



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2017

No. 20

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 6, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ADRIAN SMITH 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 would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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 1 minute 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. MESSER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, through whom we see what we could be, and what we can be-

come, thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Be with them and with all who labor here to serve this great Nation and its people.

Assure them that whatever their responsibilities, You provide the grace to enable them to be faithful in their duties and the wisdom to be conscious of their obligations and fulfill them with integrity.

Remind us all of the dignity of work and teach us to use our talents and abilities in ways that are honorable and just and are of benefit to those we serve.

May all that is done this day be 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 gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EMMER 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.

VETERAN JOHN GRAW, WELCOME TO MINNESOTA'S SIXTH

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome an incredible indi-

vidual who is new to Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District.

John Graw, a World War II veteran, recently moved to Ramsey to be closer to his daughters. Upon his arrival in Ramsey—which was, coincidentally, the day before Veterans Day—the Ramsey City Council awarded John with a key to the city and a letter welcoming him to the community.

John was a master sergeant in the U.S. Army Air Force and served with the Mediterranean Allied Air Force that fought in the North African Campaign as well as the European theater in Italy and France during World War II.

I am so glad that John received such a warm welcome to Ramsey, especially because he came to the defense of our Nation during one of its darkest times. It is inspiring to know that this hero lives among us, and it is an honor to stand here today and welcome this member of the Greatest Generation to our community.

ARMY RECOGNITION FOR ARKANSAS CONGRESSMAN STEVE WOMACK

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievement of a true Arkansas leader, my colleague and friend, Representative STEVE WOMACK.

Early this year, STEVE was awarded the Department of the Army's Decoration for Distinguished Civilian Service, which is the highest award the Secretary of the Army may bestow upon a civilian.

Before being elected Representative for Arkansas' Third Congressional District, STEVE dedicated most of his adult life to the Arkansas Army National Guard where he retired as a colonel after 30 years of service.

□ 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.

H979

He has been awarded the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Legion of Merit. His example is one all Americans and Arkansans can admire, and I treasure our work together here in the 115th Congress representing our State of Arkansas.

NOAA BETRAYED THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a whistleblower has charged that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration falsified data in a study that attempted to disprove the widely accepted 15-year halt in global warming. This was done in an effort to garner public support for the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan and the United Nations' Paris climate agreement.

NOAA's officials suppressed internal debate about the study and actively obstructed the House Science Committee's investigations of concerns about the data. However, one brave scientist decided to step forward and blow the whistle on NOAA.

According to Dr. John Bates, NOAA put its thumb on the scale to justify their predetermined conclusions and support the President's agenda, even if that meant violating their own scientific integrity rules.

The Science Committee will continue to investigate this scandal. Americans have a right to unbiased science.

We can thank Dr. Bates for his heroic act and for having the courage to step forward in the face of the liberal media's smear campaigns.

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, February 3, 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 February 3, 2017, at 1:52 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 305.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:45 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

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 45 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.

CRAGS, COLORADO LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2017

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 618) to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 618

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 "Craggs, Colorado Land Exchange Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate the land exchange set forth herein; and

(2) to promote enhanced public outdoor recreational and natural resource conservation opportunities in the Pike National Forest near Pikes Peak, Colorado, via acquisition of the non-Federal land and trail easement.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BHL.—The term "BHI" means Broadmoor Hotel, Inc., a Colorado corporation.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 83 acres of land within the Pike National Forest, El Paso County, Colorado, together with a non-exclusive perpetual access easement to BHI to and from such land on Forest Service Road 371, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Craggs Land Exchange—Federal Parcel—Emerald Valley Ranch", dated March 2015.

(3) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means the land and trail easement to be conveyed to the Secretary by BHI in the exchange and is—

(A) approximately 320 acres of land within the Pike National Forest, Teller County, Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Craggs Land Exchange—Non-Federal Parcel—Craggs Property", dated March 2015; and

(B) a permanent trail easement for the Barr Trail in El Paso County, Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Craggs Land Exchange—Barr Trail Easement to United States", dated March 2015,

and which shall be considered as a voluntary donation to the United States by BHI for all purposes of law.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, unless otherwise specified.

SEC. 4. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If BHI offers to convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of BHI in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall accept the offer and simultaneously convey to BHI the Federal land.

(b) LAND TITLE.—Title to the non-Federal land conveyed and donated to the Secretary under this Act shall be acceptable to the Secretary and shall conform to the title approval standards of the Attorney General of the United States applicable to land acquisitions by the Federal Government.

(c) PERPETUAL ACCESS EASEMENT TO BHI.—The nonexclusive perpetual access easement to be granted to BHI as shown on the map referred to in section 3(2) shall allow—

(1) BHI to fully maintain, at BHI's expense, and use Forest Service Road 371 from its junction with Forest Service Road 368 in accordance with historic use and maintenance patterns by BHI; and

(2) full and continued public and administrative access and use of FSR 371 in accordance with the existing Forest Service travel management plan, or as such plan may be revised by the Secretary.

(d) ROUTE AND CONDITION OF ROAD.—BHI and the Secretary may mutually agree to improve, relocate, reconstruct, or otherwise alter the route and condition of all or portions of such road as the Secretary, in close consultation with BHI, may determine advisable.

(e) EXCHANGE COSTS.—BHI shall pay for all land survey, appraisal, and other costs to the Secretary as may be necessary to process and consummate the exchange directed by this Act, including reimbursement to the Secretary, if the Secretary so requests, for staff time spent in such processing and consummation.

SEC. 5. EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE AND APPRAISALS.

(a) APPRAISALS.—The values of the lands to be exchanged under this Act shall be determined by the Secretary through appraisals performed in accordance with—

(1) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(2) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice;

(3) appraisal instructions issued by the Secretary; and

(4) shall be performed by an appraiser mutually agreed to by the Secretary and BHI.

(b) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—The values of the Federal and non-Federal land parcels exchanged shall be equal, or if they are not equal, shall be equalized as follows:

(1) SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND VALUE.—If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the final appraised value of the non-Federal land parcel identified in section 3(3)(A), BHI shall make a cash equalization payment to the United States as necessary to achieve equal value, including, if necessary, an amount in excess of that authorized pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Any cash equalization moneys received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act"; 16 U.S.C. 484a); and

(B) made available to the Secretary for the acquisition of land or interests in land in Region 2 of the Forest Service.

(3) SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND VALUE.—If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land parcel identified in section 3(3)(A)

exceeds the final appraised value of the Federal land, the United States shall not make a cash equalization payment to BHI, and surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered a donation by BHI to the United States for all purposes of law.

(C) APPRAISAL EXCLUSIONS.—

(1) SPECIAL USE PERMIT.—The appraised value of the Federal land parcel shall not reflect any increase or diminution in value due to the special use permit existing on the date of the enactment of this Act to BHI on the parcel and improvements thereunder.

(2) BARR TRAIL EASEMENT.—The Barr Trail easement donation identified in section 3(3)(B) shall not be appraised for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(A) WITHDRAWAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) WITHDRAWAL.—Lands acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall, without further action by the Secretary, be permanently withdrawn from all forms of appropriation and disposal under the public land laws (including the mining and mineral leasing laws) and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1930 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(2) WITHDRAWAL REVOCATION.—Any public land order that withdraws the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under a public land law shall be revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the Federal land parcel to BHI.

(3) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.—All Federal land authorized to be exchanged under this Act, if not already withdrawn or segregated from appropriation or disposal under the public lands laws upon enactment of this Act, is hereby so withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, until the date of conveyance of the Federal land to BHI.

(B) POSTEXCHANGE LAND MANAGEMENT.—Land acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall become part of the Pike-San Isabel National Forest and be managed in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the National Forest System.

(C) EXCHANGE TIMETABLE.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange directed by this Act be consummated no later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) MAPS, ESTIMATES, AND DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary and BHI may by mutual agreement make minor boundary adjustments to the Federal and non-Federal lands involved in the exchange, and may correct any minor errors in any map, acreage estimate, or description of any land to be exchanged.

(2) CONFLICT.—If there is a conflict between a map, an acreage estimate, or a description of land under this Act, the map shall control unless the Secretary and BHI mutually agree otherwise.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file and make available for public inspection in the headquarters of the Pike-San Isabel National Forest a copy of all maps referred to in this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 618, the Craggs, Colorado Land Exchange Act of 2017 that I introduced along with Congressman TIPTON and Congressman POLIS. This legislation will facilitate a mutually beneficial land exchange between the U.S. Forest Service and the Emerald Valley Ranch in El Paso and Teller Counties in Colorado.

Specifically, this legislation would convey to the United States the 320-acre Craggs property located on the west side of Pikes Peak that is currently owned by The Broadmoor Hotel, and a perpetual public-access easement for the lower portion of the popular Barr Trail. In exchange, an 83-acre Federal parcel located at Emerald Valley Ranch on the southeast side of Pikes Peak and a perpetual access easement along two Forest Service roads would be granted to The Broadmoor. This would eliminate the management and liability issues currently facing the United States because of the significant upgrades and improvements The Broadmoor has made to the Emerald Valley Ranch parcel.

This land exchange is intended to provide increased recreational opportunities for the public on the Pike National Forest. The 320-acre Craggs property is completely surrounded by the Pike National Forest and has been the top acquisition priority for the Pikes Peak Ranger District for several years. The property provides several opportunities to connect Forest Service trails emanating from the Craggs campground with trails in the Putney Gulch area. In addition, existing trails within the property could become key links in the proposed Ring the Peak trail.

I thank Chairman BISHOP and Chairman MCCLINTOCK and the entire staff of the Subcommittee on Federal Lands for all of their work and bringing this bill to the floor.

I urge the adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the Speaker for the recognition and Mr. LAMBORN for bringing forward this bill.

H.R. 618 is legislation I am proud to cosponsor because it is a commonsense land exchange in my home State of Colorado. It authorizes the Forest Service to exchange the Emerald Valley Ranch for the larger ecologically sensitive Craggs parcel. The world-famous Broadmoor Hotel—that I visited many times and attended many education conferences at—currently has a 25-year special use permit to operate the guest ranch on the Emerald Valley parcel. This parcel has lost its National Forest character, and conveying it out of Pike National Forest will simplify management at that site and replace it with a parcel that is more appropriate.

In exchange, the Forest Service will receive the 320-acre Craggs parcel and a permanent trail easement for the historic Barr Trail. The Craggs property connects with several Forest Service trails in the Pikes Peak Ranger District and has been identified by the Forest Service as a priority for acquisition. I am glad that, under this bill, we can accomplish that priority.

The exchange eliminates a large private inholding in the National Forest and removes the need for Federal land management of the Emerald Valley Ranch. It is a win-win scenario. Essentially, this legislation simplifies land management around Pikes Peak, while protecting public lands and growing our economy.

The Forest Service testified in support of H.R. 618. I support its adoption, as do stakeholders across the spectrum.

It has been a pleasure to work with my colleagues, Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. TIPTON, on this bill, and I appreciate their hard work and constructive work for this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I echo what my colleague has just said about those of us from Colorado working together. Of the six bills that we are going to be discussing today, four of them are from Colorado; and yourself, myself, and Representative TIPTON from southwest Colorado have collaborated on these four bills. It is bipartisan and we have worked hard and have gotten some good legislation to offer to the House for consideration. I look forward to doing this through the rest of the afternoon, plus two other bills as well.

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

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

I, as well, am prepared to close and I just want to highlight my agreement with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN). When people work together, these are the kind of commonsense results we get. Unfortunately, on these bills, I don't think we will be making the front page of The Washington Post or The New York Times or the FOX News Talk hour, but that is so much of the workhorse-type work that we need to do in this body.

What we have done with Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMBORN, and myself is we have been able to put together the commonsense priorities around public land management. The district I have the honor of representing is 65 percent public land. So these are everyday issues that my constituents deal with living in and around public land.

It is very exciting to be passing H.R. 618 and allowing getting rid of the private inholding, putting some appropriate land in the management of the Forest Service and, of course, doing something that will also benefit one of our iconic conference centers and hotels in Colorado Springs that I have

had the opportunity to be a guest and a conferee at so many times.

I deeply appreciate the work of Mr. TIPTON and Mr. LAMBORN. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 618.

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.

ELKHORN RANCH AND WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2017

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 698) to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 698

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 "Elkhorn Ranch and White River National Forest Conveyance Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCE, ELKHORN RANCH AND WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO.

(a) LAND CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Consistent with the purpose of the Act of March 3, 1909 (43 U.S.C. 772), all right, title, and interest of the United States (subject to subsection (b)) in and to a parcel of land consisting of approximately 148 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled "Elkhorn Ranch Land Parcel—White River National Forest" and dated March 2015 shall be conveyed by patent to the Gordman-Leverich Partnership, a Colorado Limited Liability Partnership (in this section referred to as "GLP").

(b) EXISTING RIGHTS.—The conveyance under subsection (a)—

(1) is subject to the valid existing rights of the lessee of Federal oil and gas lease COC-75070 and any other valid existing rights; and

(2) shall reserve to the United States the right to collect rent and royalty payments on the lease referred to in paragraph (1) for the duration of the lease.

(c) EXISTING BOUNDARIES.—The conveyance under subsection (a) does not modify the exterior boundary of the White River National Forest or the boundaries of Sections 18 and 19 of Township 7 South, Range 93 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado, as such boundaries are in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) TIME FOR CONVEYANCE; PAYMENT OF COSTS.—The conveyance directed under subsection (a) shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The conveyance shall be without consideration, except that all costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior relating to

any survey, platting, legal description, or other activities carried out to prepare and issue the patent shall be paid by GLP to the Secretary prior to the land conveyance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 698, the Elkhorn Ranch and White River National Forest Conveyance Act sponsored by my colleague, Congressman SCOTT TIPTON of the great State of Colorado, and cosponsored by Congressman POLIS and myself, resolves a longstanding surveying issue in the White River National Forest in western Colorado.

In the early 20th century, the U.S. Government issued a series of patents conveying Federal land to private landowners in the region. However, a land survey conducted in 1949 brought these conveyances into question, and the ownership of the land has been in dispute for nearly 70 years. In 2014 the White River National Forest conducted a survey to finalize the land ownership and concluded that 148 acres were improperly within the forest's boundary.

This legislation simply conveys this land back to its rightful ownership. This land conveyance is consistent with the existing forest management plan, and the Forest Service is managing this land as though it were already private property.

This bill has the support of a wide range of stakeholders in the community and I thank the Congressman from Colorado for his work on this legislation. I would point out, as we discussed earlier, there is bipartisan support from within the Colorado delegation for this bill as well.

I urge adoption of the measure and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Living in and around public land, as Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMBORN, and I do, we often have these kinds of bills to address the interactions between our communities and our Federal lands in Colorado.

H.R. 698 is another bill that addresses public lands. I am proud to join Mr. TIPTON as a cosponsor of this bill. It will convey 148 acres of land to the Gordman-Leverich Partnership, a company in Colorado, which will remedy a land dispute between a private landowner and the Forest Service.

Way back in 1947, just a few years after my dear mother—who is watching us on C-SPAN as we speak—and my father were born, an administrative error occurred that shifted the boundary between the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest. This survey placed 148 acres of private land inside the forest boundary without providing consideration to the landholders. Since then, the title of the ranch has changed several times, but the administrative error has never been corrected.

We all know how we hold private property rights dear in this country, and this bill will correct the error, acknowledge the correct boundary of the Elkhorn Ranch, providing the current owner with a clear and free title rather than the encumbrance that the disputed nature of the land previously provided.

It will help avoid costly litigation to both sides, provides clarity for landowners and the Forest Service. It recognizes today's reality on the ground and it will help local officials in the Forest Service as well.

I thank my colleague, Mr. TIPTON, for his good work on this legislation, working with stakeholders. I want to point out that the Forest Service testified in support of this bill. I join my colleagues in urging its adoption.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those comments. I would point out, for anyone who is interested, that the three of us who are here—and I am about to yield the floor to Representative TIPTON—we are all on the Natural Resources Committee. This is a committee that is going to be doing a lot of exciting and interesting things in this Congress. We are going to be very busy. I am looking forward to that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), my friend and colleague, who is also a member of the committee.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks to my colleagues, Mr. POLIS and Mr. LAMBORN. I think among our three congressional districts, we hold the vast majority of public lands in the State of Colorado. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to work with you on these significant bills, to be able to address many of the challenges that we have, and to be able to work together in a bipartisan manner as well.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me time to be able to discuss this important legislation. H.R. 698 is a very straightforward bill, which Congressmen LAMBORN and POLIS and I have reintroduced this year that confirms private ownership of 148 acres of land in my congressional district.

The lands concerned were patented into private ownership via the United States land patents issued in 1914, 1917, and 1957, but their ownership came into question by virtue of a 1949 government

survey which erroneously showed them to be National Forest land rather than private land. A long-held U.S. law specifically states that a government resurvey cannot take away private property or private property rights.

Mr. Speaker, the Forest Service and the private landowner of the Elkhorn Ranch only became aware of the potential title issue in the early 2000s, and thereafter, the Forest Service conducted a lengthy and thorough review of the matter. Upon completion of their review in 2014, both the supervisor and the surveyor of the White River National Forest concluded the ownership of the 148 acres should be confirmed in the successors in interest to the original patentee; namely, the Elkhorn Ranch.

In reaching this conclusion, the Forest Service noted that the land has never been managed as National Forest land and, indeed, has been fenced and occupied with stock ponds, developed springs, roads and other private improvements, and has been used as private land for ranching and agriculture for the better part of the past 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a simple matter of fairness and equity to a private landowner to honor government land patents that were granted by the Federal Government to the landowner's predecessors 60 to 100 years ago. The bill is supported by both the surveyor and supervisor of the White River National Forest; the Garfield County surveyor; the Garfield County Commissioner; the city of Rifle; Colorado Club 20, which represents 20 Colorado counties; and Piceance Energy, which has a lease on part of the area.

□ 1700

In addition, the legislative hearing that was held on the same bill in 2015, the administration testified that this bill is a practical and workable way to address this longstanding issue. This bill is identical to the one that passed out of the House by voice vote in the last Congress, and I once again urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Once again, I extend my thanks to my colleagues Congressman LAMBORN and Congressman POLIS for all of their hard work on this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight, as Mr. TIPTON said, a number of the bills that we are going through, including this one, have passed the House before, and yet the Senate failed to send them to the President's desk. These are real issues that our constituents face.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to simply take up these noncontroversial bills, pass them, and allow President Trump to sign them so we can resolve these real-life issues that affect our constituents. While it feels good to pass a bill as a legislator—and Mr. TIPTON deserves credit, and I look forward to being able to argue for the passage

of a bill that I am a lead sponsor on shortly; and, of course, we recently passed, by voice vote, Mr. LAMBORN's bill—these issues will remain pending until the Senate acts.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to bring forward these bills so we can address these pressing concerns that our constituents have and deal with them in an appropriate multistakeholder manner, where Democrats and Republicans can join in support of addressing the real-life issues that those of us who represent areas in and around public land have.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 698.

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.

ARAPAHO NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 688) to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 688

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 "Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. ARAPAHO NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Arapaho National Forest in the State of Colorado is adjusted to incorporate the approximately 92.95 acres of land generally depicted as "The Wedge" on the map entitled "Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment" and dated November 6, 2013, and described as lots three, four, eight, and nine of section 13, Township 4 North, Range 76 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado. A lot described in this subsection may be included in the boundary adjustment only after the Secretary of Agriculture obtains written permission for such action from the lot owner or owners.

(b) BOWEN GULCH PROTECTION AREA.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall include all Federal land within the boundary described in subsection (a) in the Bowen Gulch Protection Area established under section 6 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 539j).

(c) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 200306(a)(2)(B)(i) of title 54, United States Code, the boundaries of the Arapaho National Forest, as modified under subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the Arapaho National Forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

(d) PUBLIC MOTORIZED USE.—Nothing in this Act opens privately owned lands within the boundary described in subsection (a) to public motorized use.

(e) ACCESS TO NON-FEDERAL LANDS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6(f) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 539j(f)) regarding motorized travel, the owners of any non-Federal lands within the boundary described in subsection (a) who historically have accessed their lands through lands now or hereafter owned by the United States within the boundary described in subsection (a) shall have the continued right of motorized access to their lands across the existing roadway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 688, sponsored by Congressman JARED POLIS and cosponsored by Congressman TIPTON and myself, would adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest in the State of Colorado to incorporate 93 acres. It passed the House under suspension of the rules during the 113th and 114th Congresses.

The legislation would incorporate 10 undeveloped parcels of land into the Arapaho National Forest. The parcels sit between the Arapaho and the Rocky Mountain National Park and will help the Forest Service to better manage this land. The bill ensures that private landowners with parcels within the national forest will continue to have access through these parcels. Additionally, the land purchased by the Forest Service must be with the written consent of the landowner.

I urge adoption of the measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced the Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act, also known as the Wedge Act.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I wish all of my bills could come to the floor so quickly, within a week of introducing them. But I am very glad, on behalf of Grand County, which I am honored to represent, that we could move so expeditiously, at least through the House, through this body.

Once again, I will call upon the Senate, upon passage, to move on this bill. Again, this is another bill the House did its work on, we did pass last session, and the Senate failed to pass into law.

It is very important for Grand County. It is a commonsense protection of public lands. It was coordinated with local landowners and local officials, supported by the county commissioners and Federal land agencies.

