Judiciary Committees today am giving the following statement in response to the Executive Order issued by the President regarding admission of refugees to the United States:

Today, I am introducing the Universal Security of American Values Act of 2017 (USA Values Act of 2017), which declares the Executive Order issued by the President on January 27, 2017 to be null and void and of no force and legal effect. In addition, USA Values Act prohibits the issuance or implementation of any Executive Order that has the effect of abridging any of the privileges and immunities of Americans or would discriminate against any person seeking entry to the United States on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation and identity, place of birth, place of residence, ethnicity, religion, age, or statuses that pose no undue health threat to the general population.

As Americans we are best when we are true to the values we hold dear, beginning with fidelity to the Constitution and the laws of the United States. The executive order issued last

Friday by President Trump is a radical departure from these principles and I call upon him to rescind this order immediately.

This Executive Order has affected 67,000 refugees thoroughly vetted by an 18 to 24 month screening process, many of whom have been separated from their families despite processing the proper paperwork.

I agree with President Barack Obama's statement that he "fundamentally disagrees with the notion of discriminating against individuals because of their faith and religion.

Arbitrarily excluding Muslims from our country will not make us safer and makes a mockery of our reputation the world's most welcoming nation.

America is a country founded by persons escaping religious persecution. We must be ever vigilant to ensure we remain the land religious liberty. Innocent lives are being put at risk as a result of a political theater and reactionary policies of the current Administration without even going through the normal review and clearance process.

'The USA Values Act,' which affirms the nation's core values, compliments the 'Statute of Liberty Values Act,' (SOLVE Act) introduced today by my colleague Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN of California and sponsored by me and more than 125 Members of the House which bars ethnic and religious discrimination against refugees.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 31, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 1

Time to be announced
Committee on the Budget
Business meeting to consider the nomination of Mick Mulvaney, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

TBA

9:40 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original

resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing from Department of Homeland Security officials.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine a growth agenda, focusing on reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens.

SH-216

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the Affordable Care Act, focusing on stabilizing the individual health insurance market.

SD-430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the Congressional Budget Office's budget and economic outlook, focusing on fiscal years 2017-2027.

SD-608

10:45 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, and the nomination of Scott Pruitt, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SD-106

Special Committee on Aging

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine stopping senior scams, focusing on developments in financial fraud affecting seniors.

SD-562

FEBRUARY 2

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

FEBRUARY 8

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine emergency management in Indian Country, focusing on improving the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Federal-tribal relationship with Indian tribes.

SD-628

POSTPONEMENTS

FEBRUARY 1

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine fencing along the southwest border.

SD-342

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S461–S497

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 236–248, S.J. Res. 9–15, and S. Res. 28–29. **Pages S489–90**

Tillerson Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State. **Pages S467–86**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 34), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S469**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached provided that on Tuesday, January 31, 2017, following disposition of the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, of Kentucky, to be Secretary of Transportation, Senate continue consideration of the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State, post-cloture.

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nomination:

Mick Mulvaney, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget. **Page S497**

Messages from the House: **Pages S488–89**

Measures Referred: **Page S489**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S490–91**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S491–97**

Additional Statements: **Pages S487–88**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—34) **Page S469**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 10:48 p.m., until 12 noon on Tuesday, January 31, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S497.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Airland: Senators Cotton (Chair), Inhofe, Wicker, Tillis, Sullivan, Cruz, Sasse, King, McCaskill, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Warren, and Peters.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity: Senators Rounds (Chair), Fischer, Perdue, Graham, Sasse, Nelson, McCaskill, Gillibrand, and Blumenthal.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Senators Ernst (Chair), Wicker, Fischer, Perdue, Cruz, Heinrich, Nelson, Shaheen, and Peters.

Subcommittee on Personnel: Senators Tillis (Chair), Ernst, Graham, Sasse, Gillibrand, McCaskill, and Warren.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support: Senators Inhofe (Chair), Sessions, Rounds, Ernst, Perdue, Kaine, Shaheen, and Hirono.

Subcommittee on SeaPower: Senators Wicker (Chair), Sessions, Cotton, Rounds, Tillis, Sullivan, Hirono, Shaheen, Blumenthal, Kaine, and King.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Senators Fischer (Chair), Inhofe, Cotton, Sullivan, Cruz, Graham, Donnelly, Heinrich, Warren, and Peters.

