

can make more of a difference outside of Congress. That is too bad, because we need good people. We need them. We need them to be here, to be part of us.

One of the brutal realities as—author Jim Collins of “Good to Great,” you know, he talks about facing the brutal realities. One of the brutal realities that I believe we have to face is the professional politician. That wasn’t written about anywhere 240 years ago. It just occurred over time.

It is our responsibility—especially as a freshman class, you can feel the passion that we believe is the right passion to be put behind term limits to begin to make the change necessary. So we are all in this together. In fact, I am proud to be a member of the freshman class, and I am proud of the fact that we signed a commitment to civility a couple of months ago that put us in a position where we are finding our voice. And what you are hearing today from our colleagues is part of that voice says: We need to do some things a little differently.

So let’s move forward; let’s expand the debate; and let’s make sure that we are inclusive in everyone who wants to get their opinion heard on this issue; and make sure that those who have questions about what we mean, we articulate it because in so many areas we have got big decisions to make. This is going to be a big one.

In the Marines, we accept the mission that is assigned; we plan and train for it, and then we execute it, and we get it right. And that doesn’t mean we don’t make a few tweaks in the process, but the bottom line is that we accomplish the mission.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all of my colleagues to seriously consider getting behind support for term limits in the United States Congress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank Congressman BERGMAN not only for his leadership in the freshman class, but a lifetime of leadership and a lifetime spent leading marines.

I ask my team here in Congress, whenever we are considering a difficult issue, to apply what I call the lance corporal test. In other words, how are the policies that we are debating today and how is the legislation that we are considering going to affect that lance corporal, that 19-year-old man or woman at the tip of the spear?

I think General BERGMAN has seen in his career how messy things can get at the tip of the spear when you are far removed from air-conditioned offices in Washington, D.C.

I believe having more people not only with military experience, but with experience from a wide range of occupations will allow us to more thoughtfully consider how our policies here, designed in Washington, D.C., have real impacts on the American people and, indeed, across the world.

I now yield to the gentleman (Mr. ARRINGTON) from Lubbock, Texas, to talk more about this issue. It has been great to work with the pride of Texas Tech, the pride of Lubbock, Texas.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for his leadership on this very important issue.

I have made the statement often when I ran for this office that I ran to change not only the course for this country, but the culture of Washington. It is my strong belief that we cannot change the course in any meaningful way without changing the culture.

So I want to, again, thank my colleague, MIKE GALLAGHER, for his leadership in rallying the freshman class, both Republicans and Democrats, on an issue that I think, because of this unique time in the history of our country, a time that I think calls for bold action, he is seizing the opportunity and heeding that call on behalf of our freshman class. And so I am deeply grateful for his courageous leadership.

Our country, the greatest experiment in liberty and democracy, was conceived by men of great principle; men who were committed to leading, to governing; and, yes—and I know this isn’t popular—to compromising; making difficult decisions and putting the Nation’s interest above their own personal interest. They were also men who never envisioned a lifelong career in politics.

In 1819, only 1 percent of Representatives had served over 16 years. Now, 20 percent of Representatives have served over 16 years. The current scenario where Members of Congress serve for 15, 20, even 30 years, is inconsistent with the Founders’ view of citizen statesmen. We need an environment that encourages politicians to do what is right not by their party or some special interest, and certainly not to secure their long-term career goals, but to do what is right for their fellow countrymen. Period.

I think passing legislation to implement term limits across the board is a good step in the right direction. I am grateful to be a part of this body and a part of this freshman class. It is such a unique time in our Nation’s history.

We need to go big; we need to go bold; or we need to go home.

So thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank Congressman ARRINGTON for his comments. As he rightfully points out, the time is now for big and bold action. We have a unique window of opportunity here that we must seize. The American people gave us an opportunity to turn this country around, to really, in my opinion, save the country. But that is all it is: a fleeting opportunity. And what we do over the coming days and weeks will determine whether we get more of that opportunity.

I thank Congressman ARRINGTON for reminding us that this is just the first step; that the hard work is yet to come. We have to fight for this idea to implement it, and there is a lot of hard work ahead. I look forward to working with him on that.

I know there is a division of opinions on this issue, and there are some principled arguments against term limits.

I just remember talking with the man who held this seat before I did, Congressman Reid Ribble. He had spent his entire life in roofing, which was a nonstandard preparation for serving in Congress, but he decided to give up his successful private sector career to come here for a season of service and to work on behalf of the people of north-east Wisconsin.