The legislation involves a parcel of 10 lots in Grand County, which we and locals call the "wedge." As indicated by its name, the parcel is wedged between Arapaho National Forest and Rocky Mountain National Park, effectively separating the two. Although the wedge is integral for the successful management of the public land, it remains outside of the National Forest Service boundary.

Millions of visitors already enjoy the parcel's beauty as they travel west from the 13,000-foot apex of the Rocky Mountains, along the Trail Ridge scenic byway and into the destination town of Grand Lake, in my district. The area is undeveloped. Seven of the ten parcels are already being managed by the U.S. Forest Service. The owners of the remaining parcels are all in favor of this bill. It is very important to point out that all of the stakeholders are supportive of this effort in statute.

Development of the wedge parcel would significantly affect the health of Rocky Mountain National Park and hurt the adjoining Colorado River headwaters. Not only would the development harm clean water for millions, but it could also harm the economic potential for what is truly a jewel of the National Park System, Rocky Mountain National Park, supporting millions of visitors in the surrounding communities.

In recognition of these potential threats to the quality and character, as well as the economy and jobs in the area, there has been significant support locally for this bill. Supporters include everyone from local officials, like the Grand County Commissioners and the town of Grand Lake, to conservation and outdoor recreation groups, including Headwaters Trails Alliance, Conservation Colorado, and the Rocky Mountain Nature Conservancy.

H.R. 688 simply responds to the wishes of my constituency—including the landholders in these areas, particularly those living in and around the wedge, as well as the visitors every year—by incorporating it into the Arapaho National Forest boundary and adding the lots owned by the Forest Service into the adjacent Bowen Gulch Protection Area, just as we did when the House passed this exact bill last year.

This strong, bipartisan bill has the express support of my Colorado colleagues in both chambers, including the cosponsorship of Mr. TIPTON and Mr. LAMBORN, and introduction by Senator BENNET and Senator GARDNER in the Senate.

It was passed out of the Natural Resources Committee unanimously last Congress and passed here on the House floor. Unfortunately, the clock ran out before the Senate was able to consider

it. I am looking forward to, after expeditiously moving it out of this body, allowing the Senate to do their work and pass this bill into law.

I am extremely grateful for the House Natural Resources Committee's support of this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just build on what my colleague was saying about the rest of his bills.

On this one, there is strong collaboration and consensus. I look forward to working with him to pass it. I will make an offer on the rest of his bills. If he lets me help him write them, I bet we could get them to the floor sooner.

In all seriousness, the Rocky Mountain National Park is a crown jewel of the National Park System. I believe it is in the top five of all parks in the entire country in terms of visitorship. It is very popular, and for good reason. It is a spectacular and accessible place near Boulder, Colorado, not far from Denver.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

Furthermore, I call upon the United States Senate to bring up these series of bills that are very important to those of us like Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMBORN, and me, who represent areas with substantial public land where our constituents in the private sector, our residents, interact every day with issues around public land and land management. These issues will improve the quality of life in our communities. This bill will help improve the quality of the tourism experience, as well as the conservation goals of Rocky Mountain National Park.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 688.

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.

BOLTS DITCH ACCESS AND USE ACT

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 689) to insure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 689

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 "Bolts Ditch Access and Use Act".

SEC. 2. BOLTS DITCH ACCESS.

(a) ACCESS GRANTED.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall permit by special use authorization nonmotorized access and use, in accordance with section 293.6 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, of the Bolts Ditch headgate and the Bolts Ditch within the Holy Cross Wilderness, Colorado, as designated by Public Law 96-560, for the purposes of the diversion of water and use, maintenance, and repair of such ditch and headgate by the Town of Minturn, Colorado, a Colorado Home Rule Municipality.

(b) LOCATION OF FACILITIES.—The Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment referenced in subsection (a) are as generally depicted on the map entitled "Bolts Ditch headgate and Ditch Segment", dated November 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Since 1882, the town of Minturn, Colorado, has used Bolts Ditch to fill Bolts Lake, a place of recreation for the town and an important source of water for the surrounding community. When Congress passed the Colorado Wilderness Act in 1980, 450 feet of Bolts Ditch was inadvertently included in the Holy Cross Wilderness area, leading to questions and the town's ability to access this important infrastructure. After a discussion amongst stakeholders, the town agreed to seek a legislative solution to address this access issue.

This bipartisan bill, sponsored by Congressman JARED POLIS and cosponsored by Congressman TIPTON and myself, simply allows the Forest Service to issue a special use permit to the town of Minturn to allow nonmotorized access to maintain a headgate and water ditch in the Holy Cross Wilderness. This bill ensures the town will have access to Bolts Ditch for basic maintenance needs.

H.R. 689 was developed in consultation with the community and the Forest Service and enjoys support from a wide range of groups in the region. I urge adoption of the measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 689, the Bolts Ditch Access and Use Act, at the request of our local community in my district, Minturn, Colorado. In Eagle County, Minturn really needs this legislation because it improves

public land and water management in my district.

The bill has bipartisan support. I thank Mr. TIPTON and Mr. LAMBORN for collaborating with me on this bill here in the House. I am thankful that Senator GARDNER and Senator BENNET have partnered to pass this bill as well.

This legislation passed the House last session, but once again was held up in the Senate. I call upon the Senate, after House passage, to act expeditiously to put this matter to rest. I am very hopeful we can get it across the finish line soon.

I am grateful to the town of Minturn, to the conservation community, and to water utilities for working together for a commonsense solution that I am proud to support. This is an example of how we can truly solve any problem when everybody comes together and works together to solve it.

The need for this bill is to solve a vital local problem for the people of Minturn, Colorado, a town of about 1,000 people in Eagle County. The problem it fixes results from a mistake, an error, in the 1980 Wilderness Act, which inadvertently left Bolts Ditch off of the list of existing water facilities, where it should have been included.

This legislation would simply authorize the special use of the Bolts Ditch headgate and the segment of the Bolts Ditch within the Holy Cross Wilderness area, allowing Minturn to use rights that it already has, existing water rights, to fill Bolts Lake.

The residents of Minturn, including the mayor, whom I have met with, who brought this bill to me, as well as Coloradans across the central mountains, have long relied on water infrastructure like Bolts Ditch to access clean and affordable drinking water for our growing communities. This bill will ensure that the town of Minturn is able to utilize a crucial resource, and do so without compromising the sanctity of the surrounding wilderness areas.

I thank the Republican and Democratic staffs on the committee for working with us on this bill.

It is very important for the people of Minturn and for our central mountain region in Colorado to pass this bill into law. I urge its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that this body is moving forward on the Bolts Ditch land boundary adjustment bill. I am hopeful that, after passage, the Senate will bring this bill up and pass it on until it becomes law to remove any encumbrances that Minturn has in accessing its pre-existing water rights due to a clerical error from the 1980s. I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 689.

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. LAMBORN. 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.

□ 1715

BLACK HILLS NATIONAL CEMETERY BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 337) to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 337

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

The Act may be cited as the "Black Hills National Cemetery Boundary Expansion Act".

SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSFER OF PUBLIC LAND FOR CEMETERY USE.

(a) DUE DILIGENCE.—Prior to the withdrawal and transfer in subsection (b), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs will complete appropriate environmental, cultural resource and other due diligence activities on the public lands identified in subsection (c), so that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may confirm that the land is suitable for cemetery purposes. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall notify the Secretary of the Interior of such due diligence activities prior to initiating and shall coordinate as needed during the performance of such activities.

(b) WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSFER.—After completion of the due diligence activities in subsection (a) and upon receipt by the Secretary of the Interior of written confirmation from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the land is suitable for cemetery purposes, and subject to valid existing rights, the public lands described in subsection (c) shall be—

(1) withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws, for as long as the lands remain under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;

(2) deemed property as defined in section 102(9) of title 40, United States Code, for as long as the lands remain under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(3) transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for use as national cemeteries under chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The public lands withdrawn, deemed property, and transferred

under subsection (b) shall be the approximately 200 acres of land adjacent to Black Hills National Cemetery, South Dakota, generally depicted as "Proposed National Cemetery Expansion" on the map entitled "Proposed Expansion of Black Hills National Cemetery—South Dakota" and dated June 16, 2016, except the land located within 100 feet of the centerline of the Centennial Trail (which runs along the northern boundary of the "Proposed National Cemetery Expansion") and that is located south of the Trail.

(d) BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—Immediately after the public lands are withdrawn, deemed property, and transferred under subsection (b), the boundary of the Black Hills National Cemetery shall be modified to include the public lands identified in subsection (c).

(e) MODIFICATION OF PUBLIC LAND ORDER.—Immediately after the public lands under subsection (b) are withdrawn, deemed property, and transferred under subsection (b), Public Land Order 2112, dated June 6, 1960 (25 Fed. Reg. 5243), shall be modified to exclude the lands identified in subsection (c).

SEC. 3. LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) PREPARATION OF LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable following receipt of written confirmation from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the land is suitable for cemetery purposes, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal descriptions of the public lands withdrawn, deemed property, and transferred under section 2(b).

(b) LEGAL EFFECT.—The legal descriptions prepared under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if the legal descriptions were included in this Act, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the legal descriptions.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Copies of the map referred to in section 2(c) and the legal descriptions prepared under subsection (a) shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of—

- (1) the Bureau of Land Management; and
- (2) the National Cemetery Administration.

(d) COSTS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for reasonable costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in implementing this section, including the costs of any surveys.

SEC. 4. RESTORATION TO PUBLIC LANDS FOR NON-CEMETERY USE.

(a) NOTICE AND EFFECT.—Upon a determination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that all or a portion of the lands withdrawn, deemed property, and transferred under section 2 shall not be used for cemetery purposes, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall notify the Secretary of the Interior of such determination. Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall transfer administrative jurisdiction of the lands subject to such notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) DECONTAMINATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall be responsible for costs of any decontamination of the lands resulting from contamination on the lands withdrawn, deemed property, and transferred under section 2(b) while the Secretary of Veterans Affairs exercised jurisdiction over those lands subject to a notice under subsection (a) determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be necessary for the lands to be restored to the public lands.

(c) RESTORATION TO THE PUBLIC LANDS.—The lands subject to a notice under subsection (a) shall only be restored to the public lands upon acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior and a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that such lands are suitable for restoration to the public lands

and operation of one or more of the public land laws.

(d) OPENING ORDER.—If the Secretary of the Interior accepts the lands subject to such a notice and determines that the lands are suitable for restoration, in whole or in part, the Secretary of the Interior may open the lands to operation of one or more of the public land laws and may issue an order to that effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 337, the Black Hills National Cemetery Boundary Expansion Act, sponsored by Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM of South Dakota.

This bill expands the Black Hills National Cemetery, outside of Sturgis, South Dakota, by permanently transferring the jurisdictional authority of approximately 200 acres of undeveloped Federal land from the Bureau of Land Management to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Originally opened in 1948, the cemetery now houses a memorial carillon, a memorial to Korean war veterans, and is the final resting place of many notable veterans, including Medal of Honor recipient Sergeant Charles Windolph. With its existing acreage, the cemetery can only accommodate a finite number of additional burials. Transferring jurisdiction of the land from the BLM to the VA will provide space for hundreds of additional grave sites for future generations of American veterans. Without the transfer, the National Cemetery Administration will be forced to close the cemetery to further burials in the very near future.

This is a commonsense piece of legislation that will ensure that the Black Hills National Cemetery can continue to provide proper burial sites and final resting places for America's fallen heroes.

At this point, I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters with Chairman ROE of the Veterans' Affairs Committee regarding this bill. I thank him for helping to expedite the consideration of this bill today.

I commend Representative NOEM for working closely with both the BLM and the VA on this issue, and I urge the adoption of the measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2017.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 337, the Black Hills National Cemetery Boundary Expansion Act. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 337 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DAVID P. ROE, M.D.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2017.

Hon. DAVID P. ROE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: H.R. 337, the Black Hills National Cemetery Boundary Expansion Act, was introduced on January 5, 2017. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

I thank you for allowing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support having the Committee on Veterans' Affairs represented on the conference committee. Finally, to memorialize our understanding, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered by the House.

Thank you for your response and cooperation. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

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

This bill provides the Veterans Administration with 200 acres of Federal land, which are currently managed by the Bureau of Land Management, in order to expand the Black Hills National Cemetery.

National cemeteries are reserved for the brave men and women who make the ultimate personal sacrifice while serving in the military in defense of our freedom, and it is important that we have the sufficient space to meet all of those interment requests. These heroes have served our country and deserve to permanently rest in a ceme-

tery that honors their sacrifice and commitment to the ideals that hold us together as a nation.

With respect to the Black Hills National Cemetery specifically, the BLM and the VA determined that only Congress can provide the permanent jurisdiction transfer that is needed for this particular expansion; thus, we are considering this bill and, after passage, are encouraging our friends in the Senate to do the same.

Of course, this bill represents a small fraction of the ways we can support our veterans and need to support our veterans to demonstrate our appreciation for those who have served. We need to improve access to education and job training. We need to increase funding and raise the bar on accountability for the Department of Veterans Affairs. We should work to shorten wait times at VA hospitals by allowing nurses to practice to the full extent of their licensure to ensure quality care in a quicker way at a reasonable cost, and there are many other things we need to do to make sure that those who proudly put their lives on the line—or in this case, who have paid the ultimate price to protect our freedom—and their families and loved ones are cared for by this country in recognition of their sacrifice.

I do believe this simple change in land ownership will have an impact by providing the men and women who have bravely served a final resting place. Expanding the Black Hills National Cemetery is a noble and worthy cause that deserves our support.

I thank my colleague from South Dakota for bringing this issue forward and for her hard work in guiding this bill through Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his gracious remarks.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the great State of South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), who is working hard for the people of her State.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 337, the Black Hills National Cemetery Boundary Expansion Act.

I thank the chairman of the committee and his staff for working so hard to move this bill through Congress. Their support means so much to our veterans and to their families.

Those who have served and those families who have sacrificed beside them deserve our Nation's eternal gratitude. Since 1948, the Black Hills National Cemetery has been one way that we have shown that appreciation to them. The cemetery currently covers about 100 acres of land and is home to the Korean War Veterans Memorial. Its peaceful landscape serves as the final resting place for hundreds of servicemembers and their family members.

Chief David Beautiful Bald Eagle is among the brave men and women buried here. Born in a tepee in 1919, Chief Bald Eagle served our country in World War II as a paratrooper and as one of the legendary Lakota code talkers. We lost him last summer, but his life continues to be an inspiration to the Lakota people and those who knew him.

Brigadier General Richard E. Ellsworth was also laid to rest there. He was a man who flew 400 combat missions during World War II. He earned numerous medals and returned to the U.S., where he eventually became wing commander of the Rapid City Air Force Base. In 1953, that base was renamed in his honor.

The surrounding community also does its part to honor this hallowed ground. On a brisk day this past December, Pennington County 4-H, the Sturgis Boy Scouts, the Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary, and community members came together and placed over 1,000 wreaths on the graves of servicemembers who were laid to rest at this cemetery. They upheld the vow that those laid to rest should never be forgotten. Now we must do our part to uphold that very same vow.

So we honor the legacy of these veterans and many others at the Black Hills National Cemetery, but the facility is not going to have the room it needs to continue serving future veterans without expansion. This bill would allow that expansion by transferring around 200 acres of adjacent land near Sturgis, South Dakota, from the Bureau of Land Management's jurisdiction to the Department of Veterans Affairs. My office worked with these agencies and the stakeholders in crafting this legislation, and all agreed that this land transfer is necessary.

The transfer of this land will provide the Black Hills National Cemetery with the additional burial space that is needed to assure that today's veterans and servicemembers, as well as their families, will be able to utilize the space and that we will be able to uphold our commitment and offer this Nation's eternal gratitude for everything that they have done for us.

Again, I thank the committee, my colleagues, and the chairman for supporting this bill. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill that supports our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 337.

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. LAMBORN. 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.

FORT FREDERICA NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 494) to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 494

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 Frederica National Monument Boundary Expansion Act".

SEC. 2. FORT FREDERICA NATIONAL MONUMENT, GEORGIA.

(a) MAXIMUM ACREAGE.—The first section of the Act of May 26, 1936 (16 U.S.C. 433g), is amended by striking "two hundred and fifty acres" and inserting "305 acres".

(b) BOUNDARY EXPANSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia is modified to include the land generally depicted as "Proposed Acquisition Areas" on the map entitled "Fort Frederica National Monument Proposed Boundary Expansion", numbered 369/132,469, and dated April 2016.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(3) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—The Secretary of the Interior may acquire the land and interests in land described in paragraph (1) by donation or purchase with donated or appropriated funds from willing sellers only.

(4) WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER.—No non-Federal property may be included in the Fort Frederica National Monument without the written consent of the owner.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise

and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 494, introduced by my colleague Congressman BUDDY CARTER of Georgia, expands the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 21 acres of land. The St. Simons Land Trust currently owns the additional acreage and will steward the land until the National Park Service can acquire the property.

The Fort Frederica National Monument, located on St. Simons Island, Georgia, preserves the archaeological remnants of a fort established in 1736 by James Oglethorpe. Oglethorpe constructed the fort to protect the Colony of Georgia from attack from the Spanish. The fort successfully fended off a Spanish attack in 1742 and confirmed Georgia as a British territory.

This bipartisan legislation is fully supported by the Georgia delegation, and an identical version of this legislation passed the House by voice vote in the 114th Congress. I urge the passage of the bill.

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

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

This bill expands the Fort Frederica National Monument to include a 20-acre property, known as the North Marsh, currently owned by the St. Simons Land Trust. The National Park Service evaluated the property in a 2014 study and determined that its acquisition would provide additional opportunities to protect and interpret resources that are associated with the site.

Fort Frederica, which is located on St. Simons Island, Georgia, was built by James Oglethorpe in 1736 to protect the Colony of Georgia from Spanish Florida. The National Park Service has managed the fort since 1936 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt used the Antiquities Act to designate the site as a national monument. This bill is an important reminder of how a decision to protect and elevate our shared national heritage resonates generation after generation.

Here we are today, 80 years after President Roosevelt made the decision to establish a national monument, and we are looking at a terrific opportunity to expand it and increase the resources it protects. By using money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund—a Federal program that wasn't yet around in President FDR's time and of which I fought hard to reauthorize in this body—we can continue this important legacy. It is good to highlight the work of the Land and Water Conservation Fund as we pass this bill with regard to a national monument that has been with us for 80 years.

I thank the majority for advancing this bill, and I look forward to working with them to advance similar legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Georgia includes all 100 miles of Georgia's coastline and barrier islands. It was on one of these islands that the founder of Georgia, General James Oglethorpe, built a fort in 1736 to protect the new British Colony from the Spaniards. He named the fort and nearby town "Frederica" in honor of the Prince of Wales. In 1742, Fort Frederica's strategic location helped the British win a decisive victory against the Spanish in the Battle of Bloody Marsh. After this battle, the Spanish abandoned their attempts to take over the territory, and Georgia was fully secured as a British Colony. Today, Fort Frederica National Monument is a popular destination in Glynn County, featuring portions of the original fort, a museum, and extensive hiking trails.

H.R. 494 would allow for a small addition of adjacent land that contains artifacts from prehistoric human settlements. With this addition, visitors will be able to see a more complete story of the history of Georgia—from its earliest human residents, to colonial times, to modern day.

I thank the chairman for his consideration of this bill, and I thank the Natural Resources Committee's staff for its efforts. I also thank the entire Georgia delegation for supporting and cosponsoring this legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for advancing this bill. I look forward to working with them to advance similar legislation that expands, protects, and enhances our public lands. It is particularly a privilege for me to work on a bill that uses resources and that highlights for the American people the value of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 494.

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.

□ 1730

EMAIL PRIVACY ACT

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 387) to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 387

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 "Email Privacy Act".

SEC. 2. VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE CORRECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) in paragraph (1)—
(i) by striking "divulge" and inserting "disclose"; and

(ii) by striking "while in electronic storage by that service" and inserting "that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by that service";

(B) in paragraph (2)—
(i) by striking "to the public";
(ii) by striking "divulge" and inserting "disclose"; and

(iii) by striking "which is carried or maintained on that service" and inserting "that is stored, held, or maintained by that service"; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—
(i) by striking "divulge" and inserting "disclose"; and

(ii) by striking "a provider of" and inserting "a person or entity providing";

(2) in subsection (b)—
(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting "wire or electronic" before "communication";

(B) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) to an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of such communication, to the subscriber or customer on whose behalf the provider stores, holds, or maintains such communication, or to an agent of such addressee, intended recipient, subscriber, or customer;" and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) with the lawful consent of the originator, addressee, or intended recipient of such communication, or of the subscriber or customer on whose behalf the provider stores, holds, or maintains such communication;"

(3) in subsection (c) by inserting "wire or electronic" before "communications";

(4) in each of subsections (b) and (c), by striking "divulge" and inserting "disclose"; and

(5) in subsection (c), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) with the lawful consent of the subscriber or customer;"

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO REQUIRED DISCLOSURE SECTION.

Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following:

"(a) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS IN ELECTRONIC STORAGE.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held,

or maintained by that service only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

"(1) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

"(2) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity.

In the absence of a date on the warrant indicating the date by which the provider must make disclosure to the governmental entity, the provider shall promptly respond to the warrant.

"(b) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS IN A REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is stored, held, or maintained by that service only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

"(A) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

"(B) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity.

In the absence of a date on the warrant indicating the date by which the provider must make disclosure to the governmental entity, the provider shall promptly respond to the warrant.