Senators McCain and Reed are ex-officio members of each subcommittee.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 31 public bills, H.R. 720–750; 2 private bills, H.R. 751–752; and 16 resolutions, H.J. Res. 36–49; and H. Res. 69, 72, were introduced. **Pages H742–45**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H747**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 70, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 38) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Steam Protection Rule (H. Rept. 115–6); and

H. Res. 71, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to “Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers”, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (H. Rept. 115–7). **Page H742**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H705**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:23 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H707**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:13 p.m. and reconvened at 4:30 p.m. **Page H709**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Designating a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as “Sky Point”: H.R. 381, to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as “Sky Point”; **Pages H709–10**

Northern Mariana Islands Economic Expansion Act: H.R. 339, to amend Public Law 94–241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands; **Pages H710–12**

Fort Ontario Study Act: H.R. 46, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York; **Pages H712–13**

Removing the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105–384: H.R. 374, to remove the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105–384,

by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 388 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 66; **Pages H713–14, H719–20**

Ocmulgee Mounds National Historical Park Boundary Revision Act of 2017: H.R. 538, amended, to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 396 yeas to 8 nays, Roll No. 67; **Pages H714–16, H720–21**

Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park Boundary Adjustment Act: H.R. 558, to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill; and **Pages H716–17**

Amending the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area: H.R. 560, to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. **Pages H717–18**

House Democracy Partnership—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she appointed the following Member to the House Democracy Partnership: Representative Price (NC). **Page H719**

British-American Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Representative Cicilline. **Page H719**

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representatives Connolly and Frankel (FL). **Page H719**

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Representatives Hastings and Cohen. **Page H719**

Japan-United States Friendship Commission—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission: Representative Takano. **Page H719**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:32 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. Page H719

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page S719.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages S719–20, and S720–21. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Committee Meetings

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR KNOWN AS THE STREAM PROTECTION RULE; HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO “DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS BY RESOURCE EXTRACTION ISSUERS”; HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NICS IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2007

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.J. Res. 38, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule; H.J. Res. 41, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to “Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers”; and H.J. Res. 40, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007. The committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule for H.J. Res. 41. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against pro-

visions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The Committee also granted a closed rule for H.J. Res. 40. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule for H.J. Res. 38. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Goodlatte, Chairman Hensarling, Chairman Bishop of Utah, and Representatives Cicilline, and Maxine Waters of California.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D73)

S. 84, to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces. Signed on January 20, 2017. (Public Law 115–2)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, subcommittee membership, and the nominations of Ryan Zinke, of Montana, to be Secretary of the Interior, and James Richard Perry, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee assignments, designation of members to serve on the Joint Committee on Taxation, designation of members to serve on the Congressional Oversight Group, designation of members to serve as Congressional Trade Advisors on Trade Policy and Negotiations, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, and the nominations of Steven T. Mnuchin, of California, to be Secretary of the Treasury, and Thomas Price, of Georgia, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, and subcommittee membership, 10 a.m., S-116, Capitol.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine confronting the North Korea threat, focusing on reassessing policy options, 10:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules and subcommittee membership during the 115th Congress, and the nomination of Elisabeth Prince DeVos, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Education, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, 11 a.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, S. 178, to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases, and the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Medicaid Oversight: Existing Problems and Ways to Strengthen the Program", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, business meeting on the committee's oversight and authorization plan; and markup on H.R. 396, the "Tax Accountability Act of 2017"; H.R. 194, the "Federal Agency Mail Management Act of 2017"; H.R. 702, the "Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017"; H.R. 679, the "Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement Act of 2017"; H.R. 653, the "Federal Intern Protection Act of 2017"; and H.R. 657, the "Follow the Rules Act", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules, hearing entitled "Fraud, Waste and Abuse under the Affordable Care Act", 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.J. Res. 37, disapproving the final rule submitted by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-

tion relating to the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and H.J. Res. 36, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to "Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation", 3:30 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of January 31 through February 3, 2017

Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, at approximately 12 noon, Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, of Kentucky, to be Secretary of Transportation, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 12:20 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State, post-cloture.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: January 31, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, Time to be announced, S-216, Capitol.