□ 1745

He term-limited himself. I would debate this issue with him, and we went back and forth. Ultimately, he said something that stuck with me, and I think it is the most powerful argument for implementing term limits.

He said: Every day, I woke up, and I knew that I had one less day to make a difference in the people’s House. One less day. And so every day, I woke up with a sense of urgency, wanting to fix problems and get things done on behalf of my constituents.

I just think about that whenever I consider this debate. I just think about, if all 535 Members of the House and the Senate woke up with that same sense of urgency, if we all woke up every day knowing we had one less day to make a difference, imagine what we could accomplish working together.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues who have spoken so eloquently on behalf of term limits, and I look forward to working with them.

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

U.S. POLICY TOWARDS KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an Olympic Gold Medal; groundbreaking international conferences on religious cooperation intolerance; membership in the World Bank, the IMF, and other international bodies; and recognition by more than 110 countries—these are only some of the accomplishments of the young nation of Kosovo.

The United States was among the first to recognize Kosovo, and today we are its strongest backer, and rightfully so. First recognized by President Bush, relations only deepened under President Obama. For that, Kosovo proudly has become the strongest supporter of the United States and Europe, sitting at an 85 percent approval rating.

This is not to say that Kosovo is a perfect country. We are not a perfect country. Corruption needs to be attacked in Kosovo. Judicial reform is progressing far too slowly. And official unemployment hovers at just above 30 percent. So there is hard work to be done. There is obviously a lot of work to do. But I have visited this country again and again and again and again;

and every time, I see progress, and I know there is a bright future.

I have often said that, as an American, I can go all around the world, but I will never get greeted with more love and friendship than I will in Kosovo. People there truly love Americans and all things American.

The best way to help Kosovo is through continued, strong support, as the United States has done for many years. But too many impediments stand in the way, many of them coming from outside of Kosovo's borders.

For example, Kosovo wants what most countries across the region want, to become part of a secure and integrated Europe, membership in the European Union and in NATO. Yet, just five European holdouts stand in the way of this progress for Kosovo.

When it comes to United Nations membership, Kosovo's way forward is blocked by Serbia and its ally, Russia. In fact, Serbia seeks to block Kosovo at almost every turn, and lately has been escalating tensions.

Both Serbia and Kosovo want to go to the European Union, and I support both of them getting into the European Union. But one of those countries shouldn't try to block another one, and Serbia has repeatedly tried to make it difficult for Kosovo to get into the EU and to get other things as well.

Serbia recently sent into Kosovo's north a propaganda train emblazoned with the words, Serbia is Kosovo, written in 21 languages to foment discord among Kosovo's small Serbian population. It pushed the building of a wall in Metrovica, a tiny city straddling the cleavages of Kosovo's interethnic divide. While that wall has now come down, the scars remain.

Serbia has continued to deny justice to the loved ones of hundreds of victims of its campaign of ethnic cleansing, including three American citizens, the Bytyqi brothers. And there are all kinds of insults, from a train and other things, giving propaganda against Kosovo by Serbia pushed to the Serbian-Kosovo border that helps to escalate tensions rather than bring them down.

As a result of a Serbian INTERPOL arrest warrant, French authorities recently detained former Kosovo Prime Minister Ramush Haradinaj, who has already been acquitted twice by an international tribunal.

We in the United States have this wonderful thing of no double jeopardy. If you go to trial and you are acquitted, you cannot be tried on the same thing again. That isn't true of many countries.

So Ramush Haradinaj was accused of war crimes, went to The Hague, spent many weeks and months there, was acquitted, and then was recharged again, and had to go back to The Hague to have another trial on which he was again acquitted. Now, Serbia has manipulated INTERPOL to try to get a third trial on essentially the same matter for Ramush Haradinaj again.

This, to me, is unconscionable and shows tremendous bad faith on the part of the Serbian Government.

Serbia also fought Kosovo's membership in UNESCO, ultimately a self-defeating act, because among Kosovo's most cherished historical cultural institutions are its 13th century Serbian Orthodox churches. Kosovo did not get into UNESCO. It failed by three votes, and again the Serbian interruption played a major role in preventing them from getting into UNESCO. The United States fought to have Kosovo into UNESCO, but ultimately lost by three votes.

Kosovo and Serbia have sat down across the negotiating table in talks facilitated by the European Union. Those talks showed some progress that resulted in an agreement calling for normalization. I even nominated, at that time, the Prime Ministers of Kosovo and Serbia, along with the EU's former policy head, Baroness Catherine Ashton, for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Unfortunately, today, I question these successes. What kind of normalization involves stoking tensions among a neighbor's minority population and standing in the way of international integration? That is what Serbia is doing to Kosovo, and it should be stopped.