"(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) is applicable with respect to any wire or electronic communication that is stored, held, or maintained by the provider—

"(A) on behalf of, and received by means of electronic transmission from (or created by means of computer processing of communication received by means of electronic transmission from), a subscriber or customer of such remote computing service; and

"(B) solely for the purpose of providing storage or computer processing services to such subscriber or customer, if the provider is not authorized to access the contents of any such communications for purposes of providing any services other than storage or computer processing.

"(c) RECORDS CONCERNING ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE OR REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber to or customer of such service (not including the contents of wire or electronic communications), only—

"(A) if a governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

"(i) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure; and

"(ii) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity;

"(B) if a governmental entity obtains a court order directing the disclosure under subsection (d);

"(C) with the lawful consent of the subscriber or customer; or

"(D) as otherwise authorized in paragraph (2).

“(2) SUBSCRIBER OR CUSTOMER INFORMATION.—A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall, in response to an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or any means available under paragraph (1), disclose to a governmental entity the—

“(A) name;

“(B) address;

“(C) local and long distance telephone connection records, or records of session times and durations;

“(D) length of service (including start date) and types of service used;

“(E) telephone or instrument number or other subscriber or customer number or identity, including any temporarily assigned network address; and

“(F) means and source of payment for such service (including any credit card or bank account number),

of a subscriber or customer of such service.

“(3) NOTICE NOT REQUIRED.—A governmental entity that receives records or information under this subsection is not required to provide notice to a subscriber or customer.”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “(b) or”;

(B) by striking “the contents of a wire or electronic communication, or”;

(C) by striking “sought,” and inserting “sought”; and

(D) by striking “section” and inserting “subsection”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) NOTICE.—Except as provided in section 2705, a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service may notify a subscriber or customer of a receipt of a warrant, court order, subpoena, or request under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section.

“(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO LEGAL PROCESS.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall limit the authority of a governmental entity to use an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) by a court of competent jurisdiction to—

“(1) require an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of a wire or electronic communication to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) to the governmental entity;

“(2) require a person or entity that provides an electronic communication service to the officers, directors, employees, or agents of the person or entity (for the purpose of carrying out their duties) to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) to or from the person or entity itself or to or from an officer, director, employee, or agent of the entity to a governmental entity, if the wire or electronic communication is stored, held, or maintained on an electronic communications system owned, operated, or controlled by the person or entity; or

“(3) require a person or entity that provides a remote computing service or electronic communication service to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) that advertises or promotes a product or service and that has been made readily accessible to the general public.

“(j) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall limit the

power of inquiry vested in the Congress by article I of the Constitution of the United States, including the authority to compel the production of a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of a wire or electronic communication) that is stored, held, or maintained by a person or entity that provides remote computing service or electronic communication service.”.

SEC. 4. DELAYED NOTICE.

Section 2705 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 2705. Delayed notice

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity acting under section 2703 may apply to a court for an order directing a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to which a warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive under section 2703 is directed not to notify any other person of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive.

“(b) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for an order made under subsection (a) for delayed notification of up to 180 days if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive will likely result in—

“(1) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(2) flight from prosecution;

“(3) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(4) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(5) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(c) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant one or more extensions, for periods of up to 180 days each, of an order granted in accordance with subsection (b).”.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to preclude the acquisition by the United States Government of—

(1) the contents of a wire or electronic communication pursuant to other lawful authorities, including the authorities under chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the “Wiretap Act”), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this Act; or

(2) records or other information relating to a subscriber or customer of any electronic communication service or remote computing service (not including the content of such communications) pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the “Wiretap Act”), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 387, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Thank you for this opportunity to have this very important debate on a critical piece of legislation that has been a long time in the coming. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative GOODLATTE, and Ranking Member CONYERS for their work and leadership in shepherding this bill through the process and getting us to this moment on the floor today. I thank my colleague, Mr. POLIS, for cosponsoring this legislation and working so tirelessly over the past few years.

I think we originally introduced this bill back in 2013, and it takes a while sometimes for a good idea to reach this point in Congress, Mr. Speaker, and this is an idea whose time has come. So I rise today to support these long overdue, bipartisan ideas in this legislation that will bring our digital privacy laws into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, the year was 1986. We can all try to think back where we were in 1986. I am sure Kentucky had a good basketball team back then. I know Kansas did. I was 10 years old, hoping to get a new Nintendo game console for Christmas so I could play Super Mario Brothers. You could buy a ticket to see Top Gun for \$2.75. In the tech world, 1986 marked the debut of the first laptop computer. It was 12 pounds. A mobile phone was the size of a small pet.

Mr. Speaker, it was also the year in which Congress passed the Electronic Communication Privacy Act. Now, this law, at the time, there were only 10 million email users worldwide. Most of us probably didn't have email at that time. Most Americans didn't for sure. Now, today, 232 million Americans send an email at least once per month. The first text message wouldn't be sent for another 6 years, and now Americans send more than a billion texts each year.

Mr. Speaker, the times and technologies have changed, but the laws have not kept pace. Federal laws regarding how we treat and protect the privacy of digital communications have been unchanged since 1986 and, because of it, our digital content is not afforded the same Fourth Amendment protections as our paper documents on our desks in our home.

Now, the Fourth Amendment protects the “right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures.” Yet when it comes to what is on Americans' cell phones, their home computers, what might be in the cloud, or on their business computer, whatever it is, our laws allow Federal agencies like the IRS, the SEC, or law enforcement to kick down their virtual doors and search an innocent American's private communications and data storage without a warrant, without probable cause or any type of due process.

Now, many Americans take great precautions to protect and store their digital communications on services

like Dropbox, for example, or an iCloud. Yet our Federal laws perversely treat that data storage as if somehow that data has been abandoned by its owner and, therefore, that data loses its constitutional protection.

Well, in 1986, Mr. Speaker, lawmakers believed within reason that individuals and families wouldn't store mass amounts of data online. They wouldn't leave their Gmail stored online. They might have their own servers, or they would delete the emails or delete the data.

Therefore, if an individual actually left information on a third-party storage, it was akin to that person leaving their documents in a garbage can at the end of their driveway, therefore, voiding its Fourth Amendment protections. Thus, that individual had no reasonable expectation of privacy in regards to that email under the Fourth Amendment.

As we all know, virtually everyone now stores millions of emails and tons of gigabytes of data and other personal items on third-party servers. Those emails contain pictures and videos of our kids, our business transactions, our most sensitive information that the government shouldn't have access to without a warrant, without due process as required by the Constitution of the United States.

Establishing these privacy protections are critical for both ensuring that American's rights are protected, but also, Mr. Speaker, ensuring that companies that do business in America know that they can ensure their customers that if they store with them, they can protect it; that that information won't be intruded upon or searched and seized without due process of law, without their permission, without the government proving that they have a need for that information and protecting individuals' rights.

We ensure that cloud computer services are covered by the same warranty for content requirements and that all data is treated as if it is paper documents given our law modernization that is desperately needed.

In addition to updating our constitutional rights, these privacy protections do create business certainty, making sure consumers will be happy to continue to use cloud storage services.

Mr. Speaker, fundamentally, these changes in my bill codify the Sixth Circuit's decision in *U.S. v. Warshak*, which held that email content is protected by the Fourth Amendment. A decision which, while important, needs to be enshrined in law as it only currently applies in the Sixth Circuit. It must be applied nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, today we can cast a unifying vote in these divided times. We so desperately want to find points of bipartisanship and collegiality and to tell the American people that this Congress, this government is doing great things to help protect Americans' rights and to help modernize our laws in a way that is consistent with how we communicate today.

I thank my colleagues on the left side of the aisle for their strong work and strong support. This is a unifying bill. It passed the House last year 419-0. So it is the type of thing that is great policy coming out of the Judiciary Committee. I look forward to seeing it pass again on the floor later today.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can send a unifying vote and a unifying message to the American people today. We can dispel the myth that Congress doesn't work together, and we can send a strong message to the American people that their privacy matters.

I urge passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In 2014, in a unanimous ruling delivered by Chief Justice Roberts, the Supreme Court concluded that the police may not search a cell phone without first demonstrating probable cause.

Citing an obvious Fourth Amendment interest—namely, the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure—in the vast amount of data we store on our personal devices, the Court wrote:

“The fact that technology now allows an individual to carry such information in his hand does not make the information any less worthy of the protection for which the Founders fought. Our answer to the question of what police must do before searching a cell phone seized incident to an arrest is accordingly simple—get a warrant.”

With that decision, the Court took a bold step toward reconciling the Fourth Amendment with the advent of modern communications technology.

Today the House takes a similar step to reconcile our interests in privacy and due process with the realities of modern computing. We do so for the second time.

H.R. 387, the Email Privacy Act, recognizes that the content of our communications, although often stored in digital format, remains worthy of Fourth Amendment protection. And to investigators and government agents who seek access to our email, our advice is rather simple: get a warrant.

It is an idea whose time has long since come. So this bill will allow us to move to a clear, uniform standard for law enforcement agencies to access the content of our communications; namely, a warrant based on probable cause.

H.R. 387 also codifies the right of the providers to give notice of this intrusion to their customers, except in certain exigent circumstances that must be also validated by the court.

We should note the absence of a special carve-out from the warrant requirement for the civil agencies, like the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Internal Revenue Service.

Last Congress, in the Judiciary Committee, we reached quick consensus that a civil carve-out of any kind is unworkable, unconstitutional, or maybe both. I would have preferred to keep

the notice provisions of the original bill, which are absent from the version we reported from committee.

In the digital world, no amount of due diligence necessarily tells us that the government accessed our electronic information. The government should have an obligation to provide us with some form of notice when intruding on a record of our most private conversations.

I fully understand that not everyone shares this view, and I am willing to compromise, for now, in order to advance the important reforms that we will adopt today.

I am proud of the work we have done. Last Congress, the House passed this legislation that has already been noted by 419-0. I hope that today we can send our colleagues in the Senate a similarly strong signal to pass this bill.

This legislation is several years in the making, and it should not be delayed any further.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 387, the Email Privacy Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) will control the time of the majority.

There was no objection.

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

Today, the House of Representatives will again vote to approve legislation that reforms and modernizes the Electronic Communications Privacy Act or ECPA. Last year, identical legislation passed with unanimous bipartisan support by a vote of 419-0.

Reforming ECPA has been a top priority for me as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I have worked with Members of Congress, advocacy groups, and law enforcement agencies for years on many complicated nuances involved in updating this law.

The resulting bill is a carefully negotiated agreement to update the procedures governing government access to stored communications content and records.

Thirty years ago, when personal computing was still in its infancy and few of us had ever heard of something called the world wide web, Congress enacted ECPA to establish procedures that strike a fair balance between the privacy expectations of American citizens and the legitimate needs of law enforcement agencies.

In 1986, mail was sent through the U.S. Postal Service, a search engine was called a library, and clouds were found only in the sky. In 1986, computer storage was finite and expensive. It was unheard of that a commercial product would allow users to send and receive electronic communications around the globe for free and store those communications for years with a third-party provider.

So much has changed in the last three decades. The technology explosion of the last three decades has

placed a great deal of information on the internet, in our emails, and on the cloud. Today, commercial providers, businesses, schools, and governments of all shapes and sizes provide email and cloud computing services to customers, students, and employees.

□ 1745

The Email Privacy Act establishes for the first time in Federal statute a uniform warrant requirement for stored communication content in criminal investigations, regardless of the type of service provided, the age of an email, or whether the email has been opened.

The bill preserves the authority for law enforcement agents to serve the warrant on the provider because, as with any other third-party custodian, the information sought is stored with them. However, the bill acknowledges that providers may give notice to their customers when in receipt of a warrant, court order, or subpoena, unless the provider is court-ordered to delay such notification.

The bill continues current practice that delineates which remote computing service providers, or cloud providers, are subject to the warrant requirement for content in a criminal investigation.

ECPA has traditionally imposed heightened legal process and procedures to obtain information for which the customer has a reasonable expectation of privacy, namely, emails, texts, photos, videos, and documents stored in the cloud. H.R. 387 preserves this treatment by maintaining in the statute limiting language regarding remote computing services.

Contrary to practice 30 years ago, today, vast amounts of private, sensitive information are transmitted and stored electronically. But this information may also contain evidence of a crime, and law enforcement agencies are increasingly dependent upon stored communications content and records in their investigations.

To facilitate timely disclosure of evidence to law enforcement, the bill authorizes a court to require a date for return of service of the warrant. In the absence of such a requirement, H.R. 387 requires email and cloud providers to promptly respond to warrants for communications content.

Current law makes no distinction between content disclosed to the public, like an advertisement on a website, versus content disclosed only to one or a handful of persons, like an email or text message. The result is that law enforcement could be required to obtain a warrant even for publicly disclosed content. The bill clarifies that commercial public content can be obtained with process other than a warrant.

Lastly, H.R. 387 clarifies that nothing in the law limits Congress' authority to compel a third-party provider to disclose content in furtherance of its investigative and oversight responsibilities.

Thirty years ago, the extent to which people communicated electronically was much more limited. Today, however, the ubiquity of electronic communications requires Congress to ensure that legitimate expectations of privacy are protected, while respecting the needs of law enforcement. I am confident that this bill strikes the necessary balance and does so in a way that continues to promote the development and use of new technologies and services that reflect how people communicate with one another today and in the future.

I would like to thank Congressman YODER and Congressman POLIS for introducing the underlying legislation.

It is my hope that today the House will once again approve this legislation that embodies the principles of the Fourth Amendment and reaffirms our commitment to protecting the privacy interests of the American people without unduly sacrificing public safety. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) was chairman of the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Subcommittee in 2010, he held three hearings on various aspects of ECPA, including the need for a warrant requirement.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 387, the Email Privacy Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, which will provide a critical update to the privacy laws governing electronic communications.

The Electronic Communications Privacy Act, or ECPA as it is known, was enacted in 1986. It was an attempt to reestablish a balance between privacy and law enforcement needs at a time when personal and business computing was becoming more commonplace. Over the last 30 years, however, we have seen a revolution in communications technology, and what might have made sense in 1986 is vastly out of date today.

New technologies, including cloud computing, social networking, and location-based services, have rendered many of the law's provisions outdated, vague, or inapplicable to emerging innovations. For example, even a single email is potentially subject to multiple different legal standards under current law.

In 2009 and 2010, when I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, we held multiple hearings to consider reforms to our Nation's electronic and privacy laws. This work culminated in the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Modernization Act of 2012, a bill I introduced along with Ranking Member CONYERS requiring law enforcement to obtain a warrant

based on probable cause before searching emails. That approach, now embodied in the Yoder-Polis Email Privacy Act, is what we are here today to consider.

In an era in which government access to an individual's private information held by third-party providers has become far too easy, this legislation will finally update our laws to reflect our new understanding of what it means, in the words of the Fourth Amendment, for "people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures."

Clarifying the laws will also help industry stakeholders who currently struggle to apply the existing, outdated categories of information to their products and services, and it will provide a clear standard for law enforcement.

This bill is not perfect and, clearly, there is more to be done. In particular, we must keep working to require a probable cause warrant for location information. However, this bill is an important step forward toward ensuring that our laws strike the right balance between the interests and needs of law enforcement and the privacy rights of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I congratulate all those involved in its development.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, the American people's Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable search and seizure by our government must always be protected. Unfortunately, our privacy protections from government intrusion have not kept pace with the way we communicate with each other. It is long past time that we update our Nation's electronic communication privacy laws.

The last time we updated these laws was 1986. That was 6 years after the U.S. Olympic Hockey team's Miracle on Ice, 2 years after I graduated from college, and 1 year before the Minnesota Twins won their first World Series. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, that was a long time ago.

Today, more than 200 million Americans have access to a smartphone, and many more use email and cloud technology. However, many Americans may not realize that these antiquated laws allow law enforcement to read every email that is more than 6 months old, without a warrant.

The Email Privacy Act would codify the reasonable expectation of privacy Americans already have in their electronic communications by requiring a search warrant for private digital communications.

I was pleased to support this legislation when it passed unanimously in the House last Congress, and I look forward to its swift consideration in both Chambers in the 115th. I urge all of my

colleagues to support this long overdue modification of the law.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a former member of the Judiciary Committee and the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Email Privacy Act is long overdue. The fact that the law that governs the government access to emails dates from 1986, before email was really a mass phenomena, is a glaring loophole in our privacy protection laws.

1986 was a time when we used floppy disks to store our information, when, if any internet existed at all, it was just a few people at research universities communicating with another. It was far from a mass phenomena.

Today, this bill catches up with the reasonable expectation that consumers already have that their emails are private. Just as Americans view their phone conversations as private, their physical letters through the mail private, Americans view their emails the same way. Yet, until we close this loophole, the government maintains access, without a warrant, to emails that are older than 6 months in a way that they do not allow access to your old personal letters filed away in a filing cabinet in your office. They don't allow access to old voice mails, and emails are, frankly, no different.

The Email Privacy Act requires that Americans have the same legal protection for our emails as we do for paper letters, faxes, and other types of communication that may remain sitting around. Updating this law simply aligns the law to the digital and physical world. It has taken too long already. Today is a major step forward.

I would like to highlight the House has already passed this bill unanimously last session. How rare it is not just Democrats and Republicans coming together, not just Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, but every single Democrat and Republican coming together, Mr. Speaker. That is rare, and yet this body has spoken overwhelmingly last session and I hope will speak overwhelmingly again today to encourage the Senate to promptly bring up this bill and pass it into law.

This bill is a strong victory for bipartisanship. This bill has been one of the most popular bills in the entire Congress. I am proud to say, as the lead Democrat, this bill had 314 cosponsors last Congress and passed unanimously.

Back when Congress passed the Electronic Communications Privacy Act in 1986, it is fair to say that electronic communications meant something different than it means today. Thirty years ago, modern email simply didn't exist. And today, with 24/7 accessibility, accessibility on our smart devices, in our homes, everywhere else, it has been estimated that there were 205 billion emails sent each day by Ameri-

cans. Those emails contain private communications for millions of us, and they deserve the same right of privacy as the letters in your file cabinet or your desk.

You often hear Members talk about commonsense bills. Well, this bill really defines common sense. When you read our bill, there is nothing more common sense than the Email Privacy Act, which is why the bill passed 419-0 last Congress. Unfortunately, the bill didn't make it to a Senate Judiciary Committee vote, which is why I am so thrilled that Chairman GOODLATTE and Mr. CONYERS have succeeded in having Mr. MCCARTHY and Speaker RYAN bring this bill forward so early this session, giving the Senate a chance to act.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. YODER, for his hard work as the lead sponsor on this bill. I remember he and I, in gathering floor sponsors, would have these friendly contests of who could get more, Democrats or Republicans. That is how popular this bill was in terms of gaining 314 cosponsors, more than any other bill in the House of Representatives at that time.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill. Send a strong message to the Senate to vote immediately on the Email Privacy Act. Tell the Senate it is time to stand up for the privacy of Americans. This bill must be passed. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this good legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 387, the Email Privacy Act.

As I said last Congress, current law is woefully out of date when it comes to protecting privacy in electronic communications. I support H.R. 387, just as I supported the same legislation previously, because it is long past time we afforded Americans the privacy they are due online.

At the same time, I am disappointed this bill has come straight to the Floor, and not through the Judiciary Committee, a committee on which I sit. Nor are any Members able to offer amendments on the Floor. Going through the committee process and allowing amendments on the Floor would have enabled us to address some of the concerns raised by law enforcement about H.R. 387, such as its view that the bill fails to enable personnel to expediently obtain critical evidence. As a former prosecutor I share its interest in making sure that while we improve privacy protections we do not impede the ability to bring people swiftly to justice. I urge the Senate to work to address the points raised by law enforcement so we can continue to improve H.R. 387.

I encourage all Members to support H.R. 387.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 387.

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.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services:

FEBRUARY 6, 2017.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Pete Aguilar, am submitting my resignation from the House Armed Services Committee effective immediately. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this committee and I look forward to serving my constituents in a new capacity as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely,

PETE AGUILAR,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2017.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Scott Peters, am submitting my resignation from the House Armed Services Committee effective immediately. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this committee.

Sincerely,

SCOTT H. PETERS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

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 58 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. WOODALL) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 44, DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR RELATING TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 57, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ACCOUNTABILITY AND STATE PLANS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 58, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO TEACHER PREPARATION ISSUES

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-9) on the resolution (H. Res. 91) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) 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; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues, 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. 689, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 337, 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.