Committee on the Budget: February 1, business meeting to consider the nomination of Mick Mulvaney, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

February 1, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Congressional Budget Office's budget and economic outlook, focusing on fiscal years 2017-2027, 10:30 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: February 1, to hold hearings to examine a growth agenda, focusing on reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens, 10 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: January 31, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, subcommittee membership, and the nominations of Ryan Zinke, of Montana, to be Secretary of the Interior, and James Richard Perry, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: February 1, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by

the committee during the 115th Congress, and the nomination of Scott Pruitt, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10:45 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: January 31, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee assignments, designation of members to serve on the Joint Committee on Taxation, designation of members to serve on the Congressional Oversight Group, designation of members to serve as Congressional Trade Advisors on Trade Policy and Negotiations, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, and the nominations of Steven T. Mnuchin, of California, to be Secretary of the Treasury, and Thomas Price, of Georgia, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: January 31, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, and subcommittee membership, 10 a.m., S-116, Capitol.

January 31, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine confronting the North Korea threat, focusing on reassessing policy options, 10:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: January 31, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules and subcommittee membership during the 115th Congress, and the nomination of Elisabeth Prince DeVos, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Education, 10 a.m., SD-430.

February 1, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Affordable Care Act, focusing on stabilizing the individual health insurance market, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: February 1, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing from Department of Homeland Security officials, 9:40 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: January 31, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress, 11 a.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: January 31, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, S. 178, to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases, and the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: February 1, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs, 2:30 p.m., SD-106.

Select Committee on Intelligence: January 31, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

February 2, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

Special Committee on Aging: February 1, organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 115th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine stopping senior scams, focusing on developments in financial fraud affecting seniors, 2:30 p.m., SD-562.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, February 1, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, February 1, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The State of the World: National Security Threats and Challenges", 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

February 2, Full Committee, business meeting for consideration of the committee oversight plan for 115th Congress, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, February 2, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook", 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, February 1, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Rescuing Americans from the Failed Health Care Law and Advancing Patient-Centered Solutions", 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

February 2, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing entitled "Helping Students Succeed Through the Power of School Choice", 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, February 1, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Strengthening Medicaid and Prioritizing the Most Vulnerable", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 1, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled "The Electricity Sector's Efforts to Respond to Cybersecurity Threats", 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

February 2, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Patient Relief from Collapsing Health Markets", 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 2, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled "Reauthorization of NTIA", 10:45 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, February 2, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 11 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 1, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, joint hearing entitled "Next Steps in the 'Special Relationship'—Impact of a U.S.-U.K. Free Trade Agreement", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

February 2, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; and Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, joint hearing entitled "Israel, the Palestinians, and the United Nations: Challenges for the New Administration", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, February 1, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

February 2, Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, hearing entitled “The Future of the Transportation Security Administration”, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, February 1, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Empowering the Inspectors General”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

February 1, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Five Years Later: A Review of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

February 2, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Improving Security and Efficiency at OPM and the National

Background Investigations Bureau”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

February 2, Full Committee, markup on H. J. Res. 27, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Death with Dignity Act of 2016; the “Federal Records Modernization Act of 2017”; and the “Electronic Message Preservation Act of 2017”, 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, February 1, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, February 1, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Tuesday, January 31

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, January 31

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, of Kentucky, to be Secretary of Transportation, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 12:20 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Rex W. Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State, post-cloture.

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules. Consideration of H.J. Res. 38—Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Steam Protection Rule (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Arrington, Jodey C., Tex., E100
 Babin, Brian, Tex., E97
 Bass, Karen, Calif., E97, E102
 Bost, Mike, Ill., E101
 Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E101
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E97, E100, E102

Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E101
 Davis, Rodney, Ill., E99
 Espaillat, Adriano, N.Y., E103
 Gaetz, Matt, Fla., E99
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E97
 Hudson, Richard, N.C., E99
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E104
 LaHood, Darin, Ill., E103

Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E98, E100
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E103
 Norcross, Donald, N.J., E101
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E98, E102
 Rogers, Harold, Ky., E101
 Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E103
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E97, E98, E99, E101, E103
 Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E99



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.