In terms of Ramush Haradinaj, trying to try him again, I don't know why the Government of Serbia seems intent on rekindling 20- and 30-year-old Balkan wars. They were terrible things that happened in war and terrible things that happened on both sides, but the man was found innocent twice. This is nothing more than bad faith on the part of the Serbian Government and harassment.

It might come as a surprise to you, Mr. Speaker, but 9 years on, as a free and independent country, Kosovo still has no army. That is right. A sovereign nation-state without an army. It has a small, lightly armed security force, but nothing resembling the large Russian-equipped Serbian military just next door.

Earlier this month, Kosovo took a small step toward establishing its army. Legislation was submitted to parliament. Like the legislative process here in the United States, the introduction of a bill is only the opening note on a much larger and longer sheet of music, a score which involves consultation with regional partners, the international community, domestic minorities, and NGOs.

We all know how this process works. There is back and forth, there is give and take. Supporters and opponents alike are welcome into the arena and all positions are heard. The process accounts for everybody's concerns in some way or another.

So what is in this proposal? What would Kosovo's army look like? It would be multiethnic, just as the Kosovo security force and the Kosovo police are now. It would partner with Western countries and hopefully NATO

in pursuit of greater regional and international stability. It would be defensive and nonthreatening to Kosovo's neighbors. Mr. Speaker, it would be exactly what the United States wants to see in a partner.

Yet, while Kosovo slowly moves to set up its small defensive force, Serbia is beefing up its military with full Russian backing. It is taking deliveries of T-72 tanks, MiG-29 fighters, and S-300 anti-aircraft missile systems, courtesy of Moscow and Vladimir Putin.

So I am a little confused, Mr. Speaker. Kosovo, a country we support and which supports us, wants what every other country in the world has: a basic army in which its citizens can serve their nation, and probably serve alongside our own military if given the chance.

What do we do? We offer rebukes and diplomatic threats, and we make it clear that we don't support Kosovo having an army at this time. That is absolutely absurd and is a position that we ought to change, and change quickly. Yet Russian weapons and materiel are pouring into Serbia, courtesy of Vladimir Putin; and as far as I can tell, the United States has stood in silence.

Regardless, Mr. Speaker, America's relation with Kosovo is strong and the future is bright. We need to stay on that course. Kosovo is a young country. I have been there many, many times. It is not even 10 years old.

We know better than anyone that building a democracy is hard work. Sometimes you will face setbacks. Sometimes you need a helping hand. That is why American support is more important than ever. That is why the United States should work to deepen our ties, enrich our mutual understanding, and continue to bring stability to the entire Balkan region. That is the way to a more prosperous, democratic, and multiethnic Kosovo; and that is the way for the United States to see a Balkan region free, at peace, and part of the whole of Europe.

Meanwhile, France should send Ramush Haradinaj home. Enough is enough already. We cannot stand for any more of this nonsense.

The United States should stand by Kosovo. Kosovo is a free and independent country. For many years, they were fed all kinds of lies about the United States during the old Communist regime in the fifties, sixties, and seventies. You know what? The people of Kosovo didn't believe a word of it.

So I would say to my colleagues and to my friends and to all of our American citizens: When you visit Kosovo, you will know and you will be proud to be an American because people come up to you in the street and want to touch you, want to talk to you, want to do everything and be everything American. Those are the kinds of friends that we need.

America does much for many, many people around the world, many, many

nations, and sometimes we feel it is not appreciated—but not in Kosovo. Everything that the United States has helped that country with is appreciated from everyone, from the Prime Minister to the President, to people in government, to the average people in the street.

I very often have people coming up to me in the street wanting to talk to me. They recognize me. They say: Thank you. Thank you to America for standing by us in our independence. Thank you to America for being strong and keeping us strong.

So those are the kinds of friends I want to have. Those are the kind of people I want to have.

So I would say to the people of Kosovo and the Government of Kosovo: The United States stands by you and always will stand by you.

I would say to the Government of Serbia: We support the aspirations of the Serbian people to enter the European Union, but Serbia ought to stop doing what it is doing to block Kosovo. Serbia ought to stop its belligerent moves against Kosovo.

Both countries should go into the European Union—and eventually, NATO—and each one should not stop each other. They should help each other.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend the next couple of moments talking about a subject that is very near and dear to everyone's heart, and that is health care. I want to do it because tomorrow we have a big healthcare vote here in the Congress, and I think it is very important that we all very clearly lay out what we really feel should happen.