BOLTS DITCH ACCESS AND USE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 689) to insure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County,

Colorado, 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—409

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Higgins (LA)
Adams	Courtney	Higgins (NY)
Aderholt	Cramer	Hill
Aguilar	Crawford	Himes
Allen	Crist	Holding
Amodei	Crowley	Hollingsworth
Arrington	Cuellar	Hoyer
Babin	Culberson	Hudson
Bacon	Curbelo (FL)	Huffman
Banks (IN)	Davidson	Huizenga
Barletta	Davis (CA)	Hultgren
Barr	Davis, Danny	Hunter
Barragán	Davis, Rodney	Hurd
Barton	DeFazio	Issa
Bass	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Delaney	Jayapal
Bera	DeLauro	Jenkins (KS)
Bergman	Demings	Jenkins (WV)
Beyer	Denham	Johnson (GA)
Biggs	Dent	Johnson (LA)
Bilirakis	DeSantis	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Jones
Black	Dingell	Jordan
Blackburn	Doggett	Joyce (OH)
Blum	Donovan	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Katko
Blunt Rochester	F.	Keating
Bonamici	Duffy	Kelly (IL)
Bost	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (MS)
Boyle, Brendan	Dunn	Kelly (PA)
F.	Emmer	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Engel	Khanna
Brat	Eshoo	Kihuen
Bridenstine	Españillat	Kildee
Brooks (AL)	Esty	Kind
Brooks (IN)	Evans	King (IA)
Brown (MD)	Farenthold	King (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Faso	Kinzinger
Buchanan	Ferguson	Knight
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Krishnamoorthi
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Kuster (NH)
Budd	Flores	Kustoff (TN)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Labrador
Bustos	Poster	LaHood
Butterfield	Fox	LaMalfa
Byrne	Frankel (FL)	Lamborn
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Carbajal	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Gaetz	Latta
Carter (GA)	Gallagher	Lawrence
Carter (TX)	Gallego	Lawson (FL)
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lee
Castor (FL)	Garrett	Levin
Castro (TX)	Gibbs	Lewis (GA)
Chabot	Gohmert	Lewis (MN)
Chaffetz	Gonzalez (TX)	Lieu, Ted
Cheney	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Chu, Judy	Gosar	LoBiondo
Cicilline	Gottheimer	Loeb
Clark (MA)	Gowdy	Lofgren
Clarke (NY)	Granger	Long
Clay	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Cleaver	Graves (LA)	Love
Clyburn	Graves (MO)	Lowenthal
Coffman	Green, Al	Lowey
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lucas
Cole	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Grothman	Lujan Grisham,
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	M.
Comer	Hanabusa	Luján, Ben Ray
Comstock	Harper	MacArthur
Conaway	Harris	Maloney,
Connolly	Hartzler	Carolyn B.
Conyers	Hastings	Maloney, Sean
Cook	Heck	Marchant
Cooper	Hensarling	Marino
Correa	Herrera Beutler	Marshall
Costa	Hice, Jody B.	Massie

Mast	Quigley	Speier
Matsui	Raskin	Stefanik
McCarthy	Ratcliffe	Stewart
McCaul	Reed	Stivers
McClintock	Reichert	Suozi
McCollum	Renacci	Swalwell (CA)
McEachin	Rice (NY)	Takano
McGovern	Rice (SC)	Taylor
McHenry	Roby	Tenney
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Thompson (CA)
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
McNerney	Rokita	Thornberry
McSally	Rooney, Francis	Tiberi
Meadows	Rooney, Thomas	Tipton
Meehan	J.	Titus
Meng	Ros-Lehtinen	Tonko
Messer	Rosen	Torres
Mitchell	Roskam	Trott
Moolenaar	Ross	Tsongas
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Turner
Moore	Rouzer	Upton
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Valadao
Mullin	Royce (CA)	Vargas
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Veasey
Murphy (PA)	Ruppersberger	Vela
Nadler	Russell	Velázquez
Napolitano	Rutherford	Visclosky
Neal	Ryan (OH)	Wagner
Newhouse	Sánchez	Walberg
Noem	Sanford	Walden
Nolan	Sarbanes	Walker
Norcross	Scalise	Walorski
Nunes	Schakowsky	Walters, Mimi
O'Halleran	Schiff	Walz
O'Rourke	Schneider	Wasserman
Olson	Schrader	Schultz
Palazzo	Schweikert	Waters, Maxine
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Palmer	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)
Panetta	Scott, David	Webster (FL)
Pascarella	Sensenbrenner	Welch
Paulsen	Serrano	Wenstrup
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Westerman
Pearce	Shea-Porter	Williams
Pelosi	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Perlmutter	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Perry	Shuster	Wittman
Peters	Simpson	Womack
Peterson	Sinema	Woodall
Pingree	Slaughter	Yarmuth
Pittenger	Smith (MO)	Yoder
Pocan	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Poliquin	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Polis	Smith (TX)	Young (IA)
Posey	Smucker	Zeldin
Price (NC)	Soto	

NAYS—1

Amash
NOT VOTING—22

Brady (TX)	Jeffries	Rohrabacher
Cummings	Kilmer	Rush
DelBene	Lynch	Sessions
Deutch	Meeks	Sires
Duncan (SC)	Mulvaney	Smith (WA)
Ellison	Poe (TX)	Zinke
Grijalva	Price, Tom (GA)	
Gutiérrez	Richmond	

□ 1851

Messrs. KRISHNAMOORTHY and LEWIS of Georgia 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.

BLACK HILLS NATIONAL CEMETERY BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 337) to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary

of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—407

Abraham	Conyers	Hanabusa
Adams	Cook	Harper
Aderholt	Cooper	Harris
Aguiar	Correa	Hartzler
Allen	Costa	Hastings
Amash	Costello (PA)	Heck
Amodel	Courtney	Hensarling
Arrington	Cramer	Herrera Beutler
Babin	Crawford	Hice, Jody B.
Bacon	Crist	Higgins (LA)
Banks (IN)	Crowley	Higgins (NY)
Barletta	Cuellar	Hill
Barr	Culberson	Himes
Barragán	Curbelo (FL)	Holding
Barton	Davidson	Hollingsworth
Bass	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Hudson
Bera	Davis, Rodney	Huffman
Bergman	DeFazio	Huizenga
Beyer	DeGette	Hultgren
Biggs	Delaney	Hurd
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Issa
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Jackson Lee
Bishop (MI)	Denham	Jayapal
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Jenkins (KS)
Black	DeSantis	Jenkins (WV)
Blackburn	DeSaulnier	Johnson (LA)
Blum	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.
Blunt Rochester	Dingell	Johnson, Sam
Bonamic	Doggett	Jones
Bost	Donovan	Jordan
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Joyce (OH)
F.	F.	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Duffy	Katko
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Keating
Brat	Dunn	Kelly (IL)
Bridenstine	Emmer	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (AL)	Engel	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Eshoo	Kennedy
Brown (MD)	Españolat	Khanna
Brownley (CA)	Esty	Kihuen
Buchanan	Evans	Kildee
Buck	Farenthold	Kind
Bucshon	Faso	King (IA)
Budd	Ferguson	King (NY)
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger
Bustos	Fleischmann	Knight
Butterfield	Flores	Krishnamoorthi
Byrne	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Calvert	Foster	Kustoff (TN)
Capuano	Fox	Labrador
Carbajal	Frankel (FL)	LaHood
Carson (IN)	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Carter (TX)	Fudge	Lance
Cartwright	Gabbard	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Gaetz	Larsen (WA)
Castro (TX)	Gallagher	Larson (CT)
Chabot	Gallego	Latta
Chaffetz	Garamendi	Lawrence
Cheney	Garrett	Lawson (FL)
Chu, Judy	Gibbs	Lee
Cicilline	Gohmert	Levin
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Goodlatte	Lewis (MN)
Clay	Gosar	Lieu, Ted
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Lipinski
Clyburn	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Coffman	Granger	Loebsack
Cohen	Graves (GA)	Lofgren
Cole	Graves (LA)	Long
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Collins (NY)	Green, Al	Love
Comer	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Comstock	Griffith	Lowe
Conaway	Grothman	Lucas
Connolly	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer

Lujan Grisham, M.	Pingree	Smith (NJ)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pittenger	Smith (TX)
MacArthur	Pocan	Smucker
Maloney,	Poliquin	Soto
Carolyn B.	Polis	Speier
Maloney, Sean	Posey	Stefanik
Marchant	Price (NC)	Stewart
Marino	Quigley	Stivers
Marshall	Raskin	Suozy
Massie	Ratcliffe	Swalwell (CA)
Mast	Reed	Takano
Matsui	Reichert	Taylor
McCarthy	Renacci	Tenney
McCaul	Rice (NY)	Thompson (CA)
McClintock	Rice (SC)	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Roby	Thompson (PA)
McEachin	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
McGovern	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
McKinley	Rokita	Titus
McMorris	Rooney, Francis	Tonko
Rodgers	Rooney, Thomas J.	Torres
McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Trott
McSally	Rosen	Tsongas
Meadows	Roskam	Turner
Meehan	Ross	Upton
Meng	Rothfus	Valadao
Mitchell	Rouzer	Vargas
Moolenaar	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
Mooey (WV)	Royce (CA)	Vela
Moore	Ruiz	Velázquez
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Mullin	Russell	Wagner
Murphy (FL)	Rutherford	Walberg
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (OH)	Walden
Nadler	Sánchez	Walker
Napolitano	Sanford	Walorski
Neal	Sarbanes	Walters, Mimi
Newhouse	Scalise	Walz
Noem	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Nolan	Schiff	Schultz
Norcross	Schneider	Waters, Maxine
Nunes	Schrader	Watson Coleman
O'Halleran	Schweikert	Weber (TX)
O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Webster (FL)
Olson	Scott, Austin	Welch
Palazzo	Scott, David	Wenstrup
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Palmer	Serrano	Williams
Panetta	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Pascarell	Shea-Porter	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Sherman	Wittman
Payne	Shimkus	Womack
Pearce	Shuster	Woodall
Pelosi	Simpson	Yarmuth
Perlmutter	Sinema	Yoder
Perry	Slaughter	Yoho
Peters	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Peterson	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)
		Zeldin

NOT VOTING—25

Cárdenas	Jeffries	Richmond
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Rohrabacher
DelBene	Kilmer	Rush
Deutch	Lynch	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Meeks	Sires
Ellison	Messer	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	Mulvaney	Zinke
Gutiérrez	Poe (TX)	
Hunter	Price, Tom (GA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1858

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.

PERMITTING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY AS PART OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 18

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on April 25, 2017, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2017.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Joaquin Castro, am submitting my resignation from the House Armed Services Committee effective immediately. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this committee. Please do not hesitate to contact my office with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,
JOAQUIN CASTRO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ISRAEL BONDS' "A NIGHT ON THE BEACH"

(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, this Saturday night is Israel Bonds' "Una Noche en la Playa"—"A Night on the Beach"—in Miami Beach.

Over the years, I have had the honor of participating in many of Israel Bonds' programs. The work that Israel Bonds does is vital in expanding and growing Israel's economy and has helped Israel become a global leader and innovator in so many sectors.

With all of the threats now facing the Jewish state, the work of Israel Bonds is more important now than ever. The

guest speaker will be none other than the Israeli Ambassador to the United States, my good friend and Miami Beach native, Ron Dermer.

The Israel Bonds event will also serve as a commemorative tribute to Isaac and Nieves Olemberg. Isaac and Nieves were dear friends who did so much for the south Florida community, for the American Jewish community, for the Cuban American community, and for Israel, herself. Their memories will forever live on through their kindness and compassion.

CONGRATULATING THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS

(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, "Never stop believing." Those words are going to be on the front page of The Providence Journal tomorrow morning.

Like all true tests of faith, last night's Super Bowl wasn't easy going, and there were times, I have to say, when I was tempted to throw up my hands and just go to bed, but I followed the words of our quarterback and—oh, boy—was I rewarded.

What a game.

If there were any doubts, Mr. Speaker, about who the greatest quarterback of all time is, Tom Brady answered them last night; if there were any who questioned whether Bill Belichick was the best coach on the planet, this morning, they are silent; and I am sure they would all admonish me if I didn't say that football is a team sport. So, for those who had not yet been satisfied that the amazing string of successes my New England Patriots put together makes them the NFL's finest team, Super Bowl LI speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, it was truly a team effort, and I offer my heartfelt congratulations to Bob Kraft and to the entire Patriots franchise.

Congratulations, Patriots and Patriots Nation.

HONORING JIM BOEHEIM'S COACHING CAREER

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Syracuse University basketball coach Jim Boeheim upon the occasion of his 1,000th win this past Saturday over the mighty Virginia Cavaliers.

Coach Boeheim has dedicated over 40 years of his life to Syracuse University, and he and his wife, Juli, are known locally for their outstanding generosity and philanthropy.

While central New York happily celebrated Coach Boeheim's 1,000th win this past weekend, the occasion was not recognized by the NCAA due to arbitrarily harsh sanctions that followed an 8-year investigation that eliminated

scholarship opportunities for students and that vacated Coach Boeheim of 108 wins.

While we cannot stand for impropriety in collegiate athletics, we must have transparency, consistency, and fairness from the NCAA—an organization that is charged with promoting higher education opportunities and protecting the welfare of students. That is why I have and will continue to champion bipartisan legislation in the House to reform the NCAA and bring accountability and due process to this organization. There is no denying that Jim Boeheim was the coach for 1,000 basketball wins at Syracuse University, and the NCAA should recognize that fact.

Our community celebrates and congratulates Coach Boeheim for this tremendous achievement, and it is my high honor to recognize him here today.

Congratulations, Coach—and Go Orange.

AMERICA IS A DEFENDER, NOT AN OFFENDER

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I know this Nation's values. Many of us study it in the Constitution, and as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, we review that document on many occasions. We are a nation that stands for principles of democracy; so I am very disturbed by an interview that was given by the White House this weekend that defended Putin—a man who invades to dominate, to kill, a man who supports a despot in Syria who has killed and gassed his own people—and compared his acts to any that the men and women in the United States military or in the United States may have done. It is not comparable to or even equal or even anywhere near the kind of despotism of Russia under Putin.

I am offended, and I apologize to the American people for any comparison. I believe it to be appropriate for the White House to clarify and to apologize for suggesting that our values and the efforts we take to protect people who may encounter efforts of war in any way can be compared to Putin, who is, in fact, someone who kills—and kills to dominate, not to help.

America is a defender, not an offender. I stand here proudly, supporting the values of the United States of America, a country that believes in the blessings of God and democracy.

SHORE UP FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, I had a chance to go out

in the district and look at the conditions of our flood control system in northern California, which, I am sure, is reflective of a lot of the systems across this country. One particular area I was shown has had 10 feet of levee eaten away just since the end of December. This points out, with recent legislation that has been passed—good legislation—that we still aren't, by any means, close to fulfilling our infrastructure needs.

Our flood control systems all over the country and in my own district in northern California need immediate results. We expect a great amount of rain. I know we complain about drought in California—feast or famine—but we need to shore up these systems here because, otherwise, it will place communities in danger from the high flows we could get.

With so much rain forecasted in the near future and with our lakes getting full, there won't be a place to put that water. We need this infrastructure, and we need the Army Corps and everybody to be on board with fully developing and permitting these projects and getting the money going. Urgency is needed.

A BEACON OF DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, in our country, political enemies do not disappear in the dark of night or become, mysteriously, fatally ill. In our country, the press is separate from the government, and journalists do not find themselves jailed or out of business for writing articles with which the government disagrees. While the journalists are not made to write accolades about leadership or about whether they agree or not, I stand here in light of the President's words that were aired over the weekend that suggested that our country is comparable to Russia.

In our country, laws and the Constitution are supreme, not just one person. The courts rule on our Constitution, not one leader. In our country, lawyers, advocates, and citizens are free to challenge the government and its leadership without fear of reprisals.

Mr. Speaker, our country has been a beacon of democracy and freedom and hope for people all around the globe. I would suggest to the White House that it stop squandering that reputation with idle comments and dangerous actions.

HONORING COLONEL BYRON DEEL

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Colonel Byron Deel, Chief of the Joint Staff, Tennessee National Guard, who will be retiring this week after 32 years of dedicated service.

Throughout his career, Byron has held numerous leadership roles with a wide range of responsibilities. Whether it be his command of the Joint Counterdrug Task Force or his current position as Chief of the Joint Staff, Byron has exemplified a work ethic and a regard for others that is second to none.

Colonel Deel's career includes two deployments: in 2001 to Bosnia and in 2005 to Afghanistan. His exemplary service is reflected in the numerous commendations he has received, including the Bronze Star and the Tennessee National Guard Distinguished Service Medal, among a long list of many others. It is also important to mention that his wife, Mary Deel, whom Byron introduces as the "better deal," serves in the National Guard as the Education Services Officer.

On a personal note, Byron has been an invaluable resource for me and my staff on issues that impact our guardsmen. While I am sorry that Tennessee is losing an officer of such high caliber, I extend a heartfelt thanks for his outstanding service and wish him the very best in his retirement.

□ 1915

VIOLATIONS LINGER

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, candidate Donald Trump promised he would drain the swamp. The American people believed him. But instead of draining the swamp, it has become abundantly clear he is driving his own pylons deeply into the swamp.

Already, Trump Incorporated is making significant profits off the President's position. Personal profits aren't what serving the public is about.

My mother used to ask about the superrich: Do they ever fill up?

In fact, The New York Times Editorial Board wrote a scathing indictment of Trump Incorporated. I include that article in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 2017]

WHITE HOUSE INC.

(By the Editorial Board)

As a candidate, President Trump spent contributors' money for office space that he owned, stays at his resorts and food at his restaurants. He spent contributors' money on Trump-branded wine and water. He displayed Trump merchandise at campaign events. Now he seems determined to milk the presidency, apparently synonymous with his brand in his eyes, for a fortune.

"The brand is certainly a hotter brand than it was before," Mr. Trump observed, with satisfaction, shortly after the election.

Last week, an executive of the Trump Organization, Eric Danziger, said it would open Trump-branded hotels in the 26 largest metropolitan areas in the country, up from five. The business, he said, would focus its expansion domestically for "the next four or eight years." The fee to join the Mar-a-Lago club in Palm Beach, Fla., which Mr. Trump calls the "Winter White House," just doubled to \$200,000.

This news came less than a week after Mr. Trump and his inauguration committee hosted parties and other events at the Trump International Hotel in Washington, in the government-owned Old Post Office. Even his press secretary, Sean Spicer, has become a pitchman: "It's an absolutely stunning hotel," he said recently. "I encourage you to go there if you haven't been by."

Self-dealing is such standard procedure for this White House that a cynic (or satirist) might say it's time to give in and try to put Mr. Trump's conflicts of interest to work for the public. Maybe if he had hotels in every nation, he'd have a financial interest in being less bellicose, and more supportive of the free flow of trade and of people, even if they happen to be Mexican or Muslim.

But we really prefer the old-fashioned approach in which presidents put the public interest ahead of their own finances. Federal ethics officials have told Mr. Trump that he should divest his business interests to avoid allegations of bribery and to assure Americans that their needs are his only concern. Mr. Trump argues that he can put a "firewall" between his businesses and himself by having his eldest sons manage them. The president and the Trump Organization last week hired lawyers to keep an eye on the Trumps, a laughable ploy that doesn't meet ethical or anti-corruption standards and constitutional requirements.

Mr. Trump has argued that the law permits the president to keep his business—even though no modern president has done so, and far poorer ones than he have sold off business interests to serve. He and his lawyers have played down the importance of the emoluments clause of the Constitution, which prohibits government officials from accepting gifts or income from foreign governments without the approval of Congress. And he refuses to release his tax returns and divest his assets and put the proceeds in a blind trust, as his cabinet nominees are doing right now.

Consider the Trump Hotel. Mr. Trump has a 60-year lease on the property with the General Services Administration. That contract states that no elected federal official "shall be admitted to any share or part of this lease, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom." That unambiguous clause exists to prevent corruption and self-dealing by government officials.

Since Mr. Trump officially violated the lease when he assumed office, the agency is clearly obligated to cancel the lease or require that it be sold to another hotel operator. Ranking Democrats on the House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over the agency have for weeks been asking it to address the lease violation. So far, the agency, which reports to the president, appears to have done nothing. Mr. Trump's lawyers preposterously contend that because he was not an elected official when the lease was signed, he hasn't broken it.

Aside from violating the lease terms, Mr. Trump is very likely violating the emoluments clause by holding on to the hotel. His lawyers have said that he will donate profits from rooms rented to foreign governments to the Treasury, but that's no cure. Experts say it would be next to impossible to account for foreign "profits"—which, of course, would be based on the hotel's own calculations. Is the hotel prepared to open its books so the public can judge those numbers for itself?

Congress ought to demand that the G.S.A. uphold the terms of the hotel lease and shame Mr. Trump into selling his other businesses, the fortunes of which are now hitched to the presidency. Democrats have been trying to do this, but the Republicans who run the House and Senate have not joined them. So far, they lack the spine to challenge the president. Just imagine how they would have

reacted if Hillary Clinton had been elected and the Clinton Foundation were merely leasing a government building, let alone using it to generate revenue.

If the agency doesn't act, a competing hotel could sue to demand that it cancel the lease because the president's control of the hotel represents unfair competition. The Trump Hotel has been drawing business away from other hotels, precisely because its proprietor occupies the White House. Indeed, the hotel has promoted itself on Twitter with an image of a man relaxing in one of its rooms, gazing out upon a building that looks very like the White House (it's actually the Environmental Protection Agency, which Mr. Trump campaigned to abolish). Since the election, embassies from countries that include Bahrain, Kuwait and Azerbaijan have held receptions at the hotel, and diplomats say it's important that they be seen patronizing it.

Mr. Trump has boasted that the presidency boosts his brand. He should focus instead on how his commercial ambition is tarnishing the image of public service. If he continues to reduce the most powerful office in the world to a marketing scheme, ethical public servants, in Congress and across the government, can't stand by and watch.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it bodes ill for our beloved Republic. Trump Incorporated appears as if it plans to milk the Presidency with his enhanced international profile. The Trump Organization is looking to expand domestic branded hotels in the 26 largest metropolitan areas, up from five.

At his Mar-a-Lago Club, which the President dubbed the Winter White House, the club fees just doubled to \$200,000. The Trump inaugural committee hosted parties and other events at the Trump International Hotel, and his official staff in the West Wing sound like salesmen endorsing that hotel. All this is with the backdrop of President Trump refusing to fully divest his company, put his assets in a true blind trust, or release his tax returns. The question of President Trump's Emolument Clause violations linger behind every action he takes. It is time for him to fess up.