Last week, as part of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I was up for about 28 hours in a row marking up a bill that was done all night long. At the time when we marked it up, we thought it was a bit silly because the bill hadn't been scored by the Congressional Budget Office, so we had no idea what it cost. It was like buying a pig in a poke. How could you decide whether something is good or not when you don't even know what the cost is? Since we obviously don't have unlimited funds, if something costs more money, we have to pull it out of someplace else.

□ 1800

So we voted on a bill. Unfortunately, it was a strict party-line vote, and the bill passed. Shortly thereafter, a few days later, the Congressional Budget Office scored it; and I think it was, frankly, from my vantage point, a disaster for the bill.

Now, what I think that this Congress should be doing is I think that we should make tweaks and fix the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. There are many, many good things in ObamaCare, in the healthcare bill, in the healthcare act, that has now been here for many, many years. But there are also some problems with it.

You know, every major bill that has been passed by this Congress and signed into law needed some tweaks, needed some changes, because you pass a law with good intention, but sometimes it doesn't work out exactly as you wanted it to work out. So you need to change things, you need to make improvements. When you see what is working, what is not working, that is what you do.

That is what this Congress should do with ObamaCare. We should say where premiums are going up or where certain jurisdictions only have one insurance company and, therefore, there is no competition, we can figure out ways to fix it. We can figure out ways to tweak it. That is what the American people would want us to do. The American people would want us to work together and would want us to work in a bipartisan fashion to try to fix what was wrong with ObamaCare.

Now, there are many wonderful things about ObamaCare. First of all, everyone knows it eliminated the so-called preexisting condition problem, where before, when you changed jobs and you went to a new insurance company, the insurance company said, "Sorry, you have had cancer for 3 years and you have been treated; we are not going to treat you for cancer because it is a preexisting condition," or a heart attack or whatever it is. That was basically unconscionable.

And millions of people couldn't get help because they changed a job and, therefore, changed a healthcare plan. That was changed in ObamaCare. And that was a very, very important thing because an insurance company can now no longer deny you coverage because of a preexisting condition.

Also, as everybody knows, children up to 26 years old can now stay and be insured under their parents' insurance plans. That was a very good plus of ObamaCare, or of the Affordable Care Act.

And there were other very, very important, good things. We had more people being covered than ever before. People who had never had health coverage got it now because of the Affordable Care Act.

So what do we see now? We see, instead of trying to put it together in a bipartisan fashion, trying to fix it, we have this bill which passed the Energy and Commerce Committee and passed the Ways and Means Committee and supposedly is going to be on the floor tomorrow if they can round up the votes. They are having difficulty rounding up the votes.

And what do we see when we look at this new bill that they are asking us to vote for? Let me tell you what we see.

If this bill would ever come into law, we would have much less coverage than ever before. Many people would lose their healthcare coverage, and we would have a smaller population actually being covered for health care.

We call it TrumpCare, and TrumpCare will take away health care

from 24 million hardworking Americans. That is not acceptable.

Why shouldn't we be working together to improve ObamaCare? Why do we need a new plan that will insure 24 million less people than we insure now? It is bizarre. It makes no sense whatsoever.

We also feel, when we analyze it—and this is, again, what the Congressional Budget Office tells us—there are higher costs. TrumpCare forces families to pay increased out-of-pocket costs and higher deductibles.

So what does that all mean?

It means you pay more and you get less. That is a pretty bad deal. I don't think anybody wants that deal. I think Democrats and Republicans, alike, don't want that deal. I think Americans don't want that deal. We want it the opposite way. We would like to pay less and get coverage. But what TrumpCare does to the Affordable Care Act, you pay more and you get less.

If that weren't bad enough, an analysis of it finds that there is a crushing age tax. TrumpCare forces Americans between the ages of 50 and 64 to pay premiums which are five times higher than what others pay for health coverage, no matter how healthy they are. Talk about discrimination.

If you are a 50-year-old that is in good health, why should you have to pay five times more premium than what others pay for health coverage? Doesn't sound like a very good idea to me.

And then you say: How do they get the money to pay for whatever? Well, it steals from Medicaid and Medicare. TrumpCare ransacks the Medicaid funds that allow seniors to get the long-term care they need and shortens the life of the Medicare trust fund by 3 years. Again, pretty bad deal for me.

And you say: Well, who benefits from this? If this is something that people are going to have to pay more and get less coverage, it is discriminatory for people ages 50 to 64. It hurts middle class people making \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 a year, hurts them and hurts seniors, knocks seniors out. Well, who does it help?

Well, guess what? TrumpCare ransacks the Medicaid funds that allow seniors to get the long-term care they need. I said that before. But what does it do? It lowers tax cuts for the rich. So the rich get more tax cuts—I am sorry. It doesn't lower it. It gives the rich more tax cuts.

So it is really kind of nice, I suppose, when you have a billionaire President, it is nice to help the rich—but not at the expense of middle class America.

So when you look at this plan, it is a pretty bad plan for the middle class, pretty bad. So if you didn't like ObamaCare, you are going to dislike TrumpCare even more.

If it is passed, once it is passed, we are going to see, again, premiums rise, millions of people thrown out of insurance, and less coverage, but the very wealthy will get a nice, juicy tax break.

So, you know who used to steal from the rich and give to the poor? This is stealing from the poor and giving to the rich. It is really disgraceful.

So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Let's defeat TrumpCare because it doesn't help anybody, and let's put our heads together. We have enough talent in this place on both sides of the aisle, and that is what the American people want us to do. They want us to put our heads together. They want us to work together and come up with a plan that aids the largest amount of people at the lowest possible cost.

It won't be easy. It will be very difficult. But we should do it together, not jam TrumpCare down our throat, not tell people about false promises when you know people are going to be thrown off.

If you say: Well, you know what? It is going to be cheaper. Well, it is cheaper if you throw off all the sick people and you don't give them insurance, and you throw off all the seniors and you don't help them. Well, of course it is cheaper because all the people that are sick and really need the help won't get it. And after all, what is insurance about? Insurance is there just in case you get sick.

So I am very chagrined about this new bill. I hope it gets defeated tomorrow. I hope that we then go back to the drawing board and come up with a program that will help the American people, not a program that helps Democrats or a program that helps Republicans, but a program that helps Americans, because we are all in this together.

The bill proposed by my Republican colleagues called TrumpCare is not a bill for Americans that will aid them with help when they get sick. As Americans, I do believe that health care

should be a right, not a luxury. I believe that the richest country that the world has ever known can give its citizens health care. I believe in the single-payer health care.

But even if it is not single-payer, let's take the original Affordable Care Act, keep what is good, enhance what is good and what needs to be corrected and changed. Let's do it. That is what the American people want. That is what the American people demand, and we should do nothing less.

This bill ought to be defeated tomorrow. Let's go back to the drawing board and come up with something we can be proud of.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2352

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 115-56) on the resolution (H. Res. 221) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for March 20 through today on account of medical condition.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 21, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 1362. To name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Pago Pago, American Samoa, the Faleomavaega Eni Fa'aua'a Hunkin VA Clinic.

H.J. Res. 42. Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 23, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO KOSOVO, SRI LANKA, AND GEORGIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEBRUARY 17 AND FEBRUARY 26, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Roskam	2/18	2/20	Kosovo		469.71		(3)				469.71
Hon. David Price	2/18	2/20	Kosovo		469.71		(3)				469.71
Hon. Adrian Smith	2/18	2/20	Kosovo		469.71		(3)				469.71
Hon. Gerry Connolly	2/18	2/20	Kosovo		469.71		(3)				469.71
Jeff Billman	2/18	2/20	Kosovo		469.71		(3)				469.71
Justin Wein	2/18	2/20	Kosovo		469.71		(3)				469.71
Hon. Peter Roskam	2/20	2/24	Sri Lanka		1,002.75		(3)				1,002.75
Hon. David Price	2/20	2/24	Sri Lanka		1,002.75		(3)				1,002.75
Hon. Adrian Smith	2/20	2/24	Sri Lanka		1,002.75		(3)				1,002.75
Hon. Gerry Connolly	2/20	2/24	Sri Lanka		1,002.75		(3)				1,002.75
Jeff Billman	2/20	2/24	Sri Lanka		1,002.75		(3)				1,002.75
Justin Wein	2/20	2/24	Sri Lanka		1,002.75		(3)				1,002.75
Hon. Peter Roskam	2/24	2/26	Georgia		683.20		(3)				683.20
Hon. David Price	2/24	2/26	Georgia		683.20		(3)				683.20
Hon. Adrian Smith	2/24	2/26	Georgia		683.20		(3)				683.20
Hon. Gerry Connolly	2/24	2/26	Georgia		683.20		(3)				683.20
Jeff Billman	2/24	2/26	Georgia		683.20		(3)				683.20
Justin Wein	2/24	2/26	Georgia		683.20		(3)				683.20
Committee total					12,933.96						12,933.96

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.