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

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the start of National School Counseling Week to recognize the tremendous impact that school counselors have on our students.

School counselors are committed to helping students realize their full potential. They encourage students to explore their ability, strengths, interests, and talents as these traits relate to career awareness and development.

National School Counseling Week is sponsored by the American School Counselor Association and is always observed during the first full week of

February. This week's theme is "School Counseling: Helping Students Realize Their Potential."

Mr. Speaker, what we know is that school counselors are integral to student success. Counselors not only help students reach their academic and career goals, but they focus on assisting with social and personal development, too. Many parents also benefit from the assistance of school counselors as they encounter the challenges of raising children in today's world.

Our counselors play a vital role in the total education of children. I salute these professionals in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and throughout the United States for their dedication to preparing our students to achieve success and become productive members of society in this ever-changing world.

Thank you to our school counselors for all you do to help educate students nationwide. Happy National School Counseling Week.

REMEMBERING DR. ARTHUR ROSENFELD

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the energy world was saddened by the recent passing of Dr. Arthur Rosenfeld on January 27. I rise today to pay tribute to his extraordinary life and countless contributions.

Known as the godfather of energy efficiency, Dr. Rosenfeld's efforts brought awareness to the tremendous benefits of efficiency. As a physicist at UC Berkeley, Dr. Rosenfeld became interested in efficiency during the 1973 oil embargo. He soon began pushing efficiency standards for appliances and buildings for California, and eventually for the entire Nation. He went on to work as an adviser at the Department of Energy and served on the California Energy Commission.

According to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, a group that Dr. Rosenfeld helped found, savings from energy efficiency gains have averted the need to build more than 300 large power plants since 1990.

The EPA has estimated that between 1992 and 2014, its ENERGY STAR program, a program built on the shoulders of Dr. Rosenfeld's work, has helped families save over \$350 billion on utility bills while reducing greenhouse gas emissions by more than 2.5 billion metric tons.

The cleanest and cheapest kilowatt-hour of electricity that one may take advantage of is the one we do not use. We salute Dr. Rosenfeld.

THE RIGHT TO TRY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of

Americans who receive the devastating news of a terminal diagnosis each year. Even with the amazing work done in American medical research and development, for too many families, access to these potentially lifesaving treatments will come too late, if at all.

It is time for this body to come together with Federal regulators and industry leaders to clear the path forward to take care of those brave Americans who are fighting simply for a chance to live. A bill introduced today jointly by myself and Congressman BIGGS will offer these brave Americans a chance to extend their lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Right to Try Act would ensure that terminally ill patients, together with their physicians and pharmaceutical manufacturers, will have the right to try investigational treatments where no alternative exists. In fact, this bipartisan idea is already the law of the land in 33 States of our Nation.

For patients and their doctors, the Right to Try Act affords them an opportunity to try therapies where the benefits far outweigh the risks. Whether it is a father courageously battling ALS or a brave child living with Duchenne muscular dystrophy, all those fighting for their lives deserve a right to try. They deserve a right to live.

THE DRIVE FOR FIVE

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the Drive for Five is complete. I want to join New England in congratulating our New England Patriots on their incredible victory in Super Bowl LI. Fans across the Granite State agree that Super Bowl LI will go down in history as one of the most amazing comebacks of all time, and it cements the legacy of Tom Brady and Bill Belichick as the greatest quarterback-coach duo ever.

The game was remarkable for team effort. After finding themselves down by 25 points, the Patriots did not fall victim to despair. They, instead, showed true resolve and perseverance as the offense executed drive after drive and the defense held the powerful Atlanta offense in check.

Whether it was the record 14 catches by James White, the record 466 passing yards by Tom Brady, the forced fumble by Dont'a Hightower, the mind-boggling catch by Julian Edelman, or the coaching of Bill Belichick, everyone did their part.

So let me take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to say to the New England Patriots: Thanks for doing your job.

Congrats, Pats.

CONGRATULATING THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a lot of history was made last night. I, too, want to join my New England colleagues to say congratulations to the New England Patriots on an extraordinary victory at Super Bowl LI.

A lot of history was made. This was the greatest comeback in Super Bowl history where our team was down by 25 points in the third quarter to come on to victory. It is the only team to win in Super Bowl history in overtime; and it is an incredible display of the extraordinary talent of Tom Brady, the only quarterback in history to win five Super Bowls. This establishes Tom Brady unequivocally as the greatest quarterback ever.

Also, congratulations to Bill Belichick for his extraordinary coaching, to Jonathan and Robert Kraft, and the whole Patriots organization for all that they have done.

This was a great and wonderful night and an important example and display of determination and persistence. It is really a lesson for all of us to never stop fighting and, for young people, the importance in believing in yourself.

Mr. Speaker, the victory last night by our great team, the New England Patriots, raised the spirits of our entire Nation.

Congratulations to the Pats. Thank you for a great season and thank you for a great victory last night.

OPPOSE THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL 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, earlier today I joined members of my community to discuss the impact of President Trump's Muslim and refugee ban.

I wanted to read from a statement given by one of my constituents who participated in the discussion today. Her name is Nureed. She wrote:

I have always been grateful for being an American and for the sacrifice my parents made to afford me my American Dream. Yet, every day, since the Republican nominee for President was announced, I have feared for my safety and the safety of my little children.

I hold my breath every day praying that the day will not come that I need to flee my home for fear of retribution or, worse, because of my faith.

Mr. Speaker, Nureed is an American who realized the American Dream. She is not a threat to this Nation, nor are her young children a threat to this Nation.

President Trump wants to shut the door to the American Dream. He is tearing apart the fabric of this Nation before our eyes. I urge my Republican colleagues to remember Nureed's words and to oppose the President's unconstitutional ban.

EXPRESSING STRONG OPPOSITION
TO D.C.'S ASSISTED SUICIDE
PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise here tonight to raise a very serious and consequential issue that is taking place in our Nation's capital. Washington, D.C., our Federal city, the second hometown of every American, is just weeks away from implementing a deadly assisted suicide program.

The D.C. City Council recently passed a so-called Death With Dignity Act, which would allow adults who have been diagnosed with a terminal disease and who have been told they have 6 months or less to live to receive a prescription from their doctor to end their life. Six States, including California, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, Montana, and Colorado, have already headed down this dangerous path.

I raise this issue tonight, Mr. Speaker, because our Founders gave Congress the power in the Constitution to "exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever over such District" that would become the seat of the Government of the United States.

As a result, this Congress has the opportunity to stop this law. I am grateful that my colleagues are here tonight to join me: Dr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Dr. HARRIS, Dr. HARTZLER, Dr. MARSHALL. They are joining me tonight to speak in defense of patients who deserve protection, especially when dealing with the unimaginable difficulty of a terminal disease.

Like me, they are deeply troubled that in Washington, D.C., an alabaster city that gleams as a beacon for the principles on which we were founded, this policy is about to be put in place, jeopardizing the lives of the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is, indeed, a remarkable city. I still remember coming to this special place as a 10-year-old child with my parents, coming down the George Washington Parkway in Virginia, as millions of other tourists have, with excitement to see our national monuments and the Capitol in which I now speak.

We Americans approach this city with awe, as we know how Washington is intertwined with our Nation's history and that this city both guards our Nation's founding documents—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—and hosts the very government that our Constitution envisioned. Those founding documents frame a Republic grounded in the principles of sovereignty in the people, subject to the protection of God-given inalienable rights, among them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Nowhere, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is the view of this city more beau-

tiful than from the hills of Arlington Cemetery in Virginia and, specifically, the resting place of our 35th President, John F. Kennedy. One cannot think of President Kennedy without thinking also of his inaugural address, which is a call to action for a new generation of Americans. That call was grounded in the exceptional nature of our land.

□ 1930

"And yet," President Kennedy said, "the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

D.C.'s assisted suicide law, Mr. Speaker, threatens the inalienable rights of vulnerable citizens. Not only does the new D.C. statute tear at the tapestry of our Nation's founding, it directly contradicts the Hippocratic oath every physician takes, to do no harm.

I shudder to think of the lives that will be lost because our society tells the weak, the despairing, the suffering, or the hopeless that suicide is the best option for them. Laws similar to the D.C. Death with Dignity Act in the U.S. and Europe have resulted in individuals being pressured to end their lives, and insurance companies covering the reimbursements for suicide treatment but not for other care.

If patients find themselves unable to pay for expensive treatments out-of-pocket, they may find their options severely limited when facing a new diagnosis, facing a disability, or struggling with mental illness. In some cases, death may become the only affordable option.

Proponents of physician-assisted suicide point to real and tragic stories of suffering individuals at the end of their lives. However, according to a report by the National Institutes of Health, pain is not the primary factor motivating patients to seek a lethal dose of medication. More commonly cited motivations include depression, hopelessness, and the loss of control or autonomy. Allowing physicians to prescribe lethal medications to these patients would mean we are abandoning our Nation's most vulnerable citizens and, instead, succumbing to a culture that is worse than the disease.

Instead of death and despair that are the underlying principles of assisted suicide, our laws should reflect a culture that promotes life and hope, even in our suffering, even in our illness, and even in our weakness.

Jeanette Hall of Oregon was diagnosed with cancer in the year 2000. She was a supporter of her State's assisted suicide program, and she even voted for it. She considered taking her own life with the help of her physician when she learned she only had 6 months to live. Thankfully, she had a life-affirming doctor who simply asked her how her son, who was attending the police academy at the time, would feel about it. This made her stop and think.

His question inspired her to opt for radiation and chemotherapy, instead of suicide, and, over a decade later, she is still sharing her testimony. She is extremely happy to still be alive.

I have no doubt that Americans like Jeanette with chronic illnesses, disabilities, or struggling with mental illness will be exploited under this law, and perhaps even encouraged to pursue suicide rather than continue living until natural death. This dangerous trend is already taking shape in the six States that have legalized physician-assisted suicide. Precious lives have already met a premature end.

Mr. Speaker, there is dignity in all human life, and the root meaning of dignity is worth. Nothing—not illness, not weakness, or despair—can decrease the worth of a human life. I cannot stand idly by and watch our laws corrupt our culture.

I am thankful to be joined by several of my colleagues who refuse to let this dark policy move forward unchecked. With that, I would like to yield to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP). Dr. WENSTRUP is a physician. He has served our country in the Army Reserves having deployed to Iraq to treat our wounded servicemembers. Dr. WENSTRUP, is the prime sponsor of H.J. Res. 27, which will overturn this misguided legislation.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I appreciate that, and I thank you for yielding and thank you for taking the charge on this this evening to share this message.

Mr. Speaker, first, do no harm. Do no harm. These are three short words, but, to physicians, they represent a sacred charge—three short words that now hang in the balance here in the District of Columbia after the D.C. Council passed the Death with Dignity Act legalizing physician-assisted suicide in the Nation's Capital.

In authorizing doctors to violate the Hippocratic oath of "do no harm," physician-assisted suicide undermines a key safeguard that protects our Nation's most vulnerable citizens: the disabled, the sick, the poor—a key safeguard that helps to ensure our loved ones receive the best medical care when they need it the most.

Instead of simply providing end-of-life comfort and a potential for cure, D.C.'s new law is poised to do more harm than good. This act leaves patients unprotected, doctors unaccountable, and our most vulnerable citizens at risk of having fewer medical options at their disposal rather than having more. It is too broad. This act allows adults diagnosed with a terminal disease having less than 6 months to live to receive a prescription for medication to end their life on their own—alone.

There are concerns that the definition of "terminal disease" is too broad since most doctors will admit that accurately predicting life expectancy is almost impossible; and it is. There are many conditions such as diabetes or HIV—they are considered incurable or

irreversible, and they are terminal if left untreated. There are many diseases that are terminal if left untreated, but curable if treated.

This bill fails to accurately protect patients from coercion or abuse. Despite the fact that depression is commonly associated with a patient seeking assisted suicide, D.C.'s legislation does not make screening for mental illness mandatory. It also has no safeguard against pressure that family members or heirs might exert on a patient to choose suicide.

It leaves doctors unaccountable. Compliance with the bill's limited safeguards is difficult to track because the bill directs doctors not to place the actual cause and manner of death on the death certificate. It doesn't say "suicide." The report requirements in the bill are not subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Perhaps most concerning of all, once the prescription for lethal medication is filled, oversight is nonexistent. There is no requirement to ensure that the prescription was used as intended.

This could limit care. Under the new law, patients may end up with fewer options, not more options. D.C. residents who are not able to pay for health care out of pocket may find their options limited when facing a new diagnosis, suffering from a chronic illness, facing a disability, or struggling with mental illness. For certain medical conditions, assisted suicide could become the cheapest option.

Ultimately, whatever its intentions, D.C.'s new law puts patients at risk and could limit their access to high-quality health care. It could limit their access to cures. It prioritizes cost over compassion, cost over care. We have weighed this legislation. We have looked at it seriously, and we find it very wanting. D.C. residents deserve better.

Twenty-two years ago, my sister was diagnosed with an incurable cancer, and she had very little time to live. She was, at one point, given the option of a bone marrow transplant, and her insurance said: It is experimental. We don't cover it.

We had to fight that, and we were going to do it anyway. It is 22 years later. She survived. She is doing well. She is married and has two children, but somebody was telling her: It is not worth it.

This affects people with disabilities. This affects the poor. This attitude reminds me of a comment from the movie, "It's a Wonderful Life" when Mr. Potter says to George Bailey: "George, you're worth more dead than alive." That is not who we are, folks.

In this bill, there is no verification or validation that the prescription was taken as intended, for the person intended, or even taken at all. There is no witness necessary, no provider to address any complications that may occur when taking the medications, no assurance that it is not misused or used on someone else, and no actual cause of death is reported.

In this, they say: "Actions taken in accordance with this act do not constitute suicide, assisted suicide, mercy killing, or homicide." Oh, really? Maybe they should look up the definitions of those words. The definition of homicide is the killing of one person by another whether intended or not. The definition of suicide is the act of taking one's own life voluntarily and intentionally.

This bill is bad for the people of D.C. This is bad for America. This is not who we are. This is not who we are as a compassionate, caring group of Americans—especially caregivers, especially doctors. We can do better, and we all need to stand up against this.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Dr. WENSTRUP, I thank you for introducing this legislation and for having the courage to live the life you have lived in serving our Armed Forces overseas.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) who co-chairs our Values Action Team.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. I thank my friend and colleague for leading this Special Order and for taking the leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to try to explore our leadership to bring H.J. Res. 27 to the floor and, hopefully, to enable us, the Members of the people's House, to strike down this deeply flawed and deceptively written Death with Dignity Act that has been passed in the District of Columbia.

This is not a bill about the elderly. It is not a bill about the sick and dying, as has been stated here. This is a bill that legalizes suicide. It actually attempts to normalize euthanasia. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this bill applies to individuals with "a terminal disease." We all know that could be applied to almost anyone. We could have someone with diabetes, for example, who is able to live a perfectly normal life, in spite of the fact of having an insulin dependency, but without the insulin, it could be terminal—they would be. So this bill applies to individuals who also may have been misdiagnosed.

I appreciate Mr. ROTHFUS mentioning Jeanette Hall. What a powerful story that is—someone who actually voted for this bill in Oregon, and then a few years later comes to find out that she herself has cancer. She tries to have her doctor help her end her life. The doctor urges her to fight to have treatment. She does so, and now 16 years later, she is alive and healthy.

There is no reason for us to have this bill. If you look at the suicide rate in Oregon since that bill was passed in that State in 1997, they have 42 percent above the national average of suicide in that State.

I appreciate Dr. WENSTRUP, too. Just the flaws that he identified that this bill has are alarming. The fact that it, more than likely, will—certainly, the potential is there—lead to elder abuse. The bill has no requirement that the death certificate lists the real cause of

death. It will just be required to say "natural causes" when, in fact, there was a lethal drug injected. The drug itself is not required to be disclosed. The bill does not require a medical professional to be present to administer the lethal drug.

Furthermore, as was alluded to a moment ago, the bill bars law enforcement and, arguably, courts from reviewing medical records at the Department of Health, effectively potentially preventing them from doing their jobs in cases where there may have been foul play.

Mr. Speaker, please know that this does not simply apply to D.C. residents but to those who reside in D.C., which would include everyone in this House.

I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring H.J. Res. 27. I urge our leadership to bring this to the floor for a vote. I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to speak.

□ 1945

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank Representative HICE.

Mr. Speaker, this law, the point about what is going to go on the death certificate, we have had a debate lately in our country about alternative facts, and here we have a law that says you can't say on the death certificate what the cause of death was. It's going to be poison. It's going to be some administered drug that is not supposed to be used as it was intended, as it was authorized by the FDA to be used, but for a whole other purpose—to end the life of somebody. I think that is a very serious concern. I think, again, this is at war with truth and at war with logic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER). VICKY co-chairs our values action team with Mr. HICE.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, Representative ROTHFUS. I appreciate so much your leadership on this issue, as well as Dr. WENSTRUP, bringing this very, very necessary bill to the floor. Time is of the essence, and literally lives are at stake. Sometimes you hear that discussed here, well, this bill is going to impact life. This one truly does. This is a life-or-death matter with just a time limit.

The way that this works is that the Constitution gives Congress authority over the District of Columbia. While they can have their own council and they can make laws, we have ultimate oversight as elected Representatives of this country over what happens here. When they pass a bill here allowing death to occur by physician-assisted suicide, we have the opportunity and we have the obligation to step in and to say no.

As Representative ROTHFUS said, this is the people's town. This is representative of our entire country here, and this does not represent what we stand for, that if someone has an awful diagnosis that they are encouraged and enabled to be able to take their own life without any—any—oversight in this.

We have got to reject this. That is why we are here tonight.

The statistics are staggering. Suicide is the tenth leading cause of death across the spectrum of ages, and the death toll is, sadly, on the rise. Nearly 43,000 individuals took their own life in 2014. Now, that is a heart-wrenching number of people desperate and seemingly without hope and whose solution to traumatic life situations, clinical depression, or mental disorders was to take their own life.

But another, more sinister layer to this suicide crisis in America arises when agents of healing become distributors of lethal dosages. Five States now and the District of Columbia have legalized physician-assisted suicide.

The taking of human life is a criminal act in nearly every State and throughout the Federal Code; yet a few regions of the country, sadly, have embraced the tragic idea that it is better to prescribe death than to provide life-sustaining care, and they are tasking the medical profession, those sworn to provide and take care of people—they have tasked them with carrying out this ghastly deed.

So you go to your doctor on one hand when you have an illness or your child is sick and you are asking and expecting the doctor to be looking out for your best interests and to prescribe medicine to help you get better, and then the next day you are tasking that same physician—you are supposed to go back and ask them to kill your relative and prescribe death medicine? This is wrong.

But here is another sobering fact: legalizing physician-assisted suicide can lead to an increase in overall suicide rates. That was just what was shared by Representative HICE, what has exactly happened in Oregon, with an over 40 percent higher rate of suicide there than in other places. So if you are concerned about suicide prevention, you should be concerned about efforts to normalize doctors prescribing a bottle of pills intended to end a patient's life.

Physician-assisted suicide preys on the sick, the elderly, and the disabled. The frail are the most vulnerable to rising healthcare costs, elder abuse, and physician-assisted suicide. There is no accountability should a family member, friend, or medical provider determine that a particular patient is too sick, too old, or too disabled to continue living. Any doctor can write a prescription, and no witness is required.

Physician-assisted suicide shreds human dignity by legally and subjectively distinguishing between a life worth living and a life better off dead. The focus should be on improving healthcare options, palliative, and end-of-life care for terminally ill patients, not killing those suffering from sickness or disease.

So I call on my fellow Members of Congress to pass the resolution of disapproval sponsored by Dr. BRAD WENSTRUP to reject D.C.'s dangerous

policy and to ensure that all Americans, including those here in the District of Columbia, are granted the basic right to life.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HARTZLER for coming to the floor tonight and speaking on this bill. It is interesting that legalizing assisted suicide can lead to an increase in suicide. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars in our country on suicide prevention. It would seem that laws such as the one that the District of Columbia has passed really go against that fundamental public policy that we have in this country of saying no to suicide.

With that, it is a real privilege for me to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS). ANDY HARRIS is another physician whom I serve with who has served in our Nation's military.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

The gentleman just brought up an interesting point. It is true that in the Netherlands, when they reviewed their experience, they found that just legalizing physician-assisted suicide actually increases the amount of nonphysician-assisted suicide. It sends the wrong message. It absolutely sends the wrong message.

I want to thank the good doctor from Ohio for introducing this bill because certainly the Nation's Capital is one where we should be very careful since the Constitution has entrusted us with approving or disapproving the laws in the Nation's Capital. It behooves Congress to take a good look at a law like this, the so-called Death with Dignity Act. Now, that is striking because most people don't associate suicide with dignity in any way, shape, or form, and for good reason. But I will get to that.

There are a lot of myths associated with the bill. First of all, assisted suicide somehow offers patients more choices. It actually doesn't. What it does is it actually sends a very strong message that regardless of the many types of disease you might have and the many types of treatment that may be available, there is one final, common pathway that the State—in this case, the District—would now say is perfectly acceptable. In fact, it is not only perfectly acceptable, it is legal to actually go to a physician and ask them to participate in your suicide. That doesn't lead to more choice; that ultimately leads to less choice.

But the use of the word "dignity" is striking to me because the number one group of individuals, if we would collectively look at how we would describe those individuals to whom this applies, really, are individuals with some kind of disability, perhaps with a disease or disability that, according to the law, two physicians would just have to agree, knowing how imperfect the idea to predict lifespan is, that those could result in death in 6

months. Associating that kind of problem with the ultimate outcome of death by suicide I think removes dignity. It doesn't add dignity to anyone's life.

Worse than that, what we have done now and what we have seen in terms of the functional reduction of choice is that, according to many of the new payment systems for health care in this country, you actually align the incentives of the patient's health care from top to bottom.

What do I mean by that?

Now over half the physicians in the country no longer work for themselves; they are employed by entities. Frequently, these entities share the same financial risk as the physicians in terms of their being driven to save money. That is it. There are numerous incentives to save money within the law. If you don't believe me, go back and read the Medicare rules and regulations.

In fact, it should be noted that in the Netherlands, where assisted suicide has been legal for years, the average age for women is 65 who participate; for men it is 62. That means, Mr. Speaker, almost half the individuals are Medicare patients. There are powerful incentives built into Medicare to save money—powerful incentives—accountable care organizations, for instance, where the physician who is the patient's attending physician happens to work for the same healthcare system that shares in financial incentives if money is saved.

Mr. Speaker, I would proffer—and I think any Member who is against this legislation and for the Death with Dignity Act should stipulate that, clearly, it saves money to give someone a \$300 prescription for secobarbital rather than pay for expensive cancer therapy or expensive therapy that might cure a patient. That doesn't give a patient dignity. That doesn't add to their dignity. What that does is it now places the patient in the situation, if they truly understand the financial incentives in the system, to actually question whether their physician is doing the right thing for them.

In fact, the consulting physician under the Death with Dignity Act doesn't have to belong to a different financial entity. A physician working for this healthcare entity who actually saves money through the act of suicide can send the patient right across the hall to a consulting physician to agree, that consulting physician being a part of the same accountable care organization. That is wrong. But that is the situation patients will find themselves in, questioning whether their physician has a financial incentive to write that lethal prescription.

Now, the other straw man that is set up very frequently, and if you look at the Pew Research study that asks people their opinion, "Do you think we should allow death with dignity?" they frequently mention only one situation: a patient with terminal disease in extreme pain. But, Mr. Speaker, the data

is that only 20 percent of patients who seek physician-assisted suicide have pain as their primary reason.

Now, we are all compassionate people. Every human being has suffered pain, some human beings more than others, and it is not hard to understand how someone answering that poll question thinking of a patient with terminal illness in severe pain, knowing what pain is about, how difficult it is to treat pain unless it is done with the most modern methods, might say, yeah, maybe dying is better. But, Mr. Speaker, that is a straw man: 80 percent of patients say it is something else; 92 percent saying it is losing autonomy—losing autonomy.

Our solution to losing autonomy in a patient or being less able to engage in activities making life enjoyable, 90 percent of patients saying that, society's solution is to write a lethal prescription?

I will tell you, I am most troubled—and I will close with this. As a physician, I went into medicine to actually help people, to help people get better. That is why people go into health care. That is why my daughters became nurses. They became nurses to help people get better. God knows that is what we want to do. That is true compassion.

But now to say that if a physician, against their Hippocratic oath, shall prescribe a medication that knowingly kills a patient—and let's not mince words. That is what the Death with Dignity Act does. It says a licensed practitioner with a license to heal now has a license to kill—knowingly kill—a patient put under their care. That is a step, Mr. Speaker, I would offer that, as a society, we should take a long and hard look at before we ask our healers to, effectively, become killers.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for taking a long, hard look at what is going to happen here in the District of Columbia if we do not bring H.J. Res. 27 to the floor to block this misguided legislation.

Dr. HARRIS talked about compassion. Certainly, we all have family members, we all have friends who have had very difficult illnesses, and we have been at bedsides when people have passed.

□ 2000

It is good to know that we have palliative care that is available to help people in pain, to make sure that they are getting everything they can without having a doctor violate his or her Hippocratic oath to do no harm.

I really thank Dr. HARRIS for his words and for reminding us how he was called to the healing arts. He has got family members engaged in the healing arts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), another Representative that we are joined by this evening, a newer member from the Big One, I think it is called, also having served in the Army Reserve. He did not do his physician's work in the

Army Reserve, because I don't know what the rules are with women servicemembers and giving birth, but certainly we have women servicemembers giving birth. I don't think they are overseas, although they may be in Germany and other places. I don't think they are going to be in a war zone.

Certainly, he has got plenty of experience. He has delivered over 5,000 babies. He certainly has seen his share of difficult cases with patients. It is good to have him here this evening to talk about this legislation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with fellow physicians and other colleagues to speak out against the shameful act being allowed in some parts of this country: physician-assisted suicide.

When I became a physician, I took an oath in which I promised to help the sick and to abstain from all intentional wrongdoing and harm. To help intentionally take the life of a patient is morally abhorrent.

It is not only the beginning of a slippery slope that devalues the sanctity of all human life. It is not only based on a subjective set of qualifications lawyers and lobbyists agree to. It is against the very oath that my fellow physicians swear to uphold. I encourage my colleagues to fight for these same beliefs, to treat life as sacred, and, first of all, to do no harm.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, it is simple: this Congress has a responsibility. The Founders made us, this Congress—the House and the Senate—the stewards of this city, this beautiful Federal alabaster city. The Founders vested in us the exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia.

H.J. Res. 27, which will block the so-called D.C. Death With Dignity Act, is a bill that goes to the character of this Congress, to the character of the District, to the character of this country.

Will this Congress allow this law to go into effect?

For the vulnerable, I hope not. For the physicians who are supposed to heal, I hope not.

Earlier in my remarks, I talked about how beautiful it is to look at this city from Arlington and to recollect our 35th President and the inspiring words he spoke on January 20, 1961. He ended that address with these words: "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Mr. Speaker, let's lead the land we love. Let this House move ahead with H.J. Res. 27 and prevent this legislation, the D.C. Death With Dignity Act, from staining our Nation's capital.

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

CHALLENGES AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, our country and the community that I have the honor of representing, El Paso, Texas, lost one of our best: Dr. Joseph E. Torres, who was 93 years old at the time of his death, still practicing dentistry in the community of El Paso, and somebody who left a terrific legacy for his family, for our community, for this country, and for all posterity.

Dr. Torres served in the U.S. Army Air Corps from 1942 to 1945. He first served as an infantryman, and then later as a bombardier and a navigator for the B-17 aircraft.

Dr. Torres flew 13 bombing missions over Germany, one of the most difficult missions to be assigned to anybody, over the course of World War II. He later joined and served as a lieutenant in the Army Air Corps Reserve from 1945 to 1947. He later joined the Air Force Dental Reserve, where he reached the rank of colonel.

As I said, he was a practicing dentist in El Paso, Texas. After his time in uniform, he continued to serve his community and he continued to serve his El Pasoans, his fellow Texans, and his fellow Americans. He never stopped being an advocate for servicemembers, veterans, and this country.

So here today we mourn his loss.

Preceding him in death from that Greatest Generation, not too long ago, in August 2016, was Maynard L. Beamesderfer, known as "Beamy" to his friends and his fans. He was one of the original 350 Pathfinders, who were the first combat paratroopers to jump into Normandy, France, before the D-day invasion in 1944. He was a member of the 501st Parachute Infantry Regiment and 101st Airborne Division. Mr. Beamesderfer died at the age of 92.

The third gentleman that I want to introduce to you and who I would like to talk about today and whose story I would like to share is someone I greatly admire and who I have had the privilege of meeting several times and being able to introduce my oldest son Ulysses to. That is Retired Lieutenant Colonel Robert E. Chisolm, "Bob," who is a founding member of the 82nd Airborne Division Association in El Paso. He is someone who is very much still with us, full of vigor, strength, energy, and an inspiration at a time that we so badly need him.

He is also the rarest of Americans. He is a combat veteran of World War II, he is a combat veteran of Korea, and he is a combat veteran of Vietnam. In fact, he is one of only 325 combat veterans in the history of the United States military authorized to wear the Triple Combat Infantryman Badge for combat service in three separate wars.

During World War II, he earned the Legion of Merit Award, which can only be obtained after receiving direct approval from the President of the United

States. He was also recognized by the French Government more recently in 2012, at which time a French general awarded him the French Legion of Honor Award and the status of Knighthood.

We are grateful for the service of these three amazing Americans, these three outstanding El Pasoans, these three great examples to each and every one of us of who are we when we are at our best and what we are willing to do to serve this country and the cause of freedom and the best interests of humanity.

It is these three men and others who join them in the Greatest Generation, the men and women throughout this country who endured and suffered, survived, and began to thrive through the Great Depression. Following that, they proudly and gladly served their country in World War II in a world away, whether it was in North Africa, Italy, Europe, or the Asia Pacific.

These were men and women who fought for not just this country, but who fought for and won a world order that has more or less sustained us for the last 75 years; a world order that was won, fought for, and sustained through enormous treasure, blood, and sacrifice of this country, sustained, fought for, and won by men like Bob Chisolm, “Beamy” Beamesderfer, and Dr. Torres.

I bring them up today so, one, we can pay honor and tribute to them; and, two, so that we can remember what is at stake today, in 2017, seemingly a world away from when Dr. Torres first served in the Army Air Corps in 1942. It is a world where the United States is the sole superpower, where we guarantee the lanes of trade, the connections between countries, the viability of an entire continent in Europe. The benefits from the treasure and the blood and the sacrifice and our sustenance of these policies over the last 70 to 75 years has accrued primarily to the United States, but also to our allies and also, I would argue, to the rest of the world.

We have largely seen in that time a time of peace, a time where we avoided major world wars, where we peacefully sustained and outlasted the Soviet Union and ushered in a new era of peace in Eastern Europe.

When we think about the challenges that we face today, those countries who do not see a place in this world order that we won and have sustained—countries like Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, each of whom, in their own way, pose a threat not just to the United States, not just to their neighbors in their respective regions, but to the world and the order that we have bought at such a dear cost.

When we think about what is going on today, it is critically important that we move forward very carefully and mindful of what it took to bring this world order about and what could happen if this world order collapses.

As General David Petraeus told us last week in a House Armed Services

Committee meeting, this world order did not will itself into existence. It did not sustain itself. It did not win itself. All of that was done by Americans, for Americans, for our allies, for our interests, and our values around the world. It is important that we be mindful of that when all of that is at stake and when it is under threat unlike any time since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

As we begin a new Congress with a new administration, we have several choices before us. We can shore up that world order and the alliances and relationships that underpin them. An example is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO, our partnership with 28 European countries that has effectively kept the peace on that continent for more than 70 years. Or we can refer to that arrangement and that treaty as obsolete and we can ask the Europeans to take care of their own business without assistance or alliance from the United States.

Perhaps that is in the best interest of this country. Perhaps that reduces the burden on the United States taxpayer. Perhaps that reduces the burden on the servicemembers now deployed in Europe, reassuring that continent.

Perhaps it is also better for Russia as they continue to probe the weaknesses in the Western alliance; as they move into Ukraine and seize Crimea or are active in the eastern part of that country; as they interfere in elections throughout the Western world, most notably our own in 2016, but not limited solely to the United States, and where we fear they may be active again in interfering in other elections in the free world.

□ 2015

Perhaps this is good for Russia to think of NATO as obsolete or to withdraw our commitment because our allies are not ponying up their fair share of the burden, and I think that is a real concern. Maybe that is good for us. Maybe that is good for Europe. It is certainly going to be good for Russia. The consequence for that, my colleagues, may very well be that, while we might save some in what we are spending in treasure and sacrifice and service in Europe today, we may be called back again, as we were in the World War I and afterwards in World War II to defend that continent from tyranny at extraordinary costs to our treasury, to the lives of those who serve, to the lives that are lost, to the lives that are changed forever.

When we look at another part of the world in the South China Sea and to our allies there like Japan, the Philippines, increasingly, Vietnam, perhaps it is better that we allow China to decide what is best for that region and for those countries at the expense of those who, today, are our allies. Certainly, it would save the taxpayer the resources that we expend today to prop up and support our allies, to ensure their defense, and to ensure our inter-

ests. Perhaps it would be good for those countries in that region, including Taiwan. It would certainly be good for China, a growing competitor not just in the South China Sea, not just in Asia, but, increasingly, around the world.

So we have a choice there to make as well: Do we retrench, withdraw, close ourselves off from the rest of the world and our commitments and our obligations? Again, the benefit of which has largely accrued to us, as it has to our allies and much of the rest of the world. Or do we fix what is not working now; sustain, perhaps even grow, that commitment; meet the threats; and address the fears that that part of the world has? It comes at some cost, and it is not a trivial one.

But I would argue that we cannot foresee the future where the United States is not involved in the South China Sea, in east Asia, with our allies in that region. We don't know for sure what will happen, but we know that power abhors a vacuum. We know that where the United States is not, other world powers will be; and they certainly don't have the interests of our citizens, our values, and our way of life at heart.

When it comes to the Middle East and the series of serious challenges that we face there from Iraq and Syria to north Africa in Libya, to our difficult relationship with Saudi Arabia, who is an ally and at the same time the source of so much that threatens that region and, ultimately, the United States, certainly, in the short term, it would be cheaper to withdraw our commitments and our support, our resources and our servicemembers, who are there at such great cost, again, to this country and to themselves and to their families, who bear the burden of the fight and sustain those injuries when they are incurred and mourn the losses of those servicemembers who never make it back.

It is easy to argue, in the short term, that that could be good for the United States. But it is hard to argue, in the long term, that, without our leadership, without some level of involvement, including military involvement, but especially diplomatic and political engagement with the governments and the people and the interests in the Middle East, it is hard to argue that, without that, our interests, our goals, our values will be respected, accepted, honored, and seen through. What is much more likely is that we will find ourselves there again, responding to a great crisis at greater expense of life and treasure to this country.

And that story repeats throughout the world. Whatever country, whatever region, whatever hemisphere, whatever continent, when the United States is not there, neither are our interests, neither are we able to benefit, and neither is the world able to depend on some level of peace, security, and stability.

I urge this House, our new President, those whom we represent to think

about what is at stake right now around the world, to understand how this international order was brought about, how it was fought for and won and sustained, and how tragic it would be, after 75 years, after the noble sacrifice of so many of the Greatest Generation and of the generations that followed who served in Korea, who served in Vietnam, who served in the first Gulf War, who are serving today in our wars that followed the attacks of 9/11, how terrible would it be for us to lose what we have fought so hard to gain in the span of one administration?

It does not have to be that way. I think working together, across party lines, with this administration, with Congress, both Houses, with the American people, certainly supporting our servicemembers and honoring the sacrifices of our veterans, I think together we can meet this challenge, just as we have met serious challenges in the past. But we are going to need to correct our course, and we will need to do so immediately.

No longer can we mock allies, try to humiliate our neighbor to the south, the country of Mexico.

No longer can we call into question an alliance that has withstood the test of time and has ensured the peace of this country and the continent of Europe: the NATO alliance.

No longer can we threaten to withdraw from international obligations, whether they are at the U.N., whether they are bilateral trade negotiations or multilateral trade agreements.

No longer can we think that the United States can serve as a bunker against the rest of the world. It is too late for that. It was too late for that in World War II when the three brave gentlemen that I began my speech with decided to serve this country and to purchase the freedom and the world order that so many take for granted today.

I think it is incumbent upon us to try to offer an alternative to the course that we are currently on, an alternative that I would say starts here at home and with those countries that border ours. It starts with acknowledging that Mexico, for example, is far more an opportunity than it is a threat to the United States, that today we do hundreds of billions of dollars of trade with Mexico, trade that is unique in its character such that, when we export to Mexico, certainly we win. Those are U.S. jobs, U.S. products being exported to the country of Mexico, bought by Mexican consumers. The proceeds flow back to the U.S. worker and to the owners of those businesses and companies.

But when we import from Mexico, it is important to remember, 40 percent of the value of our imports from that country were generated here in the United States. Those same factory floor jobs in Michigan, in Indiana, in Ohio, in Tennessee, in Texas produce products that are exported to Mexico for final assembly and then brought back into the United States.

Forty percent of the value of our imports from Mexico are U.S. content. When we look at China, it is 4 percent. When we export to Mexico, we win. When we import from Mexico, we win. We win jobs, 6 million American jobs that, today, are dependent on U.S.-Mexico trade.

Nearly half a million of those are in the State of Texas alone, each one of them jeopardized by the course that this country has taken under this new administration, each one of those potentially lost if we cannot redevelop a positive relationship with the country of Mexico, certainly one in which our interests are most important to the United States, where the U.S. worker is preeminent, but where, nonetheless, we understand the larger picture and the longer game, that our future—the United States and Mexico—is a shared future, that the way we manufacture today is done together, both countries producing products that are made in North America along with Canada. That is what is going on here today, that we are linked in a way that cannot be unlinked without causing serious trauma, job loss, economic downturns, and insecurity for the United States.

In the last 30 years, as we have grown closer to Mexico and had a stronger economic relationship with that country that results in the hundreds of billions of dollars of trade that cross our ports of entry every year, at the same time, we have grown a stronger, closer security relationship such that the most notorious criminal mastermind in the history of Mexico, Joaquin Guzman, El Chapo, was recently extradited to the United States despite considerations of Mexican sovereignty. Despite, perhaps, the loss of pride that is entailed in sending that country's criminal who is responsible for countless deaths, for drug production, drug transit, and the drugs that cross into the United States and are consumed in Mexico and other parts of the world, Mexico did that precisely because of the strong security relationship that has grown between these two countries.

So should we pursue a path of humiliation for our southern neighbor? Should we build a 2,000-mile wall in a hopeless effort to seal that country off from ours? Should we propose imposing a 20 percent tax on all goods coming in from Mexico which, again, remember, will not just hurt the Mexican worker, but will hurt the U.S. worker as well?

Should we do all that, not only will we hurt ourselves economically, we will deeply damage the security bonds that exist today between those two countries, security bonds that keep us safe, that keep us secure, that help explain why today, despite the headlines, despite the campaign rhetoric, the facts show that the U.S.-Mexico border has never been more secure. It has never been more safe. It has never posed less of an immediate risk or hazard to Americans.

It has a lot to do with the brave men and women in the United States Border Patrol, those who also serve in police departments like ours in El Paso, in sheriff's departments like those under the command of Sheriff Richard Wiles in El Paso County. It has a lot to do with the immigrant populations who live in the communities along the U.S.-Mexico border who are such a part of our safety because they are striving to get ahead, to keep out of trouble, to learn, to study, to do better, to contribute to, participate in, and reap the benefits of the American Dream.

But we are also safe because the country of Mexico has made a commitment to help keep us safe. When we are concerned about transnational criminal organizations coming from the three most dangerous countries in the world today—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras—we have a partner in Mexico, who checks their advance at Mexico's southern border, who ensures, when we have the greatest humanitarian crisis this hemisphere has ever seen because of the brutality and violence that we see in those northern triangle countries in Central America, that Mexico is our partner in helping to provide shelter, sustenance, and aid to those frightened young children leaving the northern triangle.

Some still make their way to the United States and present themselves, not trying to evade detection, but present themselves to Border Patrol agents and Customs officers at our ports of entry. No wall could ever keep them out.

But as many as are coming from Central America today, we have record low levels of northbound migration and asylum-seeking attempts crossing the U.S.-Mexico border. The number last year was somewhere around 400,000 northbound apprehensions. The number 16 years ago was 1.6 million northbound apprehensions.

For all the reasons that I gave, and one of them an important one—and we must keep that in mind—is Mexico: our relationship, our partnership, part of that world order that we have fought for, worked so hard for, sustained at such great cost. These are the dividends that world order is producing for the United States today in jobs, in economic growth, in the security and safety of our communities and the people we represent.

□ 2030

El Paso, Texas, in fact, is the safest city in the United States today. It was the safest city last year, it was the safest city the year before that, and it has been among the safest cities in America for the last 15 years. It is not an outlier, and it is not an anomaly. The second safest city is San Diego, California, another large U.S. border city, conjoined with its sister city of Tijuana.

So when we upend this world order, when we upend our relationships, when we bully, humiliate, and threaten the

countries with whom we have been allied and partnered for so many years now, not only will they suffer, which I can only assume is the intent of the President, but so will we. We also do deep disservice and dishonor to those who have fought so hard, worked so long, and done so much to build up something today that we are the lucky heirs to.

Furthermore, our leadership position in the world is not sustained on blood and treasure and diplomacy alone. It is the values that we live out each and every day in our homes, in our communities, and, yes, here in our government, in the United States Congress. Values that include taking in the world's refugees.

After screening, ensuring the security and safety of the communities into which they will come, which we have always done—and no one is vetted or screened more thoroughly than a refugee from another country trying to enter the United States—most will not be able to make it, even under previous administrations. But after that screening has taken place, when they come to this country, those refugees, those asylum seekers, and those immigrants are the ones who have helped to build this success story, this exceptional country, this indispensable Nation, the United States.

And when we turn off the lamp of liberty, when we no longer shine as a beacon to the refugees, the aspirational people around the world who are looking for a better life, who were called to our shores by our values and what we represent around the world, and what we have always fought for and proved in actions beyond our words, when that lamp goes out, when we begin religious tests for the kinds of immigrants who we will bring into this country, when we do things that are immediately politically popular but are not in the best traditions of this country, we lose that place of prominence around the world, not just to the countries and the decisionmakers within those countries—the kings and queens and presidents and prime ministers—we lose that place of prominence with the people around the world who have always looked to the United States for example and for leadership.

And so I ask my colleagues to join me in ensuring that, as troubling as this course has been in the first few weeks of this administration, we remember that we still have time to correct it and that we have an obligation to offer an alternative, one that has served this country so well for so long and is a source of so much of our strength, our exceptionalism, and our greatness. I call on my colleagues to move beyond Presidential fiat, beyond executive order, beyond the whims of a new administration, and to set in law our values and our priorities.

Ultimately, we must be able to reform our system of immigration laws. But short of that, we must at least be able to honor the ones who are already

on the books. We have to do more to ensure that those who need us most in the world can find a home in this country, not solely for their benefit. That is the moral imperative. That is the argument that can persuade us in our hearts, but also because the value and the benefit will accrue to this country economically in our security, in our vibrancy, and in ensuring that the next generation is going to be the leaders, whether it comes to the businesses that are created, the books and the art that are created, the leadership that is needed, and the service that we demand in uniform throughout the world.

Certainly that comes from native born U.S. citizens, but it also, as we know when we think about the history of this country, that comes from those who came to our shores. Or, like most of the Western Hemisphere, whether your family came from Mexico or El Salvador or Argentina, there is a good chance that your Ellis Island was El Paso, Texas, that your family first set foot on U.S. soil in the community that I have the honor to represent today. Whether it was in Segundo Barria, or the Chihuahuita neighborhood, or the Chamizal district, El Paso has been that first welcoming community to millions who have answered the promise, the potential, the opportunity, and the beacon of hope that we have provided for the world.

It is no accident, and it is totally connected, that El Paso's safety is directly proportional to our connection to the rest of the world, to Mexico, to these people who so many of our political leaders want to sow fear and anxiety and misapprehension about. They want to vilify these people, call them rapists and thugs and criminals, when the facts bear out that they are the very reason that we are so secure and so safe.

So imagine in the Ellis Island of the Western Hemisphere—El Paso, Texas—building a wall that would forever separate and divide us from the rest of the hemisphere, from the place where we meet the rest of the world. That, too, will compromise our leadership position in the world. That, too, will dishonor the noble sacrifice that we have seen from countless servicemembers from those who pursue U.S. policy around the world, and to those who are now serving in more than 140 countries around the globe.

I think about another country and another wall at another time that proved American exceptionalism when the Soviets constructed the Berlin Wall to keep East Germans from being able to flee to the West, those East Germans who, in some way, were responding to the hope that I am talking about that we have so long represented around the world. It was the United States that overcame that wall. It was people like General James H. Polk who ensured that the people of East Berlin had hope, that the people of West Berlin had hope, that we made every effort to fulfill our commitments, not just to

Americans on American soil, but to American values wherever they may be represented around the world. While other governments were building walls, the United States was doing the right thing.

And it was a President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, who challenged the Soviet empire to tear down this wall. How far have we come that today, in 2017, in the living lifetime of those who served with President Reagan, who voted for President Reagan, who lived in the America that President Reagan was a President of, that we are contemplating building a wall that would keep people out, that would separate people who have a common future, a common history? And in places like El Paso and Ciudad Juarez, 3 million people who form the largest binational community in the world, two people who have a common identity, nothing to be afraid of, nothing to be anxious about, nothing to be scared of. We, the United States, are at our best when we are strong, when we are confident, when we are bold. We are at our worst when we are anxious, when we are afraid, when we are scared.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we not make policy out of fear, that we not stoke anxiety, that we not lose the best, strongest traditions of who we are as Americans, but, instead, follow those traditions. And when we do, we will be able to change the course that this country is now on. We will be able to help this President to do the right thing, the right thing for this country, in this country more importantly, but to do the right thing for this country when it means standing up for our values, our interests, our allies around the world.

Mr. Speaker, for many in this country and for many around the world, these are some of the darkest days in recent memory. But I have hope because we have had far darker days in this country before. And the institutions, such as the one that we are in today, and the American people whose work we do at whose pleasure we serve, who we represent in this Chamber, are a remarkable, resilient people. And they will help to bring this body, this administration, this government, and this country to its senses. And when we get there, I am confident that we are going to do the right thing, I am confident that we are going to honor the best traditions of this country, we are going to honor the brave men and women who have served, who helped to build what we have today, which so many people take for granted. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that working together, Republican and Democrat, we are going to do what is best for the world and what is best for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SECURITY AND GENEROSITY: ON BEING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the

Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) would mind lingering in the Chamber for just a moment, I want to make a couple of comments on what he said. Because he began his talk with a commemoration of some extraordinary Americans, World War II veterans. And as I was waiting my turn to speak, I couldn't help but reflect upon perhaps one of the most extraordinary opportunities that I have been given as a Member of the House of Representatives.

A bipartisan delegation went to the 70th anniversary of the D-day invasion. President Obama, of course, spoke, and dignitaries from around the world, including the Queen of England, also made an appearance.

When we got to the cemetery area at Omaha Beach, we were meeting veterans who had fought there or in the vicinity. One of the first gentlemen I met, he had only a thumb, and he was sitting in a wheelchair. And I just asked him, because it was such a celebratory atmosphere and everyone was so engaged by the heroism of these men and the opportunity to be back so many years later—I just asked him: Did that happen here?

He said: Yeah, right over there on the beach.

Well, his daughter was with him, and she told me a moment later: Actually, what happened was we think that he was shot on the hip and one of his grenades began to go off and he was throwing it away from himself.

I looked at him and I said: How are you here?

And he said: I don't know.

Another man had been a part of the paratroopers who dropped in behind enemy lines the night before near the town of Sainte-Mere-Eglise, and I will come to that town in a moment. And I asked him: What was your assignment?

He said: Hill 60, or some number.

And I said: Where is that?

He said: Right over there. He said: Guard the bridge at La Fiere.

I said: That is the bridge at La Fiere.

An old Norman-style, arched stone bridge, maybe a car-length wide, obviously just one lane to get a horse and cart over.

He said: Do not let the Germans cross that bridge, that was our assignment, and we held them.

Another man looked at me and said: I haven't been here in 70 years. A much better reception this time.

This great humor, this depth of character that these extraordinary men showed was so evident that day.

□ 2045

To continue the story a little bit more, Captain Luther Sextan Fortenberry, my grandfather, left his family in August of 1944. He was a medical doctor and was initially at a hospital in England. The records are a little bit unclear; but, in November of '44, he was

killed, and he left his 8-year-old son—my father—behind. He was initially buried at Sainte-Mere-Eglise, at the cemetery there. He was reinterred in Arlington National Cemetery.

One of the guides that we had during that trip was a former British military officer, and he had a complete command of the details of the battle. In fact, I was so impressed by him that I invited him to come to Nebraska to speak to my veterans, and he accepted. So, later that summer, we hosted him in Nebraska. One of my little towns is called Columbus, Nebraska. Columbus is actually the place where Andrew Jackson Higgins was born—the Higgins boat inventor, which was the troop carrier that landed there on Omaha and Utah Beaches that day. President Eisenhower said of Andrew Jackson Higgins that he won the war for us.

He is very much associated with Louisiana because that is where he spent his adulthood, in shipbuilding, and he would not let go of the idea that we needed this innovative type of troop carrier. He is from Columbus, Nebraska. In the front of Columbus, Nebraska—which is a small, agricultural town, a wonderful community of 25,000 people—they have built an extraordinary World War II memorial that is a replica of the Higgins boat, with beautiful bronze sculptures of the troops in their charging off that boat.

When my friend, the former British military officer who now does—again—tours and commentary on the battle, saw this, he looked at me and said: JEFF, this belongs on Utah Beach because there is nothing like that there anymore.

I will make a long story short.

Some of the members of the community who had worked on that project heard this. They said: Well, we can build another one.

I was trying to tamp down expectations because I knew how difficult that would be; but the day before the 71st anniversary, that new World War II memorial was put in the breach where our troops first came through, where General Roosevelt led our troops through on Utah Beach. Right in the breach, a memorial that was constructed by the good people of Columbus, Nebraska, now sits as a permanent display—a replica—of the Higgins boat, right next to the World War II museum right there on Utah Beach. I understand it is extraordinarily popular as one is able to enter onto the boat and experience the life-like reality of what it must have been like to be in that moment. The French even moved one of their own monuments, by the way. This is the cooperation we had with the French Government. They moved their own monument to General Le Clerc—their general who had followed the pathway or fought, as well, into Germany.

I apologize for holding the gentleman up, but he talked about a number of things. Obviously, we are going to have big, important debates about a number

of the sensitive points he talked about; but where there is no debate is in the character of the men and women who served in World War II. I thank the gentleman so much.

Madam Speaker, I want to give this commentary tonight, as well, on some of the dynamics of the moment. Before I begin, I would like to share with you that, outside of my office, there hangs a framed copy of a piece of legislation. In fact, it was one of the earliest pieces of legislation that I worked on here, and I am quite proud of it. The bill increased the number of Iraqi translators who could come to the United States. These persons served alongside our troops and put themselves and their families at great personal risk in service to our country. Among those who benefited from this expanded policy were members of the Yazidi faith tradition—a peaceful, ancient faith—that, very sadly, ISIS has targeted as a part of its extermination campaign against Christians and other religious minorities, including innocent Muslim communities.

Madam Speaker, as we all know, America has long opened her arms to persons who flee persecution, who wish to rebuild their lives and become good citizens here. My hometown of Lincoln, Nebraska, is a diverse, welcoming community with a number of first-generation Americans, and we are the better for it. However, when there is chaos and disorder at our border or if there is uncertainty in immigration policy and procedures, this problem undermines the ability of our country to be generous; or, worse, it affects our safety. There are two principles being held in the balance here: keeping America safe and keeping America generous.

President Trump's executive order to protect the Nation from foreign terrorist entry into the United States has suspended all new refugee admissions into the U.S. for 120 days. In addition, it blocks all travelers for 90 days from seven countries of concern—Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen—which was a list, by the way, created by the Obama administration in 2015. Refugees from Syria are banned indefinitely, and travelers from these countries with a green card will be allowed since they are permanent United States residents.

Madam Speaker, from my perspective, I believe it is reasonable to pause and review our refugee policy from dangerous parts of the world; but, clearly, the implementation of the policy has caused some confusion, difficulty, and concern, some of which has been clarified.

As an example, there is a Yazidi man named Nawaf, who was one of those military translators—again, putting himself at great risk to serve alongside our troops. Nawaf visited my office last Monday. It was in the evening. He requested help for his wife, Laila. Two of his brothers live where I live—in Lincoln, Nebraska. Although I didn't recognize him at first, I remembered that

a president of a university in Iraq, whom I know, once told me about a Yazidi student who had become class valedictorian of that university; so I began to piece this story together.

Nawaf arrived in America just last year. Following 18 months of vetting, his wife was awarded a special visa about a week and a half ago; but as Nawaf was explaining to me both with great composure and, frankly, a certain sensitivity to our security concerns, he told me that his wife, Laila, was barred from entry.

Madam Speaker, immigration and refugee policy always involves a difficult choice. A country has to consider first its absorption capacity, the possibilities of assimilation, as well as the necessity of those coming to accept the values of the host country's. I think a review of this policy or of these principles—a review of what has happened in Europe—actually sheds some light.

For example, Germany recklessly threw open its borders recently, and a wave of persons—many young, single men—entered the country, sparking an uptick in crime and violence and, possibly, the conditions for more terrorist attacks. Confusion continues as to who is where, and the German Government's rapidly considered and naive refugee policy has unwittingly created an anti-immigration backlash and political turmoil.

Madam Speaker, the immigration and refugee movement should always be a means of last resort. Everyone can't come to the West. Rather, it is the responsibility of governments around the world to create the conditions in which people can live securely. If that breaks down, as a first order response, robust humanitarian assistance and repositioning persons in nearby safe zones creates the possibility of a right of return and avoids the trauma of uprooting persons from their homes and their cultures.

Madam Speaker, with all of the complex considerations surrounding immigration, though, it is important to remember that we are not dealing with statistics, that we are not dealing with some remote geopolitical policy, but that we are dealing with the lives of real persons. So, happily, last Friday morning, after my office successfully worked on the case, Laila arrived, and with open arms and flowers, Nawaf, her husband, welcomed her to America.

Madam Speaker, given now that the executive order has been put on a temporary halt as the administration goes through the appeals process, I also think it is appropriate to pause and speak about the broader issues at stake here—what it means to be a nation and what it means to have a binding narrative as a people.

Madam Speaker, I am quite sure our soldiers know this feeling all too well—I have experienced it, too—when you are in a far-off place, with no one familiar around you, and then you, all of a sudden, have that feeling of connection be-

cause you see it—you see an American flag. At that moment, the flag is more than a piece of cloth with stars and stripes. It is an enduring symbol that expresses a deep, unspoken narrative about who we are as a people and about the ideals that unite us as a nation.

If you ask most people what America means, I would suggest that they would probably use one word: freedom. Yet I am afraid, Madam Speaker, that this word "freedom" is so overused that we have forgotten its essential meaning. Most properly understood, freedom is the ability to do what one ought—to take responsibility for oneself, one's family, one's community, and, by extension, one's nation. Freedom is not a detachment from responsibility to do whatever you want. That is a self-destructive idea that erodes freedom, resulting not only in the loss of oneself, but in the degradation of the entire community.

Of course, we often reflect on what it means to be an American when discussing immigration. America has long offered the hope of freedom for immigrants who are yearning to work for a better future for themselves, for their families. To those tempest-tossed, to those tired, poor, huddled masses yearning to breathe free, America has lifted its lamp beside the golden door. Implicit in this worldwide welcome was a basic compact that those who came here, however arduous their journey, must undertake the responsibility of citizenship. Of course, many people gleefully do.

In fact, America's very survival as a beacon-handed land requires those who immigrate to assimilate and adopt the values proposition that makes our country unique in the history of the world. Those values include respect for others, the acceptance of law and order as a prerequisite for the orderly functioning of society, and the desire to participate constructively as a citizen. Those who refuse to assimilate or reject these time-honored values take advantage of the sacrifices and hard-fought gains of generations of Americans who have built and often died for what we cherish and what we so eagerly share with people from around the world. That is fundamentally unfair and is an abuse of the idea of freedom itself.

Madam Speaker, individual freedom is achieved most fully in the context of community. When the government or interest groups see freedom merely as a functional meeting of material needs alone, it undermines the social dimensions of freedom, which are rooted in authentic human relationships.

□ 2100

Conversely, the proper amount of government, a government well-ordered, provides protection and creates the guardrails for individuals to flourish together, generating meaning for persons and community. The right political approach in America can restore that golden mean.

Madam Speaker, there is a story I would like to tell. There is a man, and he is talking to his young son. He said: Son, you see that beautiful, lovely home there on the hill? One day, if it is your heart's desire, if you are willing to work hard and be patient, and if you do what is right, then maybe you could earn that home one day.

Another man in another country took a very different approach talking to his young son. He said: See that big mansion on the hill there? If you work hard enough, if you stay focused, and if you position yourself right, one day you can get that guy.

You see, Madam Speaker, our country is not based on the principle of envy. It is based on respect and responsibility. To make America flourish again, politically, economically, and culturally, a restoration of this ideal is necessary to create the conditions for a true and lasting freedom.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2017.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Enclosed herewith are the Rules and Procedures for the 115th Congress that were adopted by the Committee on Small Business at its organizational meeting on February 1, 2017.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(A) Rules of the Committee. The Rules of the House of Representatives, in total (but especially with respect to the operations of committee, Rule X, cl. 1(q), cl. 2, cl. 3(1) and Rule XI), are the rules of the Committee on Small Business ("Committee") to the extent applicable and are incorporated by reference.

(B) Appointments by the Chair. Pursuant to the Rules of the House, the Chair shall designate a Member of the Committee Majority to serve as Vice Chair of the Committee. The Vice Chair shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the Chair. The Chair also reserves the right to designate a Member of the Committee Majority to serve as the Chair at a hearing or meeting.

2. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY THE CHAIR

The Chair will retain consideration of all legislation referred to the Committee by the Speaker. No action will be required of a Subcommittee before legislation is considered for report by the Committee. Subcommittee chairs, pursuant to the rules set out herein,

may hold hearings on any bill referred to the Committee.

3. SUBCOMMITTEES

(A) Generally. Each Subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee, and to the Rules of the House and the rules adopted herein, to the extent applicable. The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee are *ex officio* Members of all Subcommittees for the purpose of any meeting conducted by a Subcommittee.

(B) The Committee shall be organized into the following five subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy, and Trade.

This Subcommittee (which will consist of six (6) Republican Members and four (4) Democratic Members) will address policies that enhance rural economic growth, increasing America's energy independence and ensuring that America's small businesses can compete effectively in a global marketplace.

Oversight of agricultural policies.

Oversight of environmental issues and regulations (including agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers).

Oversight of energy issues, including expansion of domestic resources, whether they are renewable or non-renewable.

Oversight of international trade policy with particular emphasis on agencies that provide direct assistance to small businesses, such as: the Small Business Administration's (SBA) Office of International Trade, the Department of Commerce's United States Export Assistance Centers, the Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Export-Import Bank.

Oversight of infringement of intellectual property rights by foreign competition.

(2) Subcommittee on Health and Technology.

This Subcommittee (which will consist of six (6) Republican Members and four (4) Democratic Members) will address how health care policies may inhibit or promote economic growth and job creation by small businesses. In addition, the Subcommittee will examine small business job growth through the creation and adoption of advanced technologies.

Oversight of the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Oversight of availability and affordability of health care coverage for small businesses.

Oversight of general technology issues, including intellectual property policy in the United States.

Oversight of United States telecommunications policies including, but not limited to, the National Broadband Plan and allocation of electromagnetic spectrum.

Oversight of the Small Business Innovation Research Program.

Oversight of the Small Business Technology Transfer Program.

(3) Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access.

This Subcommittee (which will consist of six (6) Republican Members and four (4) Democratic Members) will evaluate the operation of the financial markets in the United States and their ability to provide needed capital to small businesses. In addition, the Subcommittee will review federal programs, especially those overseen by the SBA, aimed at assisting entrepreneurs in obtaining needed capital. Since the tax policy plays an integral role in access to capital, this Committee also will examine the impact of federal tax policies on small businesses.

Oversight of capital access and financial markets.

Implementation of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

SBA financial assistance programs, including guaranteed loans, microloans, certified development company loans, and small business investment companies.

Oversight of the Department of Agriculture business and industry guaranteed loan program.

Oversight of general tax policy affecting small businesses.

The management of the SBA disaster loan program.

(4) Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations.

This Subcommittee (which will consist of six (6) Republican Members and four (4) Democratic Members) will probe the efficient operation of government programs that affect small businesses, including the SBA, and develop proposals to make them operate in a more cost-effective manner. This Subcommittee also will review the regulatory burdens imposed on small businesses and how those burdens may be alleviated.

Oversight of general issues affecting small businesses and federal agencies.

Oversight of the management of the SBA.

Oversight of the SBA Inspector General.

Implementation of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Oversight of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget.

Use of the Congressional Review Act.

Transparency of the federal rulemaking process as required by the Administrative Procedure and Data Quality Acts.

Implementation of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

(5) Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce.

This Subcommittee (which will consist of six (6) Republican Members and four (4) Democratic Members) will assess the federal procurement system, including those programs designed specifically to enhance participation by small businesses in providing goods and services to the federal government. The Subcommittee will examine various programs designed to provide technical assistance to small businesses, whether specifically aimed at federal contractors or small businesses in general. Finally, the Subcommittee will review the broad scope of workforce issues that affect the ability of small businesses to obtain and maintain qualified employees.

Oversight of government-wide procurement practices and programs affecting small businesses.

Oversight of federal procurement policies that inhibit or expand participation by small businesses in the federal contracting marketplace.

All contracting programs established by the Small Business Act, including HUBZone, 8(a), Women-, and Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Programs.

Technical assistance provided to federal contractors and perspective contractors through SBA personnel, Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, and Procurement Technical Assistance Centers.

The SBA Surety Bond guarantee program.

Oversight of all federal policies that affect the workforce including, but not limited to, the roles of the Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board.

SBA entrepreneurial development and technical assistance programs unrelated to participation in the federal government contracting.

(C) Powers and Duties of Subcommittees. Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on any matters referred to it. Prior to the scheduling of any meeting or hearing of a Subcommittee, the Chair of the Subcommittee shall obtain the approval of the Chair of the Committee.

(D) Hearing Time and Date. No hearing or meeting of a Subcommittee shall take place at the same time as the meeting or hearing of the full Committee or another Subcommittee, *provided however*, that the Subcommittee Chairs may hold field hearings that conflict with those held by other Subcommittees of the Committee.

4. COMMITTEE STAFF

(A) Majority Staff. The employees of the Committee, except those assigned to the Minority as provided below, shall be appointed and assigned, and may be removed by the Chair of the Committee. The Chair shall fix their remuneration and they shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(B) Minority Staff. The employees of the Committee assigned to the Minority shall be appointed and assigned, and their remuneration determined, as the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall decide.

(C) Subcommittee Staff. There shall be no separate staff assigned to Subcommittees. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall endeavor to ensure that sufficient Committee staff is made available in order that each Subcommittee may carry out the responsibilities set forth in Rule 3, *supra*.

5. MEETINGS

(A) Regular Meeting Day. The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House is in session. The Chair may dispense with the meeting of the Committee, if in the sole discretion of the Chair, there is no need for such meeting.

(B) Additional Meetings. Additional meetings may be called as deemed necessary by the Chair or at the request of the majority Members of the Committee pursuant to Rule XI, cl. 2(c) of the rules of the House. At least 3 days' notice of such an additional meeting shall be given unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to call the meeting on less notice or upon a vote by a majority of the Committee (a quorum being present). To the extent possible, the three days shall be counted from the 72 hours before the time of the meeting. Announcements of the meeting shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

(C) Business to be Considered. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chair subject to limitations set forth in House Rule XI, cl. 2(c).

(D) Meeting Materials. The Chair shall provide to each Member of the Committee, to the extent practicable, at least 48 hours in advance of a meeting, a copy of the bill, resolution, report or other item to be considered at the meeting, but no later than 24 hours before the meeting. Such material also shall be made available to the public at least 24 hours in advance in electronic form.

(E) Special and Emergency Meetings. The rules for notice and meetings as set forth in Rule 5 of these Rules shall not apply to special and emergency meetings. Clause 2(c)(2) of Rule XI and clause 2(g)(3)(A) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, as applicable, shall apply to such meetings.

6. NOTICE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

(A) Announcement of Hearings. Public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee shall be made no later than 7 calendar days before the commencement of the hearing. To the extent possible, the seven days shall be counted from 168 hours before the time of the Committee's hearing.

(B) Exception. The Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or

upon a vote by the majority of the Committee (a quorum being present), may authorize a hearing to commence on less than 7 days' notice.

(C) Witness Lists. Unless the Chair determines it is impracticable to do so, the Committee shall make a tentative witness list available at the time it makes the public announcement of the hearing. If a tentative witness list is not made available at the time of the announcement of the hearing, such witness list shall be made available as soon as practicable after such announcement is made. A final witness list shall be issued by the Committee no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of the hearing.

(D) Hearing Material. The Chair shall provide to all Members of the Committee, as soon as practicable after the announcement of the hearing, a memorandum explaining the subject matter of the hearing and any official reports from departments and agencies on the subject matter of the hearing. Such material shall be made available to all Members of the Committee no later than 48 hours before the commencement of the hearing, unless the Chair, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determines that certain reports from departments or agencies should not be made available prior to the commencement of the hearing. Material provided by the Chair to all Members, whether provided prior to or at the hearing, shall be placed on the Committee website no later than 48 hours after the commencement of the hearing, unless such material contains sensitive or classified information, in which case such material shall be handled pursuant to Rule 16 of the Committee's Rules.

7. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(A) Meetings. Each meeting of the Committee or its Subcommittees for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except as provided by House Rule XI, cl. 4. If the majority of Members of the Committee or Subcommittee present at the meeting determine by a recorded vote in open session that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because the disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House; *provided however*, that no person other than Members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and such executive branch representatives they may authorize, shall be present in any meeting which has been closed to the public.

(B) Hearings. Each hearing conducted by the Committee or its Subcommittees shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage. If the majority of Members of the Committee or Subcommittee present at the hearing determine by a recorded vote in open session that all or part of the remainder of the hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because the disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House; *provided however*, that the Committee or Subcommittee may by the same procedure also vote to close one subsequent day of hearings. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present (if the requisite number of Members are present under Committee rules for the purpose of taking testimony) may vote: (i) to

close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether the testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate Rule XI, cl. 2(k)(5) of the House or (ii) to close the hearing, as provided clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the House.

(C) Participation in Subcommittee Hearings. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are *ex officio* Members of all Subcommittees for any hearing conducted by a Subcommittee. Members of the Committee who wish to participate in a hearing of the Subcommittee to which they are not Members shall make such request to the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee at the commencement of the hearing. The Chair, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, shall grant such request.

(D) Non-Participatory Attendance by Other Members of the House. No Member of the House may be excluded from non-participatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or any Subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or Subcommittees, for purposes of a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearing to Members by the same procedures designated to close hearings to the public.

(E) Procedure to Participate. Members of Congress who are not Members of the Committee but would like to participate in a hearing shall notify the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member and submit a formal request no later than 24 hours before the commencement of the meeting or hearing.

(F) Audio and Video Coverage. To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner easily accessible to the public.

8. WITNESSES

(A) Number of Witnesses. For any hearing conducted by the Committee or Subcommittee there shall be no more than four non-governmental witnesses of which the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee (as appropriate) is entitled to select one witness for the hearing.

(B) Witnesses Selected by the Minority. Witnesses selected by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be invited to testify by the Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee (as appropriate). Rule 8(D) shall apply with equal force to witnesses selected by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(C) Small Business Week Exception. The limitations set forth in the preceding paragraph shall not apply if the Committee holds a hearing to honor the work of the small business community in conjunction with the annual celebration of Small Business Week. Witness limitations for such a hearing shall be determined by the Chair in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(D) Statement of Witnesses.

(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or Subcommittee shall file an electronic copy of the testimony with the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member no later than 48 hours before the commencement of the hearing. In addition, the witness shall provide 25 copies of the testimony by the commencement of the hearing. The Chair may waive the requirement by the witness providing 25 copies in which case the Committee or Subcommittee shall provide the 25 copies.

(2) Each non-governmental witness shall provide to the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member, no later than 48 hours before the commencement of the hearing, a curriculum vitae or other statement describing their education, employment, professional affiliation or other background information pertinent to their testimony.

(E) Witness Disclosure. As required by Rule XI, cl. 2(g) of the Rules of the House, each nongovernmental witness before the commencement of the hearing shall file with the Chair a disclosure form detailing any contracts or grants that the witness has with the federal government, as well as the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject of the hearing originating with a foreign government. In addition, each non-governmental witness shall file with the Committee Chair a disclosure form detailing any payments or contracts received from a foreign government if such payments or contracts are related in any manner to the subject matter of a hearing. Such information shall be posted on the Committee website within 24 hours after the witness appeared at the hearing.

(F) Failure to Comply. The failure to provide the materials set forth by the deadlines set forth in these rules may be grounds for excluding both the oral and written testimony of the witness unless waived by the Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(G) Public Access to Witness Materials. The Committee will provide public access to printed materials, including the testimony of witnesses in electronic form on the Committee's website no later than 24 hours after the hearing is adjourned. Supplemental material provided after the hearing adjourns shall be placed on the Committee website no later than 24 hours after receipt of such material.

(H) Questioning of Witnesses. Except when the Committee adopts a motion pursuant to subdivisions (B) and (C) of clause 2(i)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, Committee Members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chair for that purpose. Members shall have the opportunity, as set forth in Rule XI, cl. 2 (j) of the Rules of the House, to question each witness on the panel for a period not to exceed five minutes. For any hearing, the Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee may offer a motion to extend the questioning of a witness or witnesses by the Member identified in the motion for more than five minutes as set forth in Rule XI, cl. 2(j)(B).

(I) Order of Questioning. The Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee shall commence questioning followed by the Ranking Minority Member. Thereafter, questioning shall alternate between the majority and minority Members. Before the gavel has been struck, or in the case of Members arriving simultaneously, the order of questioning shall be based on seniority among Members of his or her own party. After the gavel has been struck, Members first to arrive shall have priority over Members of his or her own party.

(J) Consideration of Ratio. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of majority and minority Members present in such a manner as to not disadvantage the Members of either party.

9. QUORUM

(A) Determining a Quorum. A quorum, for purposes of reporting a measure or recommendation, shall be a majority of the Committee Members.

(B) Quorum for a Hearing. For purposes of taking testimony or receiving evidence, a

quorum shall be one Member from the Majority and one Member from the Minority. The Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee shall exercise reasonable comity by waiting for the Ranking Minority Member even if a quorum is present before striking the gavel to commence the hearing. For hearings held by the Committee or a Subcommittee in a location other than the Committee's hearing room in Washington, DC, a quorum shall be deemed to be present if the Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee is present.

10. RECORD VOTES

(A) When Provided. A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of any Member of the Committee. A record of the vote of each Member of the Committee on a matter before the Committee shall be 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.

(B) Public Access to Record Votes. The Chair of the Committee shall, not later than 24 hours after consideration of a bill, resolution, report or other item, cause the text of the reported item and any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

11. SUBPOENAS

(A) Authorization and Issuance. A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attendance and testimony of such witness and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents, as deemed necessary. Such subpoena shall be authorized by a majority of the full Committee. The requirement that the authorization of a subpoena requires a majority vote may be waived by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(B) Issuance During Congressional Recess. The Chair may issue a subpoena, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, when the House is out for session for more than three legislative days.

12. AMENDMENTS DURING MARKUP

(A) Availability of Amendments. Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the Committee must be made available in written form by any Member of the Committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the Chair shall allow an appropriate period for the provision thereof and may adjourn the markup to provide sufficient time for the provision of such written amendment. Such period or adjournment shall not prejudice the offering of such amendment.

(B) Drafting and Filing of Amendments. For amendments to be accepted during markup, there is no requirement that the amendments be filed prior to commencement of the markup or prepared with the assistance of the Office of Legislative Counsel. Even though it is not necessary, Members seeking to amend legislation during markup should draft amendments with the assistance of the Office of Legislative Counsel and consult with the Chair or Ranking Minority Member's staff (as appropriate) in the preparation of such amendments.

13. POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

(A) When Postponement is Permissible. The Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chair may

resume postponed proceedings, but no later than 24 hours after such postponement, unless the House is not in session or there are conflicts with Member schedules that make it unlikely a quorum will be present to conduct business on the postponed proceeding. In such cases, the Chair will consult with Members to set a time as early as possible to resume proceedings but in no event later than the next meeting date as set forth in Rule 5 of these Rules.

(B) Resumption of Proceedings. 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.

14. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(A) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all actions, which shall include a record of the vote on any question on which a recorded vote is demanded. The result of any vote by the Committee, or if applicable by a Subcommittee, including a voice vote shall be posted on the Committee's website within 24 hours after the vote has been taken. Such record shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of the Member voting for and against such amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, and the names of Members present but not voting. For any amendment, motion, order, or other proposition decided by voice vote, the record shall include a description and whether the voice vote was in favor or against.

(B) Transcripts. The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee and Subcommittee activity which, in the case of a meeting or hearing transcript, shall include a substantially verbatim account of the remarks actually made during the proceedings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks.

(C) Availability of Records. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chair of the Committee shall notify the Ranking Member of the Committee of any decision, pursuant to Rule VII, cl. 3(b)(3) or cl. 4(b), to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination of the written request of any Member of the Committee.

(D) Publishing and Posting of Records. The Committee Rules shall be made 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.

15. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about Committee's activities to Committee Members and other Members of the House. The Ranking Minority Member may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the Minority to Committee Members and other Members of the House.

16. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE INFORMATION

(A) Access to classified or sensitive information supplied to the Committee or Subcommittees and attendance at closed sessions of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be limited to Members and necessary Committee staff and stenographic reporters who have appropriate security clearance

when the Chair determines that such access or attendance is essential to the functioning of the Committee or one of its Subcommittees.

(B) Procedures Governing Availability. The procedures to be followed in granting access to those hearings, records, data, charts, and files of the Committee which involve classified information or information deemed to be sensitive shall be as follows:

(I) Only Members of the House of Representatives and specifically designated Committee staff of the Committee on Small Business may have access to such information.

(II) Members who desire to read materials that are in possession of the Committee shall notify the Clerk of the Committee in writing.

(III) The Clerk of the Committee will maintain an accurate access log, which identifies the circumstances surrounding access to the information, without revealing the material examined.

(IV) If the material desired to be reviewed is material which the Committee or Subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special handling, before receiving access to such information, individuals will be required to sign an access information sheet acknowledging such access and that the individual has read and understands the procedures under which access is being granted.

(V) Material provided for review under this rule shall not be removed from a specified room within the Committee offices.

(VI) Individuals reviewing materials under this rule shall make certain that the materials are returned to the proper custodian.

(VII) No reproductions or recordings may be made of any portion of such materials.

(VIII) The contents of such information shall not be divulged to any person in any way, form, shape, or manner and shall not be discussed with any person who has not received the information in the manner authorized by the rules of the Committee.

(IX) When not being examined in the manner described herein, such information will be kept in secure safes or locked file cabinets within the Committee offices.

(X) These procedures only address access to information the Committee or Subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special treatment.

(XI) If a Member of the House of Representatives believes that certain sensitive information should not be restricted as to dissemination or use, the Member may petition the Committee or Subcommittee to so rule. With respect to information and materials provided to the Committee by the Executive Branch or an independent agency as that term is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502, the classification of information and materials as determined by the Executive Branch or independent agency shall prevail unless affirmatively changed by the Committee or Subcommittee involved, after consultation with the Executive Branch or independent agency.

(XII) Other materials in the possession of the Committee are to be handled in accordance with normal practices and traditions of the Committee.

17. OTHER PROCEDURES

The Chair of the Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

18. AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended or repealed by a majority vote of the Members, at a meeting specifically called for such purpose, but only if written notice of the proposed change or changes has

been provided to each Member of the Committee at least 72 hours prior to the time of the meeting of the Committee to consider such change or changes.

19. BUDGET AND TRAVEL

(A) Allocation of Budget. From the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in the 115th Congress, the Chair, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall designate one-third of the budget under the direction of the Ranking Minority Member for the purposes of minority staff, travel expenses of minority staff and Members, and minority office expenses.

(B) Authorization of Travel. The Chair may authorize travel in connection with activities or subject matters under the legislative or oversight jurisdiction of the Committee as set forth in Rule X of the Rules of the House. The Ranking Minority Member may authorize travel for any Minority Member or staff of the minority in connection with activities or subject matters under the Committee's jurisdiction as set forth in Rule X of the Rules of the House. Before such travel, there shall be submitted to the Chair of the Committee in writing the following at least seven (7) calendar days prior specifying: a) the purpose of the travel; b) the dates during which the travel is to occur; c) the names of the states or countries to be visited and the length of time spent in each; and d) the names of Members and staff of the Committee participating in such travel.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 305. An act to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on National Vietnam War Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 7, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

495. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Open Licensing Requirement for Competitive Grant Programs [Docket ID: ED-2015-OS-0105] (RIN: 1894-AA07) received February 2, 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.

496. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received February 2, 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.

497. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [Docket No.: EERE-2016-BT-TP-0029] (RIN: 1904-AD71) received February 2, 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.

498. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Compressors [Docket No.: EERE-2014-BT-TP-0054] (RIN: 1904-AD43) received February 2, 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.

499. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0795] [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0796] [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0797; FRL-9957-22] received February 3, 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.

500. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propamocarb; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0083; FRL-9957-68] received February 3, 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.

501. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the FY 2016 annual report of Military Assistance and Military Exports, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2415(a); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 655 (as amended by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 148); (110 Stat. 1435); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

502. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Navy's proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea, Transmittal No. 16-85, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

503. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Air Force's proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea, Transmittal No. 16-83, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

504. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Agency's reports containing the September 30, 2016, status of loans and guarantees, issued under Section 25(a)(11) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

505. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's 2016 Data Mining Report to Congress pursuant to Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

506. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the report of the Fed-

eral Mediation and Conciliation Service under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for Fiscal Year 2016; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

507. 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 — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To List Two Guitarfishes as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act [Docket No.: 150211138-7024-02] (RIN: 0648-XD771) received February 2, 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.

508. 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 Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; 2017-2018 Fishing Quotas [Docket No.: 160816746-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XE819) 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.

509. 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 rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Blueline Tilefish Fishery; Secretarial Interim Action [Docket No.: 160609505-6505-01] (RIN: 0648-BG07) received February 1, 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.

510. 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; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 160411325-6535-02] (RIN: 0648-XE568) received February 1, 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.

511. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the implementation, enforcement, and prosecution of registration requirements of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 16991; Public Law 109-248, Sec. 635; (120 Stat. 644); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

512. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, ASFR/OGAPA/Division of Grants, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Annual Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustment (RIN: 0991-AC0) received February 2, 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.

513. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment [Docket ID: BSEE-2017-0001; 17XE1700DX EX1SF0000.DAQ000 EEEE50000] (RIN: 1014-AA34) received February 3, 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.

514. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 3052-AD21) received February 2, 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.

515. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Uniform National Discharge Standards for Vessels of the Armed Forces — Phase II Batch One: Delay of Effective Date [EPA-HQ-OW-2013-0469; FRL-9959-30-OW] received February 3, 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.

516. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of a memorandum, entitled "Construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline"; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce.

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. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 91. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) 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; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues (Rept. 115-9).

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 Missouri (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ROYCE of California):

H.R. 871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt premiums paid on non-cash-value property and casualty insurance from the taxes to enforce reporting on certain foreign accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to enhance medical device communications and ensure device cleanliness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 873. A bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish

the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOEBBACH (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. VELA, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 874. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that certain veterans receive in-patient psychiatric care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 875. A bill to facilitate and streamline the Bureau of Reclamation process for creating or expanding water storage, rural water supply, and water recycling projects under Reclamation law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VELA, Mr. KEATING, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. JONES, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HECK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HILL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 877. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to place in Arlington National Cemetery a monument honoring the helicopter pilots and crewmembers who were killed while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LANCE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona,

Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. BARR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 878. A bill to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 879. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to conduct periodic reviews of the flood insurance rates and flood insurance rate maps under the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 880. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr.

THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 881. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide for direct payment of statutory sound recording performance royalties to record producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. HURD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 882. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 883. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 884. A bill to clarify that volunteers at a children's consignment event are not employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 885. A bill to extend the waiver of limitations with respect to excluding from gross income amounts received by wrongfully incarcerated individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 886. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit dependents of retired members of the Armed Forces who reside in military housing to attend Department of Defense elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 887. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend honorary citizenship to otherwise qualified noncitizens who enlisted in the Philippines and died while serving on active duty with the United States Armed Forces during certain periods of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 888. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 889. A bill to provide for the establishment of an office within the Internal Revenue Service to focus on violations of the internal revenue laws by persons who are under investigation for conduct relating to the promotion of commercial sex acts and trafficking in persons crimes, and to increase the criminal monetary penalty limitations for the underpayment or overpayment of tax due to fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 890. A bill to establish the United States Copyright Office as an agency in the legislative branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 891. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to employee protective arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 892. A bill to adjust the amount of monthly old-age, survivors, and disability insurance payments under title II of the Social Security Act based on locality-based comparability payment rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 893. A bill to protect, improve, and modernize the act of voting; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. PAULSEN:

H.R. 894. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain interest and money market fund dividend income payments to charity and to modify the requirements relating to the reporting of such payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 895. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for

a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt amounts paid for aircraft management services from the excise taxes imposed on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 897. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to State and local entities to carry out peer-to-peer mental health programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.J. Res. 64. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate campaign contributions for Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylii, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BERA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SIREN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution reaffirming a strong commitment to the United States-Australia alliance relationship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 92. A resolution condemning North Korea's development of multiple intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 93. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Natural Resources in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 94. A resolution commending Sally Quillian Yates for refusing to enforce Donald Trump's discriminatory Executive Order

13769 (82 Fed. Reg. 8977; relating to "Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States"); 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 Missouri:

H.R. 871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises."

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 873.

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 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the

United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight, Clause One "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"

Article One, Section Eight, Clause Three "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution. Specifically, Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16 and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution gives Congress the authority to "establish an uniform rule of naturalization" and to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces".

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16 and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for orga-

nizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which provides Congress with the power to lay and collect taxes and regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by security for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 "The Congress shall have the power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 894.

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. ROKITA:

H.R. 895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I: 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 Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 or Article I

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.J. Res. 64.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This joint resolution is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article V of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 112: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 140: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 176: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 233: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 275: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 299: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 332: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 334: Mr. POCAN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 350: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 358: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 367: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MAST, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COMER, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 369: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 387: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HILL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 392: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 394: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 400: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 406: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 421: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 422: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 428: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 439: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 468: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 476: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 490: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 512: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 525: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 539: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 553: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 559: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 592: Mr. KILMER, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 630: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 632: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 637: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 662: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 692: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 694: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 696: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 712: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 713: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 724: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 732: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 747: Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 757: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. McEACHIN, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 769: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 771: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 772: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 777: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 781: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PALMER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 782: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 785: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARR, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 787: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 789: Mr. DUNN, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 793: Mr. GALLEGO and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 804: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HECK, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H.R. 816: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 820: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HURD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PASCARELL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 821: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 831: Mr. HURD.
 H.R. 841: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 842: Mr. AMASH.
 H.R. 850: Mr. BANKS of Indiana and Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 852: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 860: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 866: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 868: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 869: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.J. Res. 6: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. DAVIDSON.
 H.J. Res. 27: Mr. MARINO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LAUDERMILK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BYRNE.
 H.J. Res. 42: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DUFFY.
 H.J. Res. 43: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.J. Res. 44: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.J. Res. 48: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. NORTON.
 H.J. Res. 53: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.J. Res. 57: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. BUDD.
 H.J. Res. 58: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. YOHO, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANK, and Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.J. Res. 59: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 62: Mr. ROSS.
 H.J. Res. 63: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. FASO.
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H. Res. 15: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. REED, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H. Res. 28: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H. Res. 30: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H. Res. 31: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H. Res. 38: Mr. BYRNE.
 H. Res. 60: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. ISSA.
 H. Res. 78: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H. Res. 85: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 90: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

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.R. 428 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. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions in H.J. Res. 44 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 MS. FOXX

The provisions warranting a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.J. Res. 57 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The provisions warranting a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.J. Res. 58 